

PLANS SUB-COMMITTEE NO. 1

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.00 pm on 21 March 2024

Present:

Councillor Alexa Michael (Chairman)
Councillor Christine Harris (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Jonathan Andrews, Graeme Casey, Simon Fawthrop,
Kira Gabbert, Jonathan Laidlaw, Ruth McGregor, Tony Owen and
Mark Smith

Also Present:

48 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies received from Cllr Hitchins, and Cllr Fawthrop attended as Substitute.

49 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None received.

50 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 25TH JANUARY 2024

The Minutes of the meeting held on 25th January 2024 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

51 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

51.1 BROMLEY COMMON & HOLWOOD

(23/04822/FULL6) - Little Orchard, Barnet Wood Road, Hayes, Bromley, BR2 8HJ

A presentation was given by Planning in which Members were informed that the application was for a single storey rear extension, with the existing covered side car port to form a ground floor extension with parapet wall and tiled pitched roof. Also to be included was a first floor front and side extension.

It was noted that the applicants had a second application for this property due for consideration at this meeting under Agenda Item 4.2 (23/04823/FULL6).

It was confirmed that the current application was similar to an application that was refused planning permission on 17th March 2023 and dismissed at appeal on 9th October 2023 (23/00227/FULL6). Page 10 of the Report confirms the refusal reason for the application. Amendments had been made to the previous application, as outlined on pages 11 and 12 of the Report.

Planning confirmed that extensions already made to the property had resulted in an increase of 35% in the floor area of the original dwelling, This figure clearly showed that the property had already been disproportionately enlarged in relation to the Green Belt under the NPPF and Policy 51 of the Bromley Local Plan. The current proposals would result in an overall increase of 67% in the floor area compared to the original. Planning also stated that no special circumstances had been provided by the Applicant for consideration.

An oral representation was then received from the Agent who confirmed to Members that it was felt the current application was a positive response to the previous appeal decision, with the changes made to the proposals. Members also heard that design was not an issue previously and shouldn't be now. In addition, two letters of support from neighbours had been received confirming there were no objections to the plans. The Agent also stated that the overall size of the property would have been increased to a greater extent if the applicant had decided to submit plans for an extension under Permitted Development.

Following a discussion regarding Permitted Development and a 'fall back' position, Planning advised Members that no weight should be given to a 'fall back' as prior approval had not been obtained.

Ward Member, Councillor Dr Gupta, was due to attend the meeting to speak in support of the application but had sent his apologies that he was unable to attend. Cllr Dr Gupta had provided a statement which had been circulated to Members and Officers prior to the meeting, and it was also read out by the Chairman.

Ward Councillor and Committee Member, Councillor Laidlaw, then confirmed to Members that he couldn't

see any reason not to support the application for the reasons given by Cllr Dr Gupta.

Although acknowledging and understanding the points raised, several Members also confirmed that the property was located in a Green Belt area and adjacent to the Bromley, Hayes and Keston Common Conservation area, and voiced their concerns that the application was still required to be considered following the relevant policies for such cases.

Some Members stated that the reductions to the plans following the previous application were seen to be minimal, the property had already been extended significantly over the years and the overall increase in floor area was a major consideration. Furthermore, no special circumstances had been provided and Members had a duty to follow policy.

A motion for approval was then voted on but was not carried.

Members having considered the Report, objections and representations **RESOLVED that PERMISSION BE REFUSED** as recommended for the reasons set out in the Report.

**51.2
BROMLEY COMMON &
HOLWOOD**

**(23/04823/FULL6) - Little Orchard, Barnet Wood
Road, Hayes, Bromley, BR2 8HJ**

Members were notified in the presentation given by Planning that the application was for a part one/two storey side extension.

It was acknowledged that although the application was similar to an application previously approved in 2007, Policies, Plans, Guidance may have changed since, with greater emphasis now given on specific areas eg Green Belt development.

Planners felt that the proposed extension would still result in an increase in floor area of over 10% when compared to the original dwelling, thereby resulting in inappropriate development within the Green Belt. Additionally, the applicants had not provided details of any special circumstances for consideration.

An oral representation was then given by the Agent who confirmed that this was not a resubmission of the

application that was previously refused and dismissed at appeal (23/00227/FULL6), as stated under Item 7.1.1 on page 30 of the Report. It is however a similar scheme to the application approved in 2007. The Agent stated that in his view, there had been no changes to the policies since 2007 that would now result in the application not being approved.

In response to a question from a Member, Planners confirmed that a lot of the wording may have been carried forward with Planning policies and legislation, (and the NPPF coming in in 2012). The wording regarding development in the Green Belt remained the same, with the emphasis on Green Belt protection now stronger than ever.

As with Agenda Item 4.1, Ward Member, Councillor Dr Gupta, was due to attend the meeting to speak in support of the application but had sent his apologies that he was unable to attend. Cllr Dr Gupta had provided a statement which had been circulated to Members and Officers prior to the meeting, and it was also read out by the Chairman.

Ward Councillor and Committee Member, Councillor Laidlaw, then confirmed to Members that he appreciated this was a difficult case to consider with understandable concerns for the Green Belt. However, he couldn't see that the plan would have a significant detrimental effect on the Green Belt or neighbours and would be inclined to support the application.

Some Members voiced the opinion that consistency was important, with the need to follow and implement Green Belt policy and guidance of great importance. Attention was also drawn to the Appeal Inspector's statement on page 35 of the Report, with the need to give the comments made serious consideration.

A motion for approval was then voted on but was not carried.

Members having considered the Report, objections and representations **RESOLVED that PERMISSION BE REFUSED** as recommended for the reasons set out in the Report.

52

CONTRAVENTIONS AND OTHER ISSUES

NO REPORTS.

53

TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS

NO REPORTS.

The Meeting ended at 7.55 pm

Chairman