

PLANS SUB-COMMITTEE NO. 3

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.00 pm on 21 December 2023

Present:

Councillor Jonathan Andrews (Chairman)
Councillor Tony Owen (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Peter Dean, Kira Gabbert, Alisa Igoe, Julie Ireland,
Alexa Michael, Shaun Slator and Mark Smith

Also Present:

Councillors Kate Lymer, Michael Tickner and Pauline Tunnicliffe

19 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies received from Councillor Dr Gupta & Councillor Harris, Councillor Gabbert & Councillor Dean attended as Substitutes.

20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest.

21 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 26TH OCTOBER 2023

The Minutes of the meeting held on 26th October 2023 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

22 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

22.1 BECKENHAM TOWN & COPERS COPE

(22/04039/FULL2) - School House, Overbury Avenue, Beckenham BR3 6PZ

In a presentation given by Planning, the Committee were informed that this application was initially called in by Cllr Tickner and went before Plans Sub-Committee 3 on 23rd November 2023. The application was deferred in order to seek further noise assessments. An additional noise survey was carried out on 5th and 6th December 2023, with readings taken from the rear gardens of Nos 10 and 11 Holmdene

Close. A Noise Report was submitted on 7th December 2023 with the findings detailed on Page 9 of the Planning Report. There was a further late objection.

An oral presentation in support of the application was then given by the Co-Owner of the Pre-School. It was confirmed that the children only use the building and front garden of the Pre-School. The children are only out at playtime once a day at the same time as the primary school. This is currently for 30 minutes, although a longer period would be preferred. The Committee heard that Ofsted have said that the Pre-School will have to close if the change of use application is not approved.

Visiting Ward Member, Councillor Michael Tickner, then gave an oral presentation in objection to the application, passing on the widespread concerns from local residents.

During a discussion regarding the application several Committee Members stated their support for the application, confirming that the owners had done their best to comply with requests for information and taken steps to reduce noise levels. It was felt that the application could be approved, subject to certain conditions. The length of time for the children to play outside was discussed, with 30 minutes not deemed sufficient, and 45 minutes stated as acceptable.

Members having considered the Report, objections and representations RESOLVED that the APPLICATION BE APPROVED, subject to the conditions set out in the report, and

Amendment made to condition 4 regarding external play being extended to 45 minutes instead of 30 minutes and ensuring play only takes place at the front, as well as the addition of a landscaping condition for planting along the boundary.

**22.2
ORPINGTON**

**(22/04947/ELUD) - 243 Court Road, Orpington, BR6
9BY**

In a presentation given by Planning, the Committee were informed that this application was initially called in by Cllr Tunnicliffe and went before Plans Sub-Committee 3 on 26th October 2023. The application was deferred in order to seek additional information of the existing use of the property, including the extent and nature of care provided, and the completion of a Members' site visit. The site visit was carried out on 9th December, with photos circulated to Members and some shown at the meeting. Further information has also been received from the applicant/Agent since the publication of the Agenda and further objections.

An oral representation in objection to the application was received from a local resident, highlighting residents' concerns regarding anti-social behaviour from residents of the property and questioning the suitability of the property for the purpose of providing care to its residents.

Visiting Ward Member, Councillor Pauline Tunnicliffe, then gave an oral representation regarding the application. It was acknowledged that although the residents' concerns were understood, many of them could not be taken into account under the Planning guidelines. Concerns were raised regarding the enforcement action that could be taken if future problems arose and were experienced by residents, and that the Council would deal with these issues.

During Members' discussions it was highlighted that the focus should be on planning issues and whether the change of use was in place at the time of the application in August 2022. The question of whether the applicant/Agent had provided evidence and full details of the change of use with dates etc was discussed. Several Members felt that not enough documentary evidence had been provided to approve the application.

Members having considered the Report, objections and representations RESOLVED that the APPLICATION BE DEFERRED TO RECEIVE EXTRA INFORMATION.

Extra information/evidence to include:

- **List dates of site visits/inspection of property by any Council Staff (Planning, Enforcement, Adult Social Care Teams) and reason the enforcement case was closed**
- **Tenancy Agreements for the period 02.03.2021 – 30.12.2022**
- **Contracts with staff and the health authority (if applicable) for the period 02.03.2021 – 30.12.2022**
- **Information from Adult Social Care Team about the use**

**22.3
BROMLEY COMMON &
HOLWOOD**

**(23/02655/FULL6) - 66 Pope Road Bromley BR2
9QB**

There was a presentation of the application from Planning which confirmed the side space policy did not apply.

