

PLANS SUB-COMMITTEE NO. 4

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.00 pm on 25 May 2023

Present:

Councillor Simon Fawthrop (Chairman)
Councillor Will Rowlands (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Felicity Bainbridge, Peter Dean, Julie Ireland,
Charles Joel, Kevin Kennedy-Brooks, Keith Onslow and
Ryan Thomson

Also Present:

Councillors Michael Tickner, Kate Lymer and Chloe-Jane Ross

23 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies were received from Cllr Sam Webber and Cllr Julie Ireland attended as substitute.

Apologies were received from Cllr Kathy Bance and Cllr Ryan Thompson attended as substitute.

24 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Joel declared an interest in Item 4.2, as the objector was a close friend. He agreed to leave the room when this item was discussed.

25 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 23rd MARCH 2023

The minutes of the meeting held on 23rd March 2023 were agreed and signed as a correct record.

26 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

26.1 (21/03541/FULL1): 1 ST AUGUSTINE'S AVENUE, BICKLEY & SUNDRIDGE; BICKLEY, BROMLEY, BR2 8AG

Description of Application: Proposed demolition of existing bungalow and the construction of two pairs of semi-detached houses (4 x 2 bed units), with off street parking and amenity space.

The Planning Officer explained that there would be

four on street parking bays subsequent to one being removed to allow construction access. It was proposed that four new dwellings would be built, each one with two bedrooms. The application was recommended for permission subject to the conditions outlined in the report.

An oral representation in support of the application was received at the meeting.

A discussion took place concerning the possible net loss of parking bays and the fact that the parking survey took place in the evening, whereas there was likely to be more congestion earlier, with clients visiting the dance studio. A Member asked if more parking could be provided and the agent responded that this was not required as the application complied with parking standards. The Chairman suggested that a more comprehensive parking survey may be required. Photos from Ward Councillor Kate Lymer were tabled at the meeting showing parking congestion at the location.

The Chairman raised the matter of electric charging points, as only two were detailed on the plans as opposed to four. He asked for assurances that four would be provided.

The Chairman asked what measures would be taken for water conservation. The agent responded that such measures could be factored in as a planning condition.

Oral representations from visiting Ward Councillor Kate Lymer in objection to the application were received. She addressed the Committee and requested a deferral. She said that parking stress problems were caused by the busyness of the dance studio in the road, and that the parking stress test was taken at the wrong time. She said that the parking stress test was taken on at 4.30pm on a Wednesday afternoon when there were only two dance classes.

Councillor Lymer expressed the view that the stress test should be undertaken at a transition time when classes were starting and finishing. She stated that the dance studio ran 87 different classes over seven days, as well as regular birthday parties. She reminded the Committee that Bromley had the second highest car ownership ratio in London, and that one

car per family, or one car parking space per family would probably not be sufficient. Councillor Lymer requested that a new parking stress test be undertaken at 5:15 pm on a Friday afternoon in school term time and that representatives from Highways should attend simultaneously. She said that as well as the parking stress levels, she was requesting a deferral in the hope that the number of dwellings and (therefore density) could be reduced. She would also like more information regarding plans for water conservation.

Councillor Kevin Kennedy Brooks moved that the application be permitted and this was seconded by Councillor Ryan Thompson.

Councillor Dean moved that the application be deferred and this was seconded by Councillor Rowlands.

Members, having considered the report, objections and representations **RESOLVED that** the application be **DEFERRED** without prejudice for the following reasons:

- 1) To conduct an additional parking stress survey at 5:15pm on a Friday during school term to capture the parking situation during class transition time at the adjacent Dance Studio. Bromley Council's Highway Officers need to visit at the same time.
- 2) To provide water retention measures within the site for flood risk management.
- 3) To review the scale of the proposed development in terms of reducing the site density and increase parking, with all parking spaces to have electric charging points.

