

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.30 pm on 11 July 2016

Present:

Councillor Richard Scoates (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Vanessa Allen, Graham Arthur, Nicholas Bennett J.P.,
Katy Boughey, Kevin Brooks, Lydia Buttinger, Simon Fawthrop,
William Huntington-Thresher, Charles Joel, Alexa Michael,
Neil Reddin FCCA, Pauline Tunncliffe and Michael Turner

Also Present:

Councillors Russell Mellor

8 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

An apology for absence was received from the Chairman, Councillor Peter Dean. Councillor Richard Scoates acted as Chairman for the meeting.

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Eric Bosshard; Councillor Nicholas Bennett JP attended as substitute.

Apologies for absence were also received from Councillors Douglas Auld, Nicky Dykes and David Livett.

9 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were received.

10 CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS HELD ON 11 MAY 2016 AND 2 JUNE 2016

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meetings held on 11 May and 2 June 2016 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

11 QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ATTENDING THE MEETING

The following oral question was received from Mr John Ince on behalf of CRA20ten Residents' Association, St Paul's Cray in relation to the "Living in Bromley" Draft Policy: Housing Supply/Bromley Valley Gym, Chipperfield Road:-

'In noting the public responses and especially in the light of the recognition by a national developer that the surrounding housing area is of a low density nature, would you (Chairman/Members) agree that the inclusion of a specific figure of 200 units is arbitrary, inappropriate and misleading for what is a

policy document, when this and other details should be left to the relevant Committee once a formal application is received?’

The Chairman gave the following response:-

‘The Committee will be considering all of the housing proposals at a later stage of the agenda and it would not be right to give a separate response on one site in advance.

In general, the Council does need to meet a housing target of over 641 new homes each year. To do so in line with national guidance it needs to be able to show that it can justify this at a site-by site level, so it is important to include a figure in the policy proposals in this consultation draft Local Plan.’

Mr Ince then submitted a supplementary question as follows:-

‘I understand the Council’s need to conform to policy but would the Chairman/Members agree that providing a specific figure of 200 instead of merely stating “an element” of housing is a clear invitation for a developer to use as a planning guideline, where no site capacity appears to have been addressed?’

The Chairman responded with the following:-

‘This is a matter which Members may discuss under the appropriate section of this agenda.’

The following written question was submitted by Mr Clive Lees, Chairman, Ravensbourne Valley Preservation Society:-

‘Further to the Chairman’s response to my written question at the DCC meeting held on 9 February 2016, I would like to ask the following:-

No valid application has yet been made. The Society note that the properties in this development were sold approximately 18 months ago yet still:-

- neighbours are blighted by a loss of privacy (privacy screens have not been installed);
- cyclists have nowhere satisfactory to park their bicycles (there is no roof on the ‘cycle shed’);
- the driveway has none of the promised soft landscaping and is therefore rather an eyesore next to what is otherwise a fine, locally listed building; and
- permission has not yet been granted for an unauthorised additional window in the north flank.

Additionally, since our last question to DCC, Mike Hammond, Highway Development Engineers, has also identified that the drive may not have been constructed in accordance with the permitted application and so this is a further complaint.

We should be grateful if the Council would now insist that the matter is regularised as a matter of urgency and advise us of what progress is being made in this respect.'

The Chairman responded as follows:-

'The application received was never made valid for a number of reasons including no fee being received. The matter has now been passed back to the Planning Investigation Team who are investigating all of the issues raised and will update you as soon as possible.'

12 THE STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT (SCI) RESPONSES TO CONSULTATION AND PROPOSED REVISIONS

Report DRR16/041

Members considered responses to the six week public consultation period undertaken earlier this year, regarding the draft revised Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) (2016). Members were also requested to recommend that the revised SCI (set out as Appendix 2 of the report) be referred to the next meeting of the Executive on 20 July 2016 for approval.

The draft revised SCI was agreed for consultation by the DCC on 10 December 2015 and the Executive on 13 January 2016. The SCI set out how the Planning Authority proposed to engage with stakeholders and residents in the development plan-making process and planning application process. In total, 8 responses were received.

The Local Green Space consultation ran concurrently with the revised SCI to which 70 responses were received.

RESOLVED that:-

- 1) the responses to the consultation on the draft revised Statement of Community Involvement 2016 be noted; and**
- 2) the draft revised SCI attached as Appendix 2 of the report, be referred to the meeting of the Executive on 20 July 2016 for approval.**

13 BROMLEY'S PROPOSED DRAFT LOCAL PLAN FOR CONSULTATION

Report DRR16/059 – (Page references in these Minutes refer to the DCC agenda unless otherwise stated)

Members were requested to endorse the Draft Local Plan, subject to alterations agreed by the Chief Planner in consultation with the Leader of the Council and finalisation of supporting documents, for a six weeks consultation in compliance with Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning Regulations 2012.