There was an oral representation in objection to the application from a direct neighbour of the property.

The Committee heard that the proposed extension would harm the amenities of the neighbouring property as the extension would overlook the neighbour's house and patio area, impacting on both light and outlook. It was considered to be an overbearing development.

An oral representation in support of the application was then given by the applicant/owner of the property. The Committee heard that the property currently has problems with drainage and pipework in connection with drains at the rear of the property. The owners also currently use a macerator which proves costly. It is planned to move the bathroom to the rear of the property with the installation of proper plumbing, and the owners feel the proposed changes are more cost-effective than moving house.

During discussions it was acknowledged that the road contains a lot of narrow houses with not a large amount of space or scope for extensions. A lot of the houses are different in design with a mixture of extensions and add-ons. However, the cumulative effect on several changes to one property was also highlighted with the possible negative impact on

neighbouring properties.

Members having considered the Report, objections and representations **RESOLVED** that **PERMISSION BE GRANTED**, subject to the conditions set out in the Report.

22.4
ST MARY CRAY

(23/02677/FULL6) - 51 Furzehill Square, Orpington, BR5 3SN

A presentation of the application was given by Planning during which it was noted Cllr Slator had emailed Members, following which an oral representation in support of the application was received from the applicant.

Members were informed that the applicant had lived at the property for 22 years and now wanted to add a bit more space. The applicant explained that he had a good relationship with all his neighbours and they all supported the application. It was considered to be quite a conservative plan/extension.

Ward Councillor and Committee Member, Councillor Sean Slator, gave an oral representation in support of the application, confirming that he had called-in the application on behalf of the three St Mary Cray Councillors. It was highlighted that neighbours were happy to fully support the application, considered to be a modest extension when compared to larger extensions previously approved in the area.

Members having considered the Report and representations **RESOLVED** that **PERMISSION BE GRANTED**, for the following reason:

Bearing in mind the length of the garden at the application site and of neighbouring properties and the lack of objections, it is not considered that the proposal would have sufficient adverse impacts on neighbouring amenities to justify refusal.

Delegated authority to the Assistant Director of Planning to impose such conditions as he considers necessary.

**22.5
BICKLEY & SUNDRIDGE**

**(23/02774/NDFLAT) - Summerfield, 3 Freelands
Road, Bromley, BR1 3AG.**

Following the presentation from Planning, an oral representation in support of the application was received from the Agent. Members were informed that the proposed plan to increase the existing development by one storey was planned to fit in with other buildings in the vicinity. The design was chosen to distinguish between the old and new parts of the building, with it felt to have no negative impact on local amenities.

In response to a question from a Member, the Agent confirmed that the proposed material for the additional storey was zinc cladding, but they are prepared to submit further details regarding an alternative to satisfy any conditions imposed if required.

Visiting Ward Member, Councillor Kate Lymer, then gave an oral representation in objection to the application. Members heard that as existing buildings on either side are four-storey, it was felt that the appearance of the building with an additional storey would disrupt the building height line and appear out of place. The addition of an extra storey would be obtrusive and not hidden away.

Councillor Lymer added that you couldn't compare existing buildings/blocks of flats in quieter residential roads with those on a busier main road. Members also heard that the proposed materials and finish for the extra storey was not an appropriate design and would not fit-in with existing buildings. Finally, it was highlighted that there have been 25 local objections to this application. Councillor Lymer requested that her presentation be included in the Minutes of the meeting.

Ward Councillor and Committee Member, Councillor Kira Gabbert, addressed Members to support Councillor Lymer's comments and objections, stating that she felt it wasn't the right location for this development, being that it is in a quiet residential area.

During discussions it was mentioned that although the addition of three residential units would be welcome, it still has to be considered appropriate development and be an acceptable design/plan.

Members having considered the Report, objections and representations **RESOLVED** that **PRIOR APPROVAL BE REFUSED** for the following reason:

The proposal, by reason of design, height and scale, and relationship with the host property and the neighbouring properties would appear as an over dominant and incongruous addition to the existing building which would detract from the visual amenity of the street scene and would be detrimental to the neighbouring residents outlook, contrary to conditions A.2.(1)(e) and (g) of Schedule 2, Part 20, Class A of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) and Chapter 12 of the NPPF (2023).

