

## **PLANS SUB-COMMITTEE NO. 1**

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.00 pm on 19 December 2019

### **Present:**

Councillor Alexa Michael (Chairman)  
Councillor Angela Page (Vice-Chairman)  
Councillors Kathy Bance MBE, Katy Boughey, Kira Gabbert,  
Keith Onslow, Tony Owen, Will Rowlands and Suraj Sharma

### **Also Present:**

Councillors Graham Arthur and Russell Mellor

## **23 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Christine Harris and Councillor Keith Onslow attended as her substitute.

## **24 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Tony Owen declared a Non-prejudicial Interest in Item 4.9.

## **25 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 24 OCTOBER 2019**

**RESOLVED** that the Minutes of the meeting held on 24 October 2019 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

## **26 PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

### **SECTION 1**

(Applications submitted by the London Borough of Bromley)

#### **26.1 COPERS COPE**

**(19/03192/FULL1) - Clare House Primary School, Overbury Avenue, Beckenham, BR3 6PY.**  
Description of application – Erection of changing room and floodlights.

Oral representations from Ward Member, Councillor Russell Mellor, were received at the meeting.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION be GRANTED** as recommended, subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Assistant Director, Planning.

## **SECTION 2**

(Applications meriting special consideration)

### **26.2 BROMLEY COMMON AND KESTON CONSERVATION AREA**

**(19/01888/FULL1) - Chapter One Restaurant, Farnborough Common, Orpington BR6 8NF**  
Description of application – Retractable awning over existing deck area, full-height fixed glazing along the front and sides of the deck, and replacement hedge planting to perimeter of terrace (Retrospective).

Members having considered the report, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION be GRANTED** as recommended.

### **26.3 COPERS COPE**

**(19/03027/FULL1) - 63 Copers Cope Road, Beckenham, BR3 1NJ**

Description of application – Conversion of a former care home (Class C2) to residential use (Class C3), replacement rear extension and associated works.

Oral representations in support of the application were received. Oral representations from Ward Member, Councillor Russell Mellor, in support of the application were received at the meeting. Four further emails had been received from the applicant and a summary of them circulated to Members.

It was noted that on page 32 of the Assistant Director (Planning) report the paragraph under the heading, "Copers Cope Marketing Feedback KFH:" should be amended to read, "In summary, this states that the site was shown to the relevant potential buyers (C2 and C3); the site was clearly for sale; site particulars, price and plans, etc, were provided and the indications of interest for C2 and C3 (STP) uses were received. Furthermore, the following feedback was received:"

Members were minded to grant planning permission for this application contrary to the Sub-Committee report recommendation. On the basis that having taking into account the committee report and all other material considerations they considered that sufficient marketing had been provided in accordance with policy 11 of the Bromley Local Plan and that the development would provide additional housing units in

accordance with the policy 1 (Bromley Housing Supply) of the Bromley Local Plan.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION be GRANTED AGAINST OFFICERS' RECOMMENDATIONS and SUBJECT TO THE PRIOR COMPLETION OF A LEGAL AGREEMENT TO SECURE:**

- **AFFORDABLE HOUSING PAYMENT IN-LIEU: £130,000;**
- **CAR CLUB BAY PREPARATION FEE: £2500;**
- **AGREEMENT WITH AN ACCREDITED CAR CLUB OPERATOR TO PROVIDE A CAR;**
- **2 YEARS MEMBERSHIP OF CAR CLUB FOR OCCUPIERS OF THE DEVELOPMENT;**
- **20 HOURS FREE DRIVE-TIME FOR OCCUPIERS OF THE DEVELOPMENT AND INFORMATION PROVIDED ON AN ANNUAL BASIS TO ALL RESIDENTS FOR THE FIRST 2 YEARS;**
- **CONTRIBUTION TO OFF-SITE PLAY/OPEN SPACE: £8000;**
- **CONTRIBUTION TO HEALTH INFRASTRUCTURE: £19,880.00;**
- **CONTRIBUTION TO EDUCATION INFRASTRUCTURE: £33,616.94;**
- **CARBON OFF-SETTING PAYMENT IN-LIEU: £5977.**

**THE PLANNING CONDITIONS AND INFORMATIVES TO BE DEALT WITH UNDER THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR PLANNING'S DELEGATED POWERS AND WITH THE AGREEMENT OF THE CHAIRMAN.**

### **SECTION 3**

(Applications recommended for permission, approval or consent)

#### **26.4 PETTS WOOD AND KNOLL**

**(18/05086/FULL6) - 58 Birchwood Road, Petts Wood, BR5 1NZ**

Description amended to read, 'Single storey side and rear extension and roof extensions including side dormers and gable end to rear, front porch extension, conversion of garage to habitable room and front bay window to ground floor and terrace patio to rear.'