**26.2
FARNBOROUGH AND
CROFTON**

**(21/05278/FULL1): LAND OPPOSITE 165 TO 193
ISABELLA DRIVE, ORPINGTON,**

Description of Application: Erection of a new building to provide 26 residential units (Use Class C3), together with associated car parking, cycle parking, hard and soft landscaping, tree removal, boundary treatment, access, utilities and other associated works on Land Opposite 165 to 193 Isabella Drive, and the provision of play space to the rear of No's 138-150 Broadwater Gardens and front of No's 2-16 Isabella

Drive.

The Planning Officer highlighted that the application would result in 26 new residential dwellings which would represent a moderate contribution to the supply of housing within the borough. It was also the case that some of the proposed dwellings would be affordable social rented housing. The proposal would also provide accessible and adaptable homes which would meet the minimum internal space standards. The Planning Officer explained that there would be dedicated play areas for children, as well as landscaping and ecological enhancements. There would not be any significant harm to residential amenity and there had been no objections received from Highways. There were no adverse implications that would outweigh the benefits of the proposed development.

It was noted that three late representations had been received, two of these were objections and one was in support of the application.

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

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

A letter was presented to the Committee which stated that there were no plans for further house building to be undertaken at Darrick Wood. The letter was dated 2009.

A Member expressed the view that the proposed new play areas would be a significant loss of amenity space which would be difficult to justify. The agent for Keniston Housing Association said that the provision was beyond the minimum requirements of planning policy. The Member expressed concern at the lack of face to face consultation with residents and the possible loss of light to those residents facing the proposed development, as it seemed as if the development was being built on a hill. The agent responded that a daylight survey was undertaken which indicated that there would be no noticeable impact.

The Committee also discussed matters relating to electric car charging points and water conservation.

The Chairman stated that the residents had put in an application for a community green. He asked the agent for Keniston if he was aware of this and whether or not Keniston would be prepared to delay this application until the application for a community green had been dealt with. The Council's legal representative said that processing the application for a community green could take up to two years. The agent consulted with representatives from Keniston who indicated that they did not wish to delay the application.

A Member stated that this area of land was a communal area for the local community and was not just a children's play area. There was also a section of the current development that had been built specifically for residents with disabilities who currently benefited from ease of access to a field. Biodiversity may also be impacted with the possible loss of hedgehogs and badgers. The application had many positive aspects but it was in his view being proposed on the wrong site.

Councillor Kevin Kennedy Brooks moved that the application be refused. This was seconded by Councillor Julie Ireland. The Committee agreed unanimously that the application should be refused.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that** the application be **REFUSED** for the following reasons:

1) Insufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the open space is surplus to requirements and an alternative enhanced provision has not been demonstrated in an equally accessible location to continue to meet the needs of the community it serves. The development is therefore contrary to Policy 20 of the Bromley Local Plan (2019), Policy S1 of the London Plan (2021) and the aims and objectives of Chapter 8 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

2) The proposal, by reason of its bulk, size, and overall footprint, would result in an overbearing form of development which would be detrimental to the amenities of neighbouring residents. The proposal is thereby contrary to Policy 37 of the Bromley Local

Plan (2019), Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and the aims and objectives of paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

3) The proposal would, due to its location in an area with a low PTAL rating, result in residential development that is excessively dependent on the use of private cars and fails to provide inclusive neighbourhoods which allow people to move around safely and easily by active travel modes. The proposal is therefore inconsistent with the overarching strategy of promoting sustainable transport and minimising greenhouse gas emissions, thereby contrary to Policies 31 and 33 of the Bromley Local Plan (2019), Policies T1, D5 and SI 1 of the London Plan (2021) and the NPPF (2021).

4) An acceptable planning obligation for provision of the affordable housing (including wheelchair accessible units), affordable housing viability reviews, payment of contributions in respect of carbon offsetting, and the payment of monitoring and legal costs has not been entered into. The application is thereby contrary to Policy 125 of the Bromley Local Plan (2019), Policy DF1 of the London Plan (2021), and Bromley Planning Obligation Supplementary Planning Document (June 2022).

