

## **PLANS SUB-COMMITTEE NO. 4**

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.00 pm on 24 November 2022

### **Present:**

Councillor Peter Dean (Chairman)  
Councillor Jonathan Andrews (Vice-Chairman)  
Councillors Jeremy Adams, Felicity Bainbridge, Mark Brock,  
Simon Fawthrop, Julie Ireland and Will Rowlands

### **Also Present:**

Councillor Alexa Michael

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

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Kevin Kennedy-Brooks and Sam Webber, and Councillors Jeremy Adams and Julie Ireland attended as their respective substitutes.

## **10 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

## **11 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 29TH SEPTEMBER 2022**

The minutes of the meeting held on 29<sup>th</sup> September 2022 were agreed and signed as a correct record.

## **12 PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

### **12.1 FARNBOROUGH AND CROFTON**

#### **(21/02861/RECON) - Crofton Halls (South), York Rise, Orpington, BR6 8PR**

Description of application – Application for a Minor material amendment under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to planning permission ref: DC/21/02861/FULL1 granted for the erection of new part 2, part 3 storey terraced maisonettes, and 4 storey apartment building, accommodating 35 new dwellings, with associated substation, hard and soft landscaping, and car parking in order to update conditions 2 (drawing numbers) and 29 (drainage) to reflect the revisions to the drainage strategy.

The Principal Planner – Major Developments informed Members of the Sub-Committee that, in order to link the section 73 permission to the Director's Assurance document attached to the original application, an updated recommendation was proposed. The Director's Assurance document of the 22<sup>nd</sup> December 2021 related to biodiversity compensation, carbon offsetting and monitoring fee. In response to a question, the Principal Planner – Major Developments advised that there was no additional cost to making the material amendment.

Members having considered the report and objections, **RESOLVED** that **PERMISSION BE GRANTED** as recommended, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report of the Assistant Director and the Director's Assurance of 22<sup>nd</sup> December 2021 relating to biodiversity compensation, carbon offsetting and monitoring fee applying equally to this permission.

**12.2**  
**HAYES AND CONEY HALL**

**(21/04323/FULL1) - Five Oaks Stables, Layhams Road, Keston BR2 6AR**

Description of application – Demolition of existing dwellinghouse and stables (29 stables), removal of mobile home, other buildings/structures, hard surfacing and trees. Erection of replacement dwellinghouse, stable block (10 stables) and enlargement of field (in place of existing hard surfacing) with comprehensive landscaping scheme.

The Development Management Area Team Leader (East) reported that revised plans had been received on 21<sup>st</sup> November 2022, which mainly related to the height of the new building. An addendum report summarising the changes, and copy of the revised plans, had been circulated to Members prior to the meeting.

Oral representations in support of the application were received at the meeting. The agent gave the following responses to Members' questions:

- If permission were to be granted, the applicants would accept a condition that the concrete and stables be removed before the construction of the house commenced. They would also consider accepting the removal of Permitted Development (PD) rights relating to anything that constrained the openness of the greenbelt.

- The footprint of the building was to increase by 28 sqm. This remained the same in the revised plans, however the height of the building had been lowered.

Oral representations from visiting Ward Member Councillor Alexa Michael were also received at the meeting. In response to questions, the Development Management Area Team Leader (East) advised that:

- The height of the dwelling house had been reduced by 0.5m.
- The floorspace of the dwelling house would remain as set out in the officer's report.

Councillor Michael stated that she was not keen on built development situated in the greenbelt – if this proposal was for an entirely new house, rather than the demolition of an existing dwelling and construction of a replacement, she would be urging Members to refuse the application. However this was not as straight forward. The proposed dwelling house was much larger, with floorspace increasing from 190 sqm to 440 sqm – but set against this, the application also proposed a significant reduction in the built development across the site. There would be a reduction in the built coverage from 600 sqm to 173 sqm and the 1,305 sqm of land covered by hardstanding would be returned to greenfield – green grass should be seen on greenbelt land.

