

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.30 pm on 6 September 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, Simon Fawthrop,
William Huntington-Thresher, Charles Joel, David Livett,
Alexa Michael, Neil Reddin FCCA and Michael Turner

14 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.

15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were received.

16 CONFIRMATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 11 JULY 2016

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 11 July 2016 be
confirmed and signed as a correct record.

17 QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ATTENDING THE MEETING

No questions were received.

18 PLANNING APPLICATION (16/02117/FULL1) - ORCHARD LODGE, WILLIAM BOOTH ROAD, PENGE, LONDON SE20 8BX

Description of application – Demolition of existing buildings and erection of
two 4-5 storey blocks and one 5-6 storey block of flats comprising 252
residential units (84 x 1 bed, 120 x 2 bed and 48 x 3 bed including affordable
housing provision), basement car parking, landscaped podium deck, open
space, play space, associated access roads, private and communal
landscaping, cycle parking, recycling and refuse stores and associated works
including widening of existing vehicular access onto William Booth Road.

Oral representations in support of the application were received from Mr Mark
Jackson, Head of Planning at Fairview Homes.

Mr Jackson reported that the applicant had worked closely with the GLA and planning officers throughout the planning process. A public exhibition and meetings with local residents had also taken place. The number of affordable rent units to be provided met with Bromley's affordable housing policy requirements and the S106 contribution demonstrated the applicant's positive commitment to the development and the local community. Whilst parking provision had achieved the right balance, it was possible for 100% parking to be achieved. Local residents supported the scheme which would make a significant contribution to the Borough. If planning permission was granted, construction work would begin almost immediately.

In response to Member questions, Mr Jackson stated that additional parking spaces could not be provided without the loss of amenity space. It was possible that some flats would not be allocated parking spaces.

The Lighting Calculations Report included a lighting layout to provide the minimum level of light required on the site and a Secure by Design condition would be applied to ensure the correct level of lighting was used to minimise the risk of crime and promote public safety. As the development was located on MOL, a Dark Sky system would be installed to limit the extent of lighting beyond the site.

The two proposed car pool spaces would be located at the most convenient point just within the scheme. The Section 106 Agreement included free use of the pool for the first three years.

Comments from the Designing Out Crime Officer included the statement: "Unfortunately the security measures proposed are not enough for Secured by Design purposes....". Mr Jackson confirmed that meetings would take place with officers in regard to this and any issues raised would be addressed by condition should the application be granted permission.

In summing up, the Chairman considered this development would make a significant difference to the Council's housing supply target which should be taken as a material consideration. This was an appropriate development for the site and would not be out-of-character with the surrounding area. Traffic concerns relating to access had been resolved by widening of the road. The affordable housing criteria had been met. He suggested the number of parking spaces could be increased by six with little impact on amenity space leaving just six properties which could be marketed without allocated parking.

The Chairman moved that permission be granted with the proviso that parking provision be increased by six spaces (acknowledging that there would be a slight impact on the amenity area) and the remaining properties be marketed without parking facilities. Councillor Fawthrop seconded the motion.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION BE GRANTED (SUBJECT TO THE PRIOR COMPLETION OF A SECTION 106 AGREEMENT) AND ANY DIRECTION BY THE MAYOR OF LONDON** as recommended, subject to the conditions

and informatives set out in the report of the Chief Planner. The following condition was also added:-

34 Before any work is commenced, details of parking spaces and/or garages and sufficient turning space shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and such provision shall be completed before the commencement of the use of the land or building hereby permitted and shall thereafter be kept available for such use. Notwithstanding the approved plans, the submitted details shall include a total of 252 car parking spaces and details of how these will be allocated to each property. No development whether permitted by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development Order) 2015 (or any Order amending, revoking and re-enacting this Order) or not, shall be carried out on the land or garages indicated or in such a position as to preclude vehicular access to the said land or garages. Reason: In order to comply with Policy T3 of the Unitary Development Plan and to avoid development without adequate parking or garage provision, which is likely to lead to parking inconvenient to other road users and would be detrimental to amenities and prejudicial to road safety.

19 ARTICLE 4 DIRECTION - PETTS WOOD AREA OF SPECIAL RESIDENTIAL CHARACTER

Members considered whether a non-immediate Article 4 Direction should be sought to withdraw permitted development rights for alterations to the front slopes of roofs of properties in the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character.

Ward Member and Committee Member Councillor Fawthrop, commended Mr Tim Horsman, Development Control Manager, for providing an accurate and informative report. He explained that by the withdrawal of permitted development rights, householders would be required to obtain planning permission before installing roof lights.

Councillor Fawthrop moved that an Article 4 Direction be implemented with a 12 month delay. He also requested information regarding the anticipated timeframe leading up to Portfolio Holder approval. Councillor Auld seconded the motion.

RESOLVED that the Executive be requested to confirm the issue of a non-immediate Article 4 Direction withdrawing permitted development rights for front roof alterations in the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character with a 12 month delay.

**20 FIRST REPORT OF THE EDUCATION SELECT COMMITTEE
2016/17 - THE EDUCATION LANDSCAPE IN BROMLEY**

Report CSD16124

Members considered recommendations made by the Education Select Committee at its first meeting held on 25 May 2016. In particular, the Committee were requested to consider recommendation 5 (the provision of

education sites) and recommendation 6 (the use of CIL funding for education purposes).

In regard to recommendation 5, the Chairman stated that education sites were identified and put forward through the Local Plan which had yet to be finalised. As a result, he did not feel Members were currently in a position to ensure the provision of education sites could be achieved.

Councillor Bennett explained that this matter had already been considered by the Portfolio Holder for Renewal and Recreation who had confirmed that sufficient sites had been identified and given his assurance that provision would be achieved through the Local Plan.

Councillor Huntington-Thresher reported that whilst the Draft Local Plan had identified a number of sites across the Borough, further consideration should be postponed until public consultation on the Local Plan was complete.

Councillor Dean moved that Members could not support consideration of recommendation 5 for the reasons stated above. This was seconded by Councillor Buttinger.

With regard to recommendation 6, the Chairman considered it was not within the remit of DCC to determine how CIL funds should be spent. The onus was on specific Council departments to apply through Resources. The CIL would be operated through the Local Plan with funds being allocated to various community services. Therefore the Committee could not comply with the Education Select Committee's request.

The Chief Planner explained that the collection of CIL was governed by regulations and the Council was required to justify its need to charge £35 per sq m. A plan would be formalised indicating how CIL funds would be spent; it was possible that infrastructure costs may amount to more than the Council collects. The plan would be reviewed on a yearly basis. The CIL was closely linked to the draft Local Plan and would be implemented shortly after the adoption of the Local Plan in 2017.

Councillor Bennett agreed to convey Members' views back to the Education Select Committee.

The Chairman moved that it was premature to consider recommendation 6 until the operational structure of CIL had been formally approved. Councillor Fawthrop seconded the motion.

RESOLVED that:-

- 1) Members could not support consideration of recommendation 5 for the reasons stated above or at least until public consultation on the Local Plan was complete; and**

Development Control Committee
6 September 2016

- 2) Consideration could not be given to recommendation 6 until the operational structure of CIL had been formally approved.**

The meeting ended at 8.05 pm

Chairman