

PLANS SUB-COMMITTEE NO. 2

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.00 pm on 12 May 2016

Present:

Councillor Lydia Buttinger (Chairman)
Councillor Michael Turner (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Kathy Bance MBE, Peter Dean, Nicky Dykes,
Samaris Huntington-Thresher, Russell Mellor and
Neil Reddin FCCA

Also Present:

Councillors William Huntington-Thresher, Kate Lymer,
Sarah Phillips and Catherine Rideout

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Richard Scoates and an apology for lateness was received from Councillor Russell Mellor.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were received.

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 17 MARCH 2016

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 17 March 2016 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

4 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

SECTION 1

(Applications submitted by the London Borough of Bromley)

4.1 KELSEY AND EDEN PARK

(16/01536/REG3) - Kelsey Park Cafe, Kelsey Park, Manor Way, Beckenham

Description of application – Single storey front extension to café.

It was reported that no objections to the application had been received from the Highways Division. Members having considered the report, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION BE GRANTED** as recommended, subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Chief Planner.

SECTION 2

(Applications meriting special consideration)

**4.2
BICKLEY**

**(15/02145/FULL1) - St Raphaels Residential Home,
32 Orchard Road, Bromley BR1 2PS**

Description of application – Demolition of existing care home and erection of a part one/two/three storey building with an additional storey of accommodation within the roofspace comprising 75 retirement living apartments (51x2 bed and 24x1 bed) with basement level ancillary facilities, parking for 52 cars (33 at basement level, 19 surface level), cycle parking spaces, refuse storage and landscaping.

Oral representations in objection to and in support of the application were received. Oral representations from Ward Member Councillor Catherine Rideout in objection to the application were also received at the meeting and can be viewed as Appendix 1 to these Minutes.

The Planning Officer reported that additional representations and a further letter from the applicant's agents had been received. The SPG 2012 referred to in the report had been superseded by SPG 2016 adopted in March 2016. No objections to the application were received from Highways Division. Whilst the planning officer recommendation remained the same, permission would be subject to any Direction by the Mayor of London.

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

1 The proposed development, by virtue of its bulk and mass, would result in an overdevelopment of the site, harmful to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policies BE1 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006), Policy 3.5 of the London Plan (2015) and Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

2 The proposed off street parking would be insufficient to meet the needs of the development by reason of inadequate number of spaces and the proposal would cause an unacceptable impact upon the surrounding highway network, giving rise to highway safety issues contrary to policies T3 and T18 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006), Policy 6.13 of the London Plan (2015) and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Councillor Dean's vote against refusal was noted and Councillor Mellor abstained from voting.

**4.3
ORPINGTON
CONSERVATION AREA**

(15/04574/FULL1) - Former Depot Site, Church Hill, Orpington

Description of application – Demolition of existing depot buildings and erection of eight 2 storey, 3 bedroom terraced houses, 1 part 3/part 4 storey apartment block (Block B) with 17x2 bed and 1x3 bed units and 1 part 2/part 3 storey apartment block (Block A) with 2x2 bed flats, together with 38 car parking spaces (including 2 visitor spaces), 66 cycle parking spaces, refuse and recycling facilities and associated landscaping, including pergolas in the car park.

Oral representations in support of the application were received. Oral representations from Ward Member Councillor William Huntington-Thresher in objection to the application were received at the meeting.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that the application BE DEFERRED without prejudice to any future consideration, to:-**

- 1 reassess the viability of the site for employment use or mixed use and to seek additional marketing; and**
- 2 reassess the affordable housing provision.**

**4.4
BICKLEY**

(16/00124/FULL6) - 18 Homestead Road, Bickley, Bromley BR2 8BA

Description of application – Addition of first floor and two storey rear extension with habitable accommodation in roofspace and rooflights.

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

It was reported that further objections to the application had been received.