Members having considered the report and objections, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION be GRANTED** as recommended, subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Assistant Director, Planning.

**26.5**  
**PETTS WOOD AND KNOLL**

**(18/05471/RECON) - 71 Lynwood Grove,  
Orpington, BR6 0BQ**

Description of application – Variation of Condition 5 of permission 18/05471/FULL6 (granted for a single storey rear extension, first floor front extension, replacement front dormer and elevational alterations) to reinstate Permitted Development rights other than Class A, B, C and D of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015.

Oral representations in support of the application were received at the meeting.

Comments from Ward Member, Councillor Simon Fawthrop, in objection to the application had been received and circulated to Members.

Ward Member, Councillor Keith Onslow, referred to Councillor Fawthrop's comments and that the removal of Permitted Development Rights did not prevent the applicant from making a future planning application to replace a shed with a larger summerhouse. Permitted Development Rights allowed the Council and the community to protect the area being over developed and to maintain the standards of the Area of Special Residential Character and he moved refusal. Ward Member, Councillor Tony Owen, agreed and seconded refusal.

Councillor Suraj Sharma's view was that it was unfair that some other residents in the vicinity did not require planning permission for a development of this nature and he moved permission. Councillor Kathy Bance agreed with Councillor Sharma and seconded permission.

Members having considered the report and representations, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION BE REFUSED** for the following reason:-

1. The removal of restricted permitted development rights (restricted under Condition 5 of permission 18/05471/FULL6) would likely result in development that would constitute an overdevelopment of the site and would also be harmful to the character and

appearance of the Area of Special Residential Character, contrary to Policies 6, 37 and 44 of the Council's Local Plan (2019).

The vote for refusal was 7:2.

**26.6  
BROMLEY COMMON AND  
KESTON**

**(19/01978/FULL1) - 26 Copthorne Avenue,  
Bromley, BR2 8NN.**

Description of application – Erection of detached dwelling house with lower ground and ground floor accommodation on land at rear of 26 Copthorne Avenue with associated vehicular access from Knowle Road.

The Chairman informed Members that the proposed development had an established access through Knowle Road but she was concerned at the prospective loss of green field land and the rear garden would only be 8 metres in length. The dwelling was one of three distinct style houses and would result in a loss of openness and visual amenity and it was not the location for a domestic dwelling and she moved refusal. Councillor Angela Page agreed and seconded refusal. Councillor Bance was concerned with the prospective loss of garden land, wildlife and bats.

Members having considered the report and objections, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION BE REFUSED** for the following reason:-

1. The proposed development, by reason of its scale and siting, would result in an overdevelopment of the site and an unacceptable loss of garden land, harmful to the openness and visual amenity of the area together with a detrimental impact on the visual amenity and biodiversity value of the site, the wider woodland habitat and adjacent Site of Importance for Nature Conservation resulting from the loss of trees and wildlife habitat, contrary to Policies 3 37 69, 70 and 73 of the Bromley Local Plan.

The vote for refusal was 8:0

**26.7  
HAYES AND CONEY HALL**

**(19/03215/FULL1) - 34 West Common Road, Hayes, Bromley, BR2 7BX**

Description of application - Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment to form 25 sheltered apartments for the elderly, including communal facilities, access, car parking and landscaping.

Oral representations from Ward Member, Councillor Graham Arthur, in support of the application were received at the meeting. A late objection from the neighbour had been received. It was reported that the application had been amended by revised plans received on 9 December 2019.

It was also reported that on page 108 of the Assistant Director (Planning) report paragraph 4 should be amended to read, "Car Parking- Twenty five car parking spaces (inclusive of 2 disabled spaces) are indicated on the submitted plans; which is satisfactory."

Members having considered the report, objections, and representations, **RESOLVED** that **PERMISSION BE GRANTED, SUBJECT TO THE PRIOR COMPLETION OF A LEGAL AGREEMENT TO SECURE:-**

- **HEALTHCARE CONTRIBUTION OF £24,098.00**
- **CARBON OFFSET CONTRIBUTION OF £47,470.00**
- **AFFORDABLE HOUSING PAYMENT-IN-LIEU OF £448,432.00**

as recommended and subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report of the Assistant Director, Planning with amendments to Conditions 4 and 6 and 14, the removal of Condition 8 and the addition of three further conditions to read:-

"AMENDMENT TO CONDITION 4: The development permitted by this planning permission shall not commence until the detailed design of the measures in the submitted "Drainage Strategy" Report carried out by Arch Associates Consulting with Project No. RRL038 dated July have been submitted to, and approved by, the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and completed before any part of the development is first occupied, and permanently retained thereafter.

