

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.00 pm on 2 June 2016

Present:

Councillor Peter Dean (Chairman)
Councillor Richard Scoates (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Vanessa Allen, Graham Arthur, Douglas Auld,
Nicholas Bennett J.P., Eric Bosshard, Katy Boughey,
Kevin Brooks, Lydia Buttinger, Nicky Dykes, William Huntington-
Thresher, Charles Joel, David Livett, Alexa Michael,
Neil Reddin FCCA and Michael Turner

Also Present:

Councillors Peter Morgan and Tim Stevens J.P.

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Pauline Tunnicliffe;
Councillor Nicholas Bennett JP attended as substitute.

An apology for absence was also received from Councillor Simon Fawthrop.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were received.

3 CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 19 APRIL 2016

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 19 April 2016 be
confirmed and signed as a correct record.

4 QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ATTENDING THE MEETING

No questions were received.

5 PLANNING APPLICATION (15/02398/FULL1) – SUNDRIDGE PARK MANOR, WILLOUGHBY LANE, BROMLEY BR1 3FZ

Description of application – Change of use of existing Grade I listed mansion
from hotel to 22 residential dwellings, with associated internal/external
alterations and partial demolition works, rear extensions, rear car park, cycle

parking and refuse/recycling provision, hard and soft landscaping (including removal of some trees), woodland management and associated infrastructure.

Oral representations in objection to the application were received from Mr Robert McQuillan on behalf of residents of Stable Villas. Mr McQuillan made the following comments:-

The residents of Stable Villas (which are Grade II Listed Buildings), considered themselves to be temporary custodians of this significant heritage site and were keen to protect it as such. Members were urged to consider whether permission should be granted when the current proposal was compared with the previous permitted 2011 application. The external banked area to the rear of the building and the canopy of trees, were elements of the site's historic landscape and the removal of trees and land from the glade area was disappointing to note. Compared with the permitted scheme in 2011, the current application resulted in a 20% increase in the site's footprint. Careful consideration should be given to the removal of car parking from the front of the site.

Mr McQuillan ended by requesting deferral of the application (in the event that it was not refused) to enable Members to visit the site. If refused, the historic landscape and the rationale behind it would be lost.

Oral representations from Ms Emma Ouseby (agent for the applicant) were submitted as follows:-

The site was located within a Grade II Listed Park and the current high quality scheme would secure its long-term viable use. Deferral of the application would bring no new information to light. Consultations had taken place between the applicant, Council officers and residents and attempts had been made to resolve all concerns. Woodland walks would be reallocated and the restoration of important heritage aspects preserved through sympathetic design. The removal of trees was necessary to benefit the proposed car park to the rear. A viability assessment had demonstrated that the scheme would not fall within an acceptable profit threshold if affordable housing, health and education contributions were sought. Significant new planting was proposed and a good screening buffer established between the site and Stable Villas. Compared with the hotel, there would be a decrease in traffic flow to and from the site. The Pulhamite Grotto would be repaired and maintained. The existing basement would be converted to residential use and the main staircase restored.

The Chief Planner reported that correspondence from the residents of Stable Villas had been received and circulated to Members. Further objections, similar to those already contained in the report had also been received. The applicant had made written comments about various conditions which could be considered further should the application be permitted.

Oral representations in objection to the application were also received from Ward Member Councillor Peter Morgan as follows:-

The new applicant was aware of the previous consent granted in 2011. Since that time, house prices had massively increased which meant the previously permitted scheme would become more viable. The idea that further units were required for the scheme to become viable was, therefore, ridiculous.

Willoughby Lane was a dangerous single track leading to a junction with Plaistow Lane; with Edward Road and Lodge Road nearby, all three roads were extremely busy. There were also three schools located within the area. Permitting the current application would exacerbate existing traffic problems within this area. Willoughby Lane was owned and maintained by the nearby Golf Club and whilst passing bays were currently available, they could be withdrawn at any time. Turning right into Willoughby Lane from Plaistow Lane would be difficult.

Councillor Morgan referred to the potential risks outlined on page 33 of the report in relation to access to and egress from the site's car parking area. The installation of traffic lights would not solve all the problems highlighted in the report. On-site car parking should remain at the front of the property.

Whilst removal of some trees had previously been accepted, the current proposal to remove more trees was a step too far.