22.6
PLAISTOW

(23/03952/FULL6) - 153 Ridgeway Drive, Bromley, BR1 5DB

Following a presentation from Planning, an oral representation in objection to the application was received from a neighbour of the property.

Members heard that the proposed plans would have a detrimental effect on neighbouring properties by way of a loss of light and privacy, together with possible future drainage problems. The plans would also have an adverse effect on the overall look of the area and be out of character, with the outward appearance destroying the symmetry of the existing row of houses.

Ward Councillor and Committee Member, Councillor Alisa Igoe, then addressed the committee in objection to the application, confirming that there had been a number of neighbour complaints to the plans. Members heard that this is seen as an overdevelopment of the site that will have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the area. All the houses in the road have garages in-between, contributing to the distinct look and a feeling of space.

During discussions it was stated that the application should be considered on its planning merits without speculation regarding future use. Although some Members stated that the plans seemed acceptable it was felt that it does appear to constitute overdevelopment that is out of keeping with the area.

Members having considered the Report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED** that **the application BE REFUSED** for the following reason:

The proposed two storey side extensions including roof extensions, by reason of its scale, design, relationship with the host property and its surrounding would harm the visual amenities of the street scene and be out of character and out of scale, in particular the loss of a linked garage, contrary to Policies D1 and D4 of the London Plan (2021), Policies 6 and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan (2019) and Policy DG5 of Urban Design Guide SPD (2023).

23

CONTRAVENTIONS AND OTHER ISSUES

NO REPORTS

24

TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS

NO REPORTS

The Meeting ended at 9.37 pm

Chairman

Plans 3 Sub-Committee Meeting 21/12/23

Re – Agenda Item 4.5 (23/02774/NDFLAT) Summerfield, 3 Freelands Road, Bromley BR1 3AG

Statement from Cllr Kate Lymer

Thank you, Chairman.

I would like to draw your attention to page 78 of the pack and paragraph 7.4.6.

7.4.6 (first paragraph) says that the External Appearance of the building is assessed by Officers as ACCEPTABLE. This assessment shall include the townscape context of the appearance of the building in the surrounding area, as well as the building appearance itself.

I am here this evening to argue that none of that is acceptable.

If we take the issue of townscape context first, the report says that “The surrounding context comprises of a mix of 2-3 storey semi-detached houses and 3-4 storey flatted blocks.” This correct. There are no buildings in the entire road that have 5 floors.

The existing block of flats has 4 storeys, and the block of flats to the right of it also have 4 storeys, and the block of flats next along also has 4 storeys. Together they make a row of equal level buildings. To add an extra level would stick out like a sore thumb and completely disrupt the established building height line of that side of the road.

It's not like it would be nestled away between lots of other flats, and wouldn't notice much. As you can see on p. 69, figure 3 – there are 2 small semi-detached houses to the left of the block. What you can't see in that photo is that next to them there is a row of 4 single storey garages. So you would drive into this road and on you left would be a row of garages, the two semis – and then for all the world to see a massive black box on top of the existing flats. Couldn't be any more obvious and obtrusive.

The report says that this new proposed height, scale and massing would not be dissimilar to flatted blocks in Widmore Road. So what? This is a completely different road. You can't compare a quiet residential only road with one of the main artery roads in the borough. It would be like saying that we should allow 15 storey blocks of flats being built in the Palace Estate because there are 15 storey blocks in Elmfield Road adjacent to it.

Next we will consider the building appearance that the Officer's deem acceptable. Please look at the photo (figure 5) on page 70 of your packs (wait for them to turn their pages).

The report says that the proposed zinc black clad finish (with aluminium framed windows) clearly distinguishes between the 'old' and the 'new', and is considered to be an appropriate design response.

Does that honestly look an appropriate design to you?

It looks like the Black Stone of Mecca incongruously plonked on top of a mid 20th century block of flats.

Additionally, if you have driven down this road and had a look, every single home in the road is either completely white or part white with red brick. You can get a feel for that in photos in the pack on pages 69 & 70. The proposal has nothing in common with the existing road, and would be a complete eyesore.

There are 25 local objections to this application, and I request that the Committee considers refusing this application for Prior Approval on the following grounds:

- Extra storey to building would not be in keeping with the height of other buildings on this road. Extra height will be overbearing, out of scale and obvious.
- The design is out of character with the existing building and rest of the road, and degrades the street scene.
- Will also be detrimental to the neighbouring residents outlook – particularly the houses opposite and the houses behind one of which is a listed building.

Thank you.