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

**4.5
PENGE AND CATOR**

(16/00484/FULL1) - 30 St John's Road, Penge SE20 7ED

Description of application – Conversion of dwelling to 1x2 bedroom flat and 1x3 bedroom flat.

THIS REPORT WAS WITHDRAWN BY THE CHIEF PLANNER.

**4.6
BROMLEY COMMON AND
KESTON**

**(16/00505/FULL6) - Weeks End, Jackass Lane,
Keston BR2 6AN**

Description of application – Roof alterations to incorporate 3 dormers to front and 3 dormers to rear to provide habitable accommodation in roofspace.

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

**4.7
BROMLEY TOWN**

**(16/00631/FULL6) - 61 Murray Avenue, Bromley
BR1 3DJ**

Description of application – Erection of timber cabin to rear of property RETROSPECTIVE.

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

The final sentence of the proposal set out on page 81 of the report was amended to read:- ‘There are two windows on the *southern* elevation.’

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION BE GRANTED** as recommended, subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Chief Planner with condition 2 amended to read:-

‘2 The additional accommodation shall be used only by members of the household occupying the dwelling at 61 Murray Avenue for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling and shall not be used as permanent or temporary sleeping accommodation and shall not be severed to form a self-contained unit.

Reason: In order to comply with Policy H8 of the Unitary Development Plan and to ensure that the accommodation is not used separately and unassociated with the main dwelling and so as to prevent an unsatisfactory sub-division into two dwellings.’

A further 2 conditions were added as follows:-

3 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order amending, revoking and re-enacting this Order) no building, structure or alteration permitted by Class E of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the 2015 Order (as amended), shall be erected or made within the curtilage of the dwelling without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to prevent an overdevelopment of the site and to assess any future impact in terms of neighbouring amenity in order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006).

4 Within three months of the decision, a scheme of landscaping to include screen planting shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval. The landscaping shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details in the first planting season following approval. Any trees or plants which within a period of five years from the implementation of the landscaping scheme die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced within the next planting season with others of similar size and species to those originally planted.

Reason: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan and in the interest of the amenities of the adjacent properties.

4.8 BROMLEY TOWN CONSERVATION AREA

(16/00722/FULL1) - 7 Beckenham Lane, Bromley BR2 0DA

Description of application – Demolition of existing building and construction of replacement two storey building with additional accommodation within roof space comprising 8 residential flats (4x2 bedroom and 4x1 bedroom), bin store, cycle store, 10 car parking spaces, alterations to existing vehicular/pedestrian access onto Beckenham Lane, front boundary and associated landscaping at Nos 7-9 Beckenham Lane.

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

1 The proposed development by reason of its prominent siting, scale, massing, sub-standard spatial relationship to the existing and adjacent buildings in the locality in this prominent location, represents a cramped overdevelopment of the site which would appear detrimental to the character and appearance of the Bromley Town Centre Conservation Area and harmful to the visual amenities of the area contrary to Policies BE1, BE11, H7 and H9 of the Unitary Development Plan.

2 The proposed development would be detrimental to the character and appearance of Pixfield Court which is a grade II Listed Building and Glebe Knoll which is a locally listed building and would be harmful to their settings, contrary to Policies BE8 and BE10 of the Unitary Development Plan.

3 The proposed development would be over dominant and would be detrimental to the amenities that the occupiers of adjoining properties might reasonably expect to be able to continue to enjoy by reason of visual impact and loss of prospect in view of its size, width and the depth of rearward projection, contrary to Policies BE1 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan.

**4.9
HAYES AND CONEY HALL**

**(16/01065/FULL6) - 2 Wolfe Close, Bromley
BR2 7LY**

Description of application – part one/two storey side/rear extension.

It was reported that the application had been amended by documents received on 29 April 2016. A further letter of support had also been received. Members having considered the report, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION BE GRANTED** as recommended, subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Chief Planner.