For the reasons given above, Councillor Morgan requested that the current application be refused.

It was noted that the Ward of 'Farnborough and Crofton' (page 11 of the report) should be amended to read 'Plaistow and Sundridge'.

Opening the debate, Committee Member and Ward Member Councillor Turner declared the current proposal to be 'monstrous' and considered the building would suffer unbelievable damage should the application be approved. With three local primary schools in the vicinity, traffic problems in and around Plaistow Lane had reached a desperate level. Compared with the existing hotel which was underused, the proposal would have a major impact on traffic flow. On the basis of gross over development, traffic concerns, parking and loss of trees, Councillor Turner moved that the application be refused.

Councillor Buttinger agreed with the comments made by Councillor Turner and added that the proposed scheme was out of keeping with the valuable Listed Building. Referring to pages 25-26 of report, she thanked the report author for including a table of percentage figures showing increased built floorspace but noted that if the garage extension was included, the increased volume of floorspace in the Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) substantially increased to about 40%. She requested that future tables also include figures relating to all floorspace in the main part of the tables. Councillor Buttinger seconded the motion to refuse the application.

The Chairman highlighted the fact that permission had previously been granted to provide 14 properties at the site which, at that time, was deemed to

be viable. Since then, property prices had increased making the scheme even more viable so there was no need to increase the number of units. The encroachment onto MOL was not supported.

Councillor Michael was surprised at the Planning Officer's recommendation to permit the application. The contents of the report did not show that very special circumstances had been proven to justify building on MOL which was almost the equivalent of Green Belt land. For the reasons of over-development, traffic problems and the removal of trees, Councillor Michael agreed that the previous permitted scheme for the provision of 14 units remain but that the current application be refused.

Councillor Brooks negated the statement made on page 45 of the report (Summary and Conclusions), which claimed the 'delivery of 22 new homes would contribute to the delivery of the Council's housing targets' for the reason that none of the units were affordable housing.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, RESOLVED THAT PERMISSION BE REFUSED for the following reasons:-

- 1) The proposed development of the site is considered to be inappropriate overdevelopment in Metropolitan Open Land due to the construction of new buildings which would have a greater impact on the openness of Metropolitan Open Land and the purpose of including land within it, than the existing development. This inappropriate development is by definition harmful to Metropolitan Open Land. This harm together with the loss of trees, is not clearly outweighed by the benefits of the development including the heritage benefits to Sundridge Mansion and its setting, the Woodland Management Plan and Housing provision. Very special circumstances do not therefore exist. As such the proposal is contrary to the aims and objectives of the NPPF (2012), Policy 7.17 of the London Plan (2015) and Policy G2 of the UDP (2006).**
- 2) The proposed development of the site will require road surfacing and markings, signage and traffic lights in the vicinity of Stable Villas and Sundridge Mansion for road safety purposes, that will be harmful to the setting of the Listed Buildings, contrary to the aims and objectives of the NPPF (2012) and to Policy 7.8 of the London Plan (2015) and BE8 of the UDP (2006).**
- 3) The long-term provision of passing bays along Willoughby Lane which are required for road safety purposes has not been ensured contrary to Policy T18 of the UDP (2006).**

6 PLANNING APPLICATION (15/02399/LBC) - SUNDRIDGE PARK MANOR, WILLOUGHBY LANE, BROMLEY BR1 3FZ

Description of application – Listed Building Consent sought for change of use of existing Grade I listed mansion from hotel to 22 residential dwellings, with

associated internal/external alterations and partial demolition works, rear extensions, rear car park, cycle parking and refuse/recycling provision, hard and soft landscaping (including removal of some trees), woodland management and associated infrastructure.

Discussion relating to this joint report is recorded under Item 5.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, RESOLVED THAT LISTED BUILDING CONSENT BE REFUSED for the following reason:-

- 1) In the absence of planning permission for the development of the application site, as proposed under ref 15/02398/FULL1, no justification is seen for the granting of Listed Building Consent for the proposed development and this would be contrary to the aims and objectives of the NPPF (2012) and Policy BE9 of the Unitary Development Plan.**

7 PLANNING APPLICATION (15/04941/FULL1) - BASSETTS DAY CARE CENTRE, ACORN WAY, ORPINGTON BR6 7WF

Description of application – Demolition of existing buildings except Bassetts House. Redevelopment of site comprising alterations to and change of use of Bassetts House to residential (Class C3) and conversion to form 13 flats (7 x 1 bed, 4 x 2 bed and 2 x 3 bed), erection of 102 dwellings (16 x 1 bed flats, 26 x 2 bed flats, 5 x 3 bed houses, 52 x 4 bed houses and 3 x 5 bed houses) and associated car parking (175 spaces), cycle parking and landscaping (including new boundary treatment) and other associated works.