REASON: In order to comply with Policy 5.13 of the London Plan and to reduce the impact of flooding both to and from the proposed development and third parties.

AMENDMENT TO CONDITION 6: No development shall commence on site (including demolition) until such time as a Construction and Environmental Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. As a minimum the plan shall cover:

- (a) Dust mitigation and management measures,
- (b) The location and operation of plant and wheel washing facilities,
- (c) Measure to reduce demolition and construction noise,
- (d) Details of construction traffic movements including cumulative impacts which shall demonstrate the following:-
  - (i) Rationalise travel and traffic routes to and from the site as well as within the site.
  - (ii) Provide full details of the number and time of construction vehicle trips to the site with the intention and aim of reducing the impact of construction related activity.
  - (iii) Measures to deal with safe pedestrian movement.
  - (iv) Full contact details of the site and project day-to-day management of the works
  - (v) Parking for operatives during construction period
  - (vi) A swept path drawings for any tight manoeuvres on vehicle routes to and from the site including proposed access and arrangements at the site boundary, egress
- (e) Hours of operation,
- (f) Other site specific Highways and Environmental Protection issues as requested on a case by case basis,

- (g) Undertake to carry out real time particulate (PM10) monitoring before and during demolition and construction works (at least one month prior to commencement of any monitored, duration, locations and monitoring techniques shall be approved in writing by LB Bromley prior to commencement of monitoring, works on site). Parameters to be
- (h) Be written in accordance with "The Control of Dust and Emissions during Construction and Demolition", Mayor of London SPG 2014 and the Bromley Code of Practice for Construction.
- (i) The development shall be undertaken in full accordance with the details approved under Parts a-i.

REASON: Required prior to commencement of development to ensure sufficient measures can be secured throughout the whole build programme in the interests of pedestrian and vehicular safety and the amenities of the area. In order to comply with Policies 30, 31, 32 and 119 of the Bromley Local Plan of the Unitary Development Plan, in the interest of the amenities of the adjacent properties, and to manage and prevent further deterioration of existing low quality air across London in accordance with London Plan policy 5.3 and 7.14, and NPPF 181.

AMENDMENT TO CONDITION 14: Prior to the commencement of above ground work of the development hereby permitted details of the substation together with a scheme of acoustic mitigation for the proposed substation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented before any part of the development is first occupied, and permanently retained thereafter.  
REASON: In order to comply with Policy 37 of the Bromley Local Plan to secure a visually satisfactory setting for the development and to protect neighbouring amenity.

CONDITION 24: Prior to commencement of development (excluding demolition) details of the proposed slab levels of the building(s) and the existing site levels shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority . The development shall be completed strictly in accordance with the approved levels.

REASON: Required prior to commencement in order to ensure that a satisfactory form of development can be undertaken on the site in the interest of visual amenity and to comply with Policy 37 of the Bromley Local Plan

CONDITION 25: Before the development hereby permitted is first occupied the proposed windows shown as obscure glazed on the approved plans shall be obscure glazed to a minimum of Pilkington privacy Level 3 and shall be non-opening unless the parts of the window which can be opened are more than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which the window is installed and the window (s) shall subsequently be permanently retained as such.

REASON: In the interests of protecting residential amenity in accordance with Policy 37 of the Bromley Local Plan

CONDITION 26: The apartments within the building hereby approved shall, unless otherwise agreed by the local planning authority in writing, be used solely for the designed purpose of providing self-contained independent living units of accommodation for person or persons who, for the purpose of acquiring purchase or lease of any of the approved apartments will have a minimum age of not less than 60 years old (or a spouse/or partner (who are themselves over 55 years old) living as part of a single household with such a person or persons). The building shall not be used or occupied for any other purpose (including equivalent provision in Class C3 of the Schedule of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 or any equivalent provision, and notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015) and no permitted changes of use shall occur, unless express written permission of the local planning authority has been obtained.

REASON: To ensure the provision of specialist housing within the Borough in accordance with Policy 11 of the Bromley Local Plan.”

**26.8  
PENGE AND CATOR**

**(19/03380/FULL6) - 37 Woodbastwick Road,  
Sydenham.**

Description of application – Demolition of garage, single storey side and rear extension.

Oral representations in objection to and in support of the application were received at the meeting. This

application should have been listed under Section 3 of the agenda.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that THE APPLICATION BE DEFERRED**, without prejudice to any future consideration, to seek a reduction in footprint/ scale of the extension and to ensure that it cannot be severed to form a separate unit of accommodation.