**26.3
BECKENHAM TOWN AND
COPERS COPE**

**(22/0993/FULL1): 1 THE DRIVE, BECKENHAM, BR3
1EE**

Description of Application: Part one/two storey rear extension and construction of rear dormer extension with conversion of resultant dwelling into two flats (1 no. three bedroom flat and 1 no. two bedroom flat) with associated refuse storage.

The Planning Officer stated that the application exceeded the minimum space standards and would provide family accommodation with rear gardens; there were no restrictions on converting the family home to flats and there was no significant community impact. There had not been any technical objections received from Highways. The proposal would provide a small contribution to the housing supply. The Planning Department had recommended the application for Permission.

The Planning Officer said that one late objection had been received.

Oral representations in objection to the application were received from Ward Councillor Chloe-Jane Ross.

Councillor Ross pointed out that this was an area characterised by single three bedroom family homes, and expressed concern that if the application was successful it could facilitate a shift to a transient neighbourhood. She summarised the concerns of people living in the area as follows:

- a reduced sense of community
- loss of front gardens and garden space
- loss of family single dwelling homes
- on street parking implications
- impact on the local character

Councillor Ross stated that other London boroughs were protecting single dwelling family homes, and that in many other London boroughs, the application would not meet the criteria for recommendation. She expressed the view that the application was out of character with the local area and could set a negative precedent for similar conversions. She pointed out that the London Borough of Wandsworth, (when defending appeals where they had refused the conversion of single dwelling family homes to flats), had defended many of these appeals successfully and this indicated that the Planning Inspectorate recognised the need to maintain single dwelling family homes. She said that Bromley needed a good mix of housing, and not just flats.

A discussion arose as to the possibility of the conversion of such properties to HMOs subsequent to being converted to flats. She also referred to the possibility of less protected homes being targeted by developers with the consequent loss of family homes. She recommended that the application be refused.

An oral representation in objection to the application was also received from Ward Councillor Michael Tickner. He expressed the view that the application would create an unwelcome precedent of family homes being converted to apartments. He highlighted that the application was near a Conservation Area, and that no extra parking spaces were proposed. He reminded the Committee that the borough needed a mix of flats and family homes and Beckenham already

had many flats. He felt that officers had failed to look at the eight house block as a whole. He described the application as not purpose built, not a good design and out of character for the area, and consequently he urged Members to refuse the application.

Cllr Julie Ireland moved that the application be refused. Councillor Ryan Thompson seconded the motion.

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

1. The proposal would have a detrimental impact on the distinctive character of the area, resulting in the loss of a single family dwelling, and an intensity of residential use of the end of terrace dwelling that would not be sympathetic to or consistent with the prevailing pattern of development in The Drive, contrary to Policies 9 and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan (2019).

2. The proposed sub-division of the property, by reason of its layout, increased intensity and the number of people to be housed, would be detrimental to the amenities of adjoining occupiers by reasons of increased noise and disturbance, contrary to Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) and Policies 9 and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan (2019).

**26.4
HAYES AND CONEY HALL;
CONSERVATION AREA:
KESTON VILLAGE**

**(23/01379/FULL6): 15 HEATHFIELD ROAD,
KESTON, BR2 6BG**

Description of Application: Conversion and alteration of rear ground floor premises from underused storage, to provide a one bedroom, one person apartment with rear courtyard garden and access and central courtyard garden area along with secure bin storage to rear.

The Planning Officer said that the application was located in a Conservation Area but that there would be no detrimental impact upon the local area or the Conservation Area. There had been no objections from Highways. The application was recommended for permission.

An email was noted from Councillor Alexa Michael who had called in the application, regarding her

concerns around parking and the lack of amenity space.

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

Councillor Kevin Kennedy Brooks moved that the application be approved and this was seconded by Councillor Peter Dean.

Members, having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION BE GRANTED** for the reasons and subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report of the Chief Planner.

The meeting ended at 9.08 pm.

Chairman