The following oral representations in support of the application were received from the applicant's agent, Mr Will Edmunds:-

The scheme consisted of high quality residential properties. The applicant had positively engaged with Council officers and residents and attempted to resolve all concerns. The benefits of the changes of use would include:-

- restoration and long-term use of the building;
- ecological works;
- provision of 115 new homes – 10% of which were affordable housing;
- retention of trees;
- 175 parking spaces managed through a parking permit scheme;
- CPZ contributions;
- restriction of vehicular access.

In response to Member questions, Mr Edmunds stated that a parking permit scheme would be managed on site with 130 parking spaces provided for the properties and 45 spaces for visitor use, which was the maximum allowance for the site. With regard to TfL's statement that there would be too many visitor parking bays, Mr Edmunds confirmed that these could be used by

residents. It was anticipated that development would begin almost immediately, with the first homes being available for occupation in approximately 12 months' time.

Bassetts Pond would be protected from over-accumulation of water by improved drainage and sub-systems. A filtration system would also be installed to improve the quality of the water which would be controlled by a tap-like system.

Orpington Field Club had raised concerns about the protection of the great crested newt habitat and objected to the proposal to provide car-parking spaces in this area. Mr Edmunds confirmed that the scheme had been amended to achieve minimal incursion into the SINC area and had no impact on nature preservation.

The Planning Officer reported that further correspondence had been received and provided a verbal summary to the Committee. The scheme had been amended by revised landscaping plans received on 27 May 2016. Should the application be permitted, minor changes to the stated conditions would be required.

As an important development within Farnborough and Crofton, Ward Member Councillor Joel asked the Planning Officer to respond to the following:-

- '1) There is some confusion regarding car parking provision where the report states there will be 175 spaces including 45 visitor spaces, therefore providing 130 for residents. In the report under the Highways section (page 64), this evaluates to 1.5 per dwelling. Can a more detailed breakdown be provided covering each type of dwelling with the relevant total numbers? What bearing or effect will it have on the point made by TFL in item 10, page 12 of the report?
- 2) I am requesting a suitable fence or railings be provided around the perimeter edge of the landscaped area to Bassetts Pond in the need for safety and protection of children, wildlife etc. It is accepted that some form of lockable gating will need to be incorporated in order to undertake maintenance. I accept this can be covered by condition in item 4, page 87 of the report.
- 3) It can be seen that building works to Bassetts House are currently in hand prior to receiving approval to this application. This had already been drawn to the attention of the Chief Planner and I am led to believe the situation was being investigated. Can the officer confirm the details bearing in mind condition 3 on page 32 of the agenda.
- 4) With Bassetts House being a listed building and having a distinctive character, is the use of PPC aluminium double glazed window units acceptable? It is noted that samples are required to be deposited to the Council prior to the commencement of the work for approval. Furthermore, it is mentioned in the report that black PVC rainwater

goods are not acceptable. There are a number of other products available such as black powder coated aluminium with a design pattern that will compliment a listed building. It is accepted that this can be covered by condition.

- 5) The internal road within the proposed development i.e. second paragraph, page 81, addresses it as a private estate to be managed and maintained by an independent company appointed by the developers. For the benefit of local residents who have raised concerns, can it be taken that the Council will not have any involvement other than road sweeping and refuse collection?
- 6) The question has also been raised as to whether the development could be secured by a controlled gating system to detract other outside car users from parking on the complex. It works very well on the Farnborough Park and Keston Park Estates and elsewhere throughout the Borough. There is an horrendous parking problem in the area mainly due to the overspill from the PRU Hospital.'