**26.9  
BIGGIN HILL**

**(19/04375/FULL1) - Biggin Hill Airport, Churchill Way, Biggin Hill, TN16 3BN**

Description of application – Fenced Noise Monitor Compound located at the northern end of the runway  
**RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION.**

Oral representations in support of the application were received at the meeting. Comments from adjacent Ward Member, Councillor Richard Scoates, in objection to the application were received and circulated at the meeting.

It was noted that on page 154 of the Assistant Director (Planning) report that under the heading, “Comments from Consultees” that no objections had been raised by the Environmental Health (Pollution) Officer.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that THE APPLICATION BE DEFERRED**, without prejudice to any future consideration, to seek consideration of an alternative location outside of the Green Belt and assurance on noise minimisation.

**SECTION 4**

(Applications recommended for refusal or disapproval of details)

**26.10  
ORPINGTON**

**(19/03187/FULL1) - 54 Station Road, Orpington BR6 0SA**

Description of application – Demolition of existing buildings at Nos.50-54 Station Road and erection of four storey building comprising commercial/office space at ground floor level, 6 one bedroom and 2 two bedroom flats with associated secure bin and cycle storage for commercial and residential use and landscaped amenity space.

Oral representations in objection to and in support of the application were received at the meeting.

Supplementary information and photographs had been received from the objector and circulated to

Members. Supplementary information and photographs had been received from the Ward Member, Councillor William Huntington-Thresher, in objection to the application and circulated to Members. Councillor Huntington-Thresher's comments are appended to these minutes, 'Annex A'. It was reported that no objections had been received from Highways Division and the application made no parking provision for residents or the business.

Councillor Page walked past the site most days and parking was chaotic with restricted parking in the local vicinity. She acknowledged the untidy site could take a reduced development. Councillor Boughey concurred with Councillor Page.

Councillor Owen objected to the proposed development on a busy road with buses, bus stops, diesel fumes, pedestrians and prams etc at Orpington Station Approach with a Taxi Company on the opposite side of the road.

The Chairman had visited the site and also objected to the application.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION BE REFUSED** as recommended, for the reasons set out in the report of the Assistant Director, Planning.

The meeting ended at 8.50 pm

Chairman

This page is left intentionally blank

## **ITEM 4.10 (19/03187/FULL1) – 54 STATION ROAD, ORPINGTON**

### **COMMENTS AND PHOTOGRAPHS FROM WARD MEMBER, COUNCILLOR WILLIAM HUNTINGTON-THRESHER IN OBJECTION**

No one would suggest that this site so close to the station is not developable, and a development that also retains the commercial element is to be praised in that respect. However this is not the development for this site as it contradicts LBB's Local Plan. The committee report lays out the reasons it is considered an overdevelopment but I would contend the following also need addressing for an appropriate development to emerge

Below are two photo montages provided by the applicant. The photos show that the development will result in an overly dominant development inconsistent with the street scene opposite and down the hill. These montages have been taken to emphasis the modern development on one side but not the more characterful properties along Station Road and partially visible in the second photo. The triangular site shape and avoiding the protected trees has resulted in a overdevelopment of this site and an overly dominant development

**I would support all the reasons for refusal related to the overly dominant nature of the development which is also out of character for the area – contrary to LBB Policy 4 and 37.**

This development does not include any parking for the residents or the business. The first photo shows two cars parked partly on the pavement on a private road (owned by the Railways) and on double yellow lines. Whilst these cars may not belong to the applicant's business they are very similar to the vehicles the business uses. This image shows that the current site is unable to function without abusing existing parking controls – yet they expect the future business to operate without them. A development that stepped back from the road could accommodate at least a couple of spaces.

**I would suggest that an additional reason for refusal is lack of parking for future residents and the future expanded business.** This development could not accommodate disabled residents without access to disabled parking which is not possible on street at this location as it is a bus route, so an off street disabled parking space is suggested. I note the transport assessment that an access directly to this site on a junction is not possible. But that does not stop the developer accessing the site from the church car park next door or buying spaces there. The Church park is used for a limited number of hours a week. A disabled resident could not walk to the proposed car club bay in Hill View not could that support business parking – which already abuses the current restrictions

It is LBB's Environmental Services policy that low car and car free developments are not entitled to apply for CPZ parking permits – as that would be contrary to the definition of the development.



The Planning statement states:

*3.6. The plans confirm that secure cycle storage would be provided for each apartment and this could be secured by planning condition.*

The transport statement provides an image (below) which is not secure – nor secure from others in the development. Residents who have cycles as their main mode of transport often spend considerable sums on a bike – now often (in hilly areas such as this part of station) with batter assistance. This is not adequate.

**I would suggest an additional reason of refusal is that the application does not provide individual secure cycle parking.** Individual secure cycle parking (cycle lockers are not expensive to provide and provide space for storage of cycle kit/spares as well and do not take up much more space.



This page is left intentionally blank