The Chairman directed discussion through the sections contained in the Draft Local Plan. The following comments and proposed amendments were made by Members for the purposes set out in the recommendations:-

Chapter 1 - Introduction

- Page numbers to be included against each chapter listed on page 61.
- Agreed that a general description of areas within the Borough (i.e. suburban, urban, rural) be added to the introduction section.

Chapter 2 – Vision and Objectives

The Chairman referred to the 'boxed' text on page 70 (Vision – Bromley 2031) which had been strengthened in regard to the protection and enhancement of conservation areas and heritage assets within the Borough.

- Design and the Public Realm (page 72) – It was agreed that a clarified definition such as 'good quality' public art be included to avoid any misunderstanding that graffiti may be considered as such.

Chapter 3 - Spatial Strategy

This chapter focused on employment and growth of specified areas such as the economic growth of the Biggin Hill SOLDC, the Cray Business Corridor and changes to Green Belt boundaries in regard to education sites.

- It was noted that whilst taking land from the Green Belt to accommodate the expansion of schools was not ideal, some protection would be retained by its reclassification as Urban Open Space or Metropolitan Open Land.
- Page 77 - Members voted in favour of this paragraph being amended to read:- Paragraph 5: 'The London Plan 2015 imposes the minimum housing target ...'

- Conformity with the London Plan (page 77) - It was noted that the forecasted increase in employment growth of 13.6% incorporated all methods of employment including home working.

Chapter 4 – Living in Bromley

The Council would provide a minimum of 641 additional homes per annum. The Housing Supply Policy identified and allocated sites for residential development and outlined the timescales involved in delivering schemes. The Greater London Authority was satisfied that Bromley was achieving its housing target.

- It was necessary for a predicted number of units to be set against each development scheme as a way of planning how housing targets could be met.
- It was suggested that the proposed bus station development at Bromley North could be transferred to nearby sites. The Chief Planner explained that the Bromley North site allowed for a variation in the mix of development however, this should include transport.
- Ravensbourne, Plaistow, Sundridge Renewal Area Policy (page 119) – Whilst acknowledging that PTAL ratings were taken from the London Plan, Councillor Turner disagreed with Downham being categorised as an area of deprivation and the statement that transport links were ‘relatively poor’. Grove Park was the nearest Railway Station to Downham and operated services to several London mainline stations. The demographics of the area were changing with some properties now selling at £250k which made this a good area for starter homes. This concern could be addressed by the following revision: ‘Transport links comprise...’
- Conversion of Non-Residential Buildings to Residential Policy (page 101) – The Chief Planner explained that this was a broad policy and agreed that the text could be cross-referenced to policies on the retention of industrial units.
- Specialist and Older Peoples Accommodation (page 103) – It was acknowledged that the Borough had a large ageing population and that various types of accommodation were available. It was suggested that attempts should be made to prohibit the development of bungalows into housing consisting of two or more storeys to avoid the loss of potential accommodation for elderly people. The Chief Planner explained that in such cases, a substantial amount of evidence would need to be produced to prove that there was a need to retain bungalow accommodation and that it was more likely that the impact on the character of an area would be constraint.
- Travellers’ Accommodation (page 106) – Members were informed that Traveller sites were considered and designated as ‘Traveller sites inset

within the Green belt' for GB use; non-GB use would not be acceptable other than for Traveller purposes. The siting of static caravans (which were not considered to be houses), would need to be determined through the planning application process.

- Housing Supply (page 86, second paragraph) – concern was raised as to how the housing target of 641 units per annum, provided for the level of need across tenures within the borough. The Chief Planner explained that whilst in isolation, the Bromley housing provision was set at 641 units per annum, the housing provision and needs/requirement was balanced out across London and South East London, as shown in the London Plan.
- Backland and Garden Land Development (page 94) – Cross-reference should be added in the supporting text to flood risk assessment and nature conservation policies. Councillor Fawthrop noted that the current Policy H7 stated that exceptions did not apply in Areas of Special Residential Character (ASRCs) however, nothing about this was incorporated in the draft Local Plan Policy. The Chief Planner explained that Garden Land national policy had changed and a strengthened cross-reference to ASRCs could be added.
- It was suggested that the supporting text on page 95, paragraph 2 in relation to bio-diversity, should be strengthened to protect native habitats by, for example, ensuring that bird and bat boxes were installed when necessary. The Chief Planner explained that emphasis on priority being given to indigenous species and landscaping could be included within the 'nature conservation' section however, he would check where a cross-reference to nature conservation policy would be most appropriate.
- Travellers' Accommodation (pages 106-109) - Concern was raised about the recent increase in plots at the Travellers' site in Layhams Road which only had temporary permission. The boundary of the Star Lane site had been reduced in order to separate the site from the adjacent Green Belt. The application for one plot in Cudham Lane was granted by the High Court on appeal. It was suggested that an informative be added stating that this was designated for personal use only and that any future need would be considered should the pitch be vacated.
- Side Space (page 99) – Concern was expressed over possible terracing effects of ground floor (single storey) development. The Chief Planner noted that it was possible to address this concern through the policy on 'Residential Extensions' (page 98) as this referred to space or gaps between buildings including single storey extensions. However, the Side Space policy X (page 99) was concerned with two-storey developments.
- Accommodation for Family Members (page 99) - The Chief Planner agreed to strengthen the text to emphasise that any additional accommodation i.e. granny annexes must have access to the main dwelling house and be ancillary to it.