In response to Councillor Joel's questions, the Planning Officer confirmed the following:-

- 1) The total parking provision on site was 175 spaces, including both allocated and unallocated parking spaces. In respect of the breakdown of allocated spaces, this was confirmed as follows:-
 - 55 flats – 1 space each;
 - 4 x 3 bedroom houses – 1 space each;
 - 1 x 3 bedroom house – 2 spaces;
 - 40 x 4 bedroom houses – 1 space each;
 - 12 x 4 bedroom houses – 2 spaces each;
 - 2 x 5 bedroom houses – 2 spaces each;
 - 1 x 5 bedroom house – 1 allocated space (with room on the driveway for an additional parking space).

The majority of dwellings (100) across the site would benefit from 1 car parking space each, whilst 14 of the larger dwellings and one 3 bed dwelling would each be allocated 2 spaces. It was also anticipated that future occupiers would have some flexible access to the unallocated (visitor) parking spaces, details of which could be secured through condition 22.

In respect of objections received from Transport for London (TfL), Members were advised that a request had been made to reduce parking provision for the smaller flatted units but in this instance, given the low PTAL rating of the site, the proposed level was considered to be acceptable.

- 2) Details of a boundary treatment to the Bassetts Pond area would be required by condition.
- 3) A planning investigations officer had visited the site in early May and confirmed that works taking place at that time did not require planning permission. The works undertaken to date generally related to remedial works and repairs to Bassetts House. In addition, the officer advised that a structure to house electrical equipment had been built alongside the boundary to Starts Hill Road. Officers confirmed that this required planning permission and would need to be regularised at the earliest opportunity and that the applicant had been advised accordingly.
- 4) Bassetts House was a locally listed building and the proposed materials for repair works were generally satisfactory. It was confirmed that the Conservation Officer was satisfied with the proposed use of aluminium windows in the building. However, it was noted that concerns had been expressed in the report regarding the use of UPVC guttering where the preference would be for a metal guttering and it would, therefore, be recommended that full details were secured by condition.
- 5) The internal road would remain private; it was not intended to be offered for adoption by the Council and the Council would be responsible for refuse collection.
- 6) The application did not currently propose gates across the Starts Hill Road access to the site. Should it be considered necessary in future, this could be dealt with by way of a separate application for planning permission.

Councillor Joel thanked officers for producing a detailed and comprehensive report.

The three Ward Councillors had been in close liaison with the Case Officer throughout various stages about concerns raised by local residents, mainly in relation to the number of units, density, car parking, boundaries and the protection of wild life, trees and the preservation of Bassetts Pond. The report had covered the various points raised and where necessary, had included a condition that relevant details were to be confirmed in writing and approved by the Council.

It could be seen that effectively, the scheme could be construed as a private housing estate and that the parking facilities, upkeep and maintenance of the site would be managed by an independent company appointed by the developers. The developers and their adopted agents had designed and constructed the inner road which would not be offered up to the Council for adoption.

There was mention of poor public transport links however, there were bus services in Starts Hill Road, the A21 and Crofton Road with good connections to Bromley, Orpington and elsewhere in the region.

Councillor Joel had taken the opportunity to discuss the impact of additional residents to the area with three of the local schools and a GP surgery practice but received very little response.

Towards the end of last year, he was invited, together with Councillor Tim Stevens, to visit the London Square Developments in Hayes Common and both were impressed with the standard of workmanship and care and attention being given to the site and its surroundings. As a result, the three Ward Councillors for Farnborough and Crofton considered the design and planning would complement the area.

With the support and agreement of fellow Ward Councillors, Councillor Joel moved approval of the application. The motion was seconded by the Chairman.

Councillor Buttinger requested that the habitat of great crested newts at the site be protected by condition and bat boxes be installed to enhance the environment. She also requested that officers consider talking with Orpington Field Club in regard to landscaping.

Councillor Allen believed further consideration should be given in regard to the provision of affordable housing. The Planning Officer confirmed that 12 affordable units were incorporated into the scheme.

Councillor Bosshard considered the Council would receive less than it should from the proposed S106 contribution as the profit achieved by the development would far exceed what was originally anticipated. The Planning Officer reported that S106 monies would mitigate health and education needs.

Charging points for electric cars could be installed in the visitor bays; this would not prohibit anyone from using the bays for normal parking.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, RESOLVED THAT PERMISSION BE GRANTED as recommended, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report, with the inclusion of some minor amendments.

The meeting ended at 8.30 pm

Chairman

This page is left intentionally blank