**4.10
CLOCK HOUSE**

**(16/01091/FULL1) - 45 Ancaster Road, Beckenham
BR3 4DZ**

Description of application – Demolition of existing bungalow and the construction of a two storey building in order to provide 4 two bedroom flats, together with four off road parking spaces, cycle and refuse storage (amendment to application ref: 15/05399).

Oral representations in support of the application were received at the meeting. Oral representations from Ward Member Councillor Sarah Phillips were also received.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that the application BE DEFERRED without prejudice to any future consideration to seek a reduction in the size and scale of the rear of the development.**

**4.11
CLOCK HOUSE**

**(16/01190/FULL1) - 25 Samos Road, London
SE20 7UQ**

Description of application – Single storey side extension, part one/two storey rear extension, rear dormer extensions and conversion into 5 flats with associated parking.

Oral representations from Ward Member Councillor Sarah Phillips were received at the meeting. It was reported that further representations had been received and the application had been amended by documents received on 18 April 2016.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that the application BE DEFERRED without prejudice to any future consideration, to:-**

- 1 seek a reduction in the quantum of development;**
- 2 reassess the off-street parking provision; and**
- 3 seek a reduction in the number of residential units.**

SECTION 3

(Applications recommended for permission, approval or consent)

4.12 BICKLEY

(16/00240/FULL1) - 6A Beaconsfield Road, Bickley BR1 2BP

Description of application – Demolition of existing building at 6 and 6A Beaconsfield Road and erection of detached two storey building with accommodation in roof comprising 4 two bedroom flats with associated car parking, cycle and refuse stores and landscaping.

Oral representations in objection to and in support of the application were received. Oral representations from Ward Member Councillor Kate Lymer in objection to the application were received at the meeting.

It was reported that further objections to the application had been received together with further photographs which had been circulated to Members. Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION BE REFUSED** for the following reasons:-

- 1 The proposal, as a result of its design, considerable bulk and mass and projection beyond the established front building line, is considered to represent an overdevelopment of the site that would be out of character with the street scene and result in a diminution of spatial standards that would be harmful to the area, thereby contrary to Policies BE1 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006).
- 2 The proposed balconies are considered to cause actual and perceived overlooking of the neighbouring properties and will result in a loss of privacy that will be detrimental to the residential amenities of the

adjoining properties, contrary to Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006).

3 The proposed development, by virtue of the loss of green amenity space, is considered to adversely impact upon the verdant character of the wider locality contrary to Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006).

**4.13
BICKLEY**

**(16/00583/FULL1) - 38 Hawthorne Road, Bickley
BR1 2HH**

Description of application – Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 2 detached two storey 4 bedroom dwellings including accommodation in roofspace and integral garage and new vehicular access.

It was reported that the published site plan was incorrect; an amended version was circulated to Members.

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

1 The proposed development results in the loss of a Locally Listed Building which is considered of significant merit in terms of its character and design. Whilst it is recognised that the property has been fire damaged, planning permission has previously been granted for its repair and reinstatement. This is a character property that has the potential to again make a substantial positive contribution to the wider locality and it is considered that there is insufficient justification for its loss which would be detrimental to the area and contrary to Policy BE10 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006) and should therefore be resisted.

2 The plot of 38 Hawthorn Road has already been sub-divided and the proposed development which includes a further sub-division, is considered to represent an unacceptable overdevelopment and over intensification of the use of the site, contrary to the prevailing spatial standards of the wider locality contrary to Policies BE1 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006).

3 The bulk and mass of the proposed development is considered to be excessive and represent an overdevelopment of the site that would be detrimental to the street scene and the wider character and visual amenities of the area, contrary to Policies BE1 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006).

**4.14
CHELSFIELD AND PRATTS
BOTTOM**

**(16/01029/FULL1) - 195 Worlds End Lane,
Orpington BR6 6AT**

Description of application – Demolition of existing dwellings on 195 and 195a Worlds End Lane and erection of detached two storey 6 bedroom dwelling including attached double garage with accommodation above and associated parking and landscaping.