Councillor Michael noted that the openness of the greenbelt was also affected and measured by the height of built development, however there had been an application for a hay store permitted on the site in 1998. This allowed a one-storey dwelling to be turned into a two-storey dwelling, and therefore the principle of an increased height had been set. The applicants had looked to reduce the eaves height and it was a judgement call for Members to decide if this was sufficient. On a site-wide basis there would be an overall reduced to the built coverage by 177 sqm, however if the stables were assessed separately the dwelling house may be felt to be too tall and therefore detrimental to the openness of the greenbelt. If Members felt the latter was the case, they may wish to consider a deferral to allow the applicant to reduce the size and height of the house further.

Councillor Fawthrop said that normally he would refuse an application of this size in the greenbelt,

however there were some gains such as the removal of 1,305 sqm of hardstanding. This would be beneficial, not just to the greenbelt, but the environment as a whole. A reduction in the stable block could be offset against the increase to the dwelling house. It was noted that the Agent had said the applicant would agree to removing the stable blocks and hardstanding first, which could be conditioned, and they were happy for the removal of PD rights that could be detrimental to the greenbelt. Councillor Fawthrop moved that the application be approved as he considered that, on this occasion, the benefits equated to very special circumstances.

The Chairman said that he took a contrary view and was opposed to the increase in residential property within the greenbelt. Balanced against that was the reduction of the number of stables and hardstanding, however this was felt to be a reduction of surplus resources which could be easily afforded on this particular application. The Chairman moved that the application be refused for the grounds stated in the officer's report.

Councillor Rowlands noted that the application had its benefits, but there were lots of disadvantages. The officer recommendation stated a reason for refusal was that the development would be contrary to Policy 49 of the Bromley Local Plan – if this application was approved it would set a precedent for others. Councillor Rowlands seconded the motion for refusal.

Councillor Brock agreed with the conditions suggested by Councillor Fawthrop and seconded the motion for approval.

The Vice Chairman said that it was important, when looking at the greenbelt as a whole, to protect what the policies stood for. It was considered that the proposals would impact the openness of the greenbelt and should be reused as per the officer recommendation.

Councillor Bainbridge noted that applications should each be considered on their own merits. There were significant advantages to this application, and it was deemed acceptable on the conditions suggested by Councillor Fawthrop.

In response to questions, the Development

Management Area Team Leader (East) advised that PD rights could be removed for fences, structures and caravans to protect a newly established green areas as much as possible. A landscaping strategy could also be implemented if the application were to be granted. Planning permission would be required for any unauthorised development on the land but it was hard to enforce these rules. A structure could be built with retrospective permission, if applied for. With regards to offsetting a newly established green area against loss of the greenbelt, it was noted that it was a fine balance, and they would be looking at the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land – officers had come to the conclusion that there was a benefit from the loss of the stables and hardstanding, but considered that the openness would be harmed by the dwelling, which they felt was too large.

The Motion for refusal was put to a vote and CARRIED on the Chairman's casting vote.

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

**12.3  
PETTS WOOD AND KNOLL  
CONSERVATION AREA**

**(22/01776/FULL6) - 261 Chislehurst Road,  
Orpington, BR5 1NS**

Description of application – Two storey side and rear extensions, first floor side extension, conversion of one garage to habitable accommodation, and elevational alterations.

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

**12.4  
KELSEY AND EDEN PARK**

**(22/02953/FULL1) – Bandstand, Croydon Road,  
Beckenham**

Description of application – Restoration of grade II listed bandstand, located in Croydon Road Recreation Ground. Redecoration and re-introduction of traditional roofing material and rainwater guttering. Localised landscaping works to improve access and usability.

The Chairman noted that the bandstand was within his ward and, if the application was approved, he would be proud to have chaired the Sub-Committee that permitted these works. It was highlighted that David Bowie was one of the most globally celebrated musicians of the last 50 years and it was considered that not carrying out the works proposed would constitute a betrayal of Bromley and particularly Beckenham residents who highly valued their heritage. The improvements to the bandstand would have no impact on local amenities other than potentially increasing the number of visitors to the park.