- Provision of Affordable Housing (page 88) – This Policy reflected what was outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Chapter 5 - Supporting Communities

- Education (page 130) – The Kentwood Site had been added to the list of designated sites for educational use. As a number of the courses were a vital requirement within this part of the Borough, it was requested that the current Adult Education Centre be relocated as close as possible to its original site.
- The deletion of the allocation for secondary education at Balmoral Avenue was queried, particularly noting the potential time implications for other sites such as Kentwood coming forward and the potential for school sites to drop out. The Committee was advised that consideration was given to the recommendation of the Advisory Panel, notably in respect of the number of schools in close proximity. A vote to reallocate the site at Balmoral Avenue for education use fell.
- It was agreed that the Education Policy (page 147) should place emphasis on schools expanding upwards in order to conserve Green Belt/MOL land and recreation areas.
- Valued Local Community Assets (page 124) – The Chairman emphasised the importance of public houses within local communities and considered the six months marketing period to be insufficient time. It was noted that empty buildings such as these were often inhabited by squatters and the eviction process was a long and difficult one. The six month period was retained following the fall of a vote at 7-8 to extend this to 12 months.
- Social Infrastructure (page 122) – One Member requested that emphasis be placed on new developments incorporating appropriate convenience stores; social and community services. The Chief Planner agreed that the words 'other facilities' be included in this text.
- Burial Space (page 151) – It was suggested that reference be made to reflect the safeguarding of plots for private burials.

Chapter 6 – Getting Around

- Members were generally satisfied with the Cross-over Policy.
- Access for All (pages 160/161) – The final sentence of the second paragraph of the supporting text was amended to read:- 'Contributions towards the Mayoral cycle route programmes may be sought'.

Chapter 7 – Bromley's Valued Environments

- Visiting Member Councillor Mellor considered the predicted number of units required (300-400) within the Copers Cope area was too high and he requested a reduction of these figures.
- Areas of Special Residential Character (page 191) - Councillor Mellor also requested that the boundary of the existing Copers Cope ASRC be increased up to the edge of the Conservation Area in order to protect the piece of land between the two. Following a vote, Members agreed to retain the current Copers Cope ASRC boundary.
- Reintroduction of ASRC development guidelines from the 2006 UDP Appendix 1.2 was proposed to strengthen guidance.
- Councillor Fawthrop referred to the description of the Petts Wood ASRC which had been amended without reference to the three Ward Members. The Chief Planner agreed to discuss the amended description with officers and Ward Members. The amended description could then be inserted (page 7 of the supplementary agenda).

Chapter 8 – Working in Bromley

- It was suggested that the boundary of South Camp at Biggin Hill Airport be reduced. However, Members were informed that the Airport already possessed PDRs and that the release of GB land was for business development. Requests for the release of further GB land was being independently assessed. The issue of an Article 4 Direction restricting the use of PDRs was suggested but it was noted that this could be at odds with the Strategic Outer London Development Centre designations.
- It was considered beneficial to small businesses if companies could be persuaded to sub-divide their offices into small business suites or to consider leasing small areas of larger offices. This could often be completed without the need for a separate planning permission.

Chapter 9 – Environmental Challenges

- Whilst happy to note the Noise Pollution Policy, Councillor Fawthrop also alluded to light pollution which impacted on the landscape and nature conservation such as bats and other small species of mammal. He requested that a revision to the light pollution policy be included in the draft Local Plan (page 257).

Chapter 10 – Delivery and Implementation

- No comments.

RESOLVED that subject to the amendments agreed above, the Draft Bromley Local Plan document be endorsed and referred to the Executive to agree, subject to the Chief Planner, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, being authorised to make alterations to the Draft Local Plan and finalise supporting documents as required, prior to its publication.

The meeting ended at 9.15 pm

Chairman