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

Comments from Tree Officers were reported to Members.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that the application BE DEFERRED without prejudice to any future consideration, to seek the following:-**

- 1 a reduction in massing of the overall development;**
- 2 to amend the extent of the front projection of the development; and**
- 3 to increase the side space provisions between the flank elevation and the boundary with No. 193 Worlds End Lane.**

**4.15
WEST WICKHAM**

**(16/01155/FULL6) 120 The Avenue, West Wickham
BR4 0EA**

Description of application – roof alterations to incorporate rear dormer and front rooflights and single storey rear and first floor side extension.

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

**4.16
BROMLEY COMMON AND
KESTON**

**(16/01389/FULL2) - Carisbrooke House, 1A Pope
Road, Bromley BR2 9SS**

Description of application – Change of use from doctor's surgery (Class D1) to 3 two bedroom flats (Class C3) incorporating elevational alterations, increase in roof height, 2 storey front and 3 storey rear extensions.

It was reported that no objections to the application had been received from Tree Officers.

Plans Sub-Committee No. 2
12 May 2016

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 Chief Planner.

The meeting ended at 8.55 pm

Chairman

COMMENTS FROM COUNCILLOR CATHERINE RIDEOUT IN OBJECTION TO ITEM 4.2 – ST RAPHAELS RESIDENTIAL HOME, 32 ORCHARD ROAD, BROMLEY BR1 2PS

'Thank you Chairman for allowing me to speak tonight. This objection has been very well covered by the residents' solicitor already. The report to the Committee is over 40 pages long and it would be difficult to comment on everything in the report so I will limit mine to the most worrying aspects of the application. This revised development only reduces the number of residential living apartments to 75 and 52 car parking spaces and does not go nearly far enough to address the concerns raised at the January meeting. This building, because of its bulk and size would be an over-development of the site and would have an unacceptable impact upon the character and appearance of the area. It will also have an unacceptable impact on the residents in Baytree Close, Ashmead Gate and also Highgrove from the rear aspect. However it is dressed up, it is still a commercial enterprise. The application states that the flats are for retirement living with access to care provision and at least one person must be over 60. The vast majority of over 60s are very active with time and money to spend on leisure activities, so I envisage there will be a lot of vehicular movements. The fact that the development provides 52 car parking spaces proves that the developers are aware of this. The residents are probably also savvy enough to shop on-line so there will be deliveries made to the premises. I have had a lot of complaints about the scale and height of the building. There is a plan to remove 26 trees and 5 groups of trees. These trees provide a very necessary function in keeping our air clean and it is not for nothing that they are called 'green lungs'. A building which goes from boundary to boundary with a frontage devoted to spaces for cars would be totally unacceptable in this area.

At the meeting on 21 January, the statement I made regarding congestion in Orchard Road was challenged. Orchard Road houses have cars parked in front of them for the best part of the day, leading to very severe congestion which occurs 5 days a week during term time at Scotts Park School, even though St Raphaels is currently vacant. The 314 buses cannot pass one another and the road is reduced to a single line of traffic. The proposal to build these flats will add an unacceptable and dangerous amount of traffic to the area. There is also a strong likelihood that should an emergency arise and an ambulance is called which coincides with school time, it would not be able to get through, or at the very least, it would be dangerously delayed. At the meeting on 21 January, because the statement made regarding congestion in Orchard Road was challenged, the residents commissioned an Independent Traffic Survey in Orchard Road covering the period between 20-29 April. The results confirm a much higher vehicular movement (up to over 40%) compared to previously reported in the applicant's Transport Statement. In fact, the congestion continues from early afternoon until later in the day, peaking at 18:00. If this application is approved, the traffic congestions can only get worse. For this reason and my previous comments, I would ask that this application be refused.'

This page is left intentionally blank