Councillor Ireland said she was honoured to be able to vote in favour of this application as she was aware that a number of people had work and campaigned for this over several years. These comments were echoed by Members of the Sub-Committee.

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

**12.5  
KELSEY AND EDEN PARK**

**(22/02954/LBC) - Bandstand, Croydon Road  
Recreation Ground, 319 Croydon Road,  
Beckenham, BR3 3FD**

Description of application – Restoration of grade II listed bandstand, located in Croydon Road Recreation Ground. Redecoration and re-introduction of traditional roofing material and rainwater guttering. Localised landscaping works to improve access and usability. LISTED BUILDING CONSENT.

Members having considered the report, **RESOLVED** that **LISTED BUILDING CONSENT BE GRANTED** as recommended, subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Assistant Director, Planning.

**12.6  
HAYES AND CONEY HALL**

**(22/03071/FULL6) - 17 Coney Hill Road, West  
Wickham, BR4 9BU**

Description of application – Erection of a two-storey side and rear extension; single storey rear extension; loft conversion with side dormer and rear gable end window; removal and replacement of existing car port with single storey linked garage.

The Principal Planner – Major Developments reported that further comments in objection to the application had been received and circulated to Members.

Oral representations in support of the application were received at the meeting. The agent gave the following response to Members' questions:

- If permission were to be granted, the applicants would accept the removal of PD rights (Class A and B). The applicants would also be happy for a condition to be added relating to the use of swift nest bricks.
- The extensions proposed were compliant with the Council's side space policy. This required a 1m gap to be preserved and both the single and two storey extensions would be set away from the boundary.

Oral representations from visiting Ward Member Councillor Alexa Michael in support of the application were also received at the meeting. Councillor Michael said that initially she had been nervous about the impact of this planning application on the neighbouring property, hence it being called in. However, having seen the site from both the applicant and objector, it was understood that the pitched roof garage behind 17 Coney Hill Road would be knocked down, which was currently situated on the boundary with number 15. The proposed extensions would not come back as far as the existing garage and would also be stepped away from the boundary. The report stated that the application was a modest development that would not overwhelm the host property, and the two-storey side extension would have a side space gap of 1.3m between the property and the northern side boundary at number 15. It was considered that the roof design would complement the host dwelling and suitable materials would be used. It was noted that a similar application had been granted at number 5 Coney Hill Road. Councillor Michael said she would be happy if Members chose to support the application and agreed with the suggestion of the additional conditions previously mentioned.

Members having considered the report, representations and objections, **RESOLVED** that **PERMISSION BE GRANTED** as recommended, subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Assistant Director, Planning with the addition of further conditions to read:-

**5. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order amending, revoking and re-enacting this Order) no development permitted by Class A and B of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Order to enlarge the dwellinghouse shall be carried out.**

**Reason: In the interests of protecting the character of the area and residential amenity of neighbouring properties in accordance with Policy 37 of the Bromley Local Plan**

**6. The two-storey side and rear extension shall be constructed to include an integral swift nest brick (i) in the first or second row from the top of externally facing bricks, (ii) on the northern elevation and (iii) at least 4.5 metres away from the first-floor window.**

**Reason: In the interest of a net gain of biodiversity and to comply with Policies 37, 70 and 79 of the Local Plan and Policy of the G6 London Plan.**

**12.7  
CHISLEHURST  
CONSERVATION AREA**

**(22/03635/FULL6) - The Croft, Yester Park,  
Chislehurst, BR7 5DQ**

Description of application – First floor side extension and single storey rear extension, loft conversion with rear dormers and rooflights .

The Development Management Area Team Leader (East) advised Members that there was an error on the first page of the report (page 87 of the agenda pack) and the Application Number should read 22/03635/FULL6.

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

The Meeting ended at 7.52 pm

Chairman