

PLANS SUB-COMMITTEE NO. 4

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.00 pm on 30 March 2017

Present:

Councillor Richard Scoates (Chairman)

Councillors Kathy Bance MBE, Lydia Buttinger, Simon Fawthrop, Kate Lymer, Russell Mellor, Melanie Stevens and Michael Turner

Also Present:

Councillors Neil Reddin FCCA

22 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Peter Dean.

An apology for lateness was received from Councillor Russell Mellor.

23 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were received.

24 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 2 FEBRUARY 2017

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 2 February 2017 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

25 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

SECTION 1

(Applications submitted by the London Borough of Bromley)

25.1 BROMLEY TOWN

(16/05346/FULL1) - Car Park, South Street, Bromley

Description of application – Erection of a new substation.

Members having considered the report and objections, **RESOLVED that the application be DEFERRED** without prejudice to any future consideration, to seek re-location of the substation (preferably inside the building).

SECTION 2

(Applications meriting special consideration)

**25.2
HAYES AND CONEY HALL**

**(17/00382/FULL1) - 55 Kechill Gardens, Bromley
BR2 7NB**

Description of application – Proposed 2 storey three bedroom end of terrace dwellinghouse (attached to No. 55).

Oral representations from Ward Member, Councillor Neil Reddin, in objection to the application were received at the meeting.

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

1 The proposal, by reason of the subdivision of the plot would result in an overdevelopment of the site, out of character with the area contrary to Policies BE1 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006), chapter 7 of the London Plan (2016) and the aims and objectives of the NPPF (2012).

**25.3
CHISLEHURST
CONSERVATION AREA**

**(17/00555/FULL1) - 18 Greatwood, Chislehurst
BR7 5HU**

THIS REPORT WAS WITHDRAWN BY THE CHIEF PLANNER.

SECTION 3

(Applications recommended for permission, approval or consent)

**25.4
COPERS COPE
CONSERVATION AREA**

**(16/05699/FULL1) - Methodist Church, Bromley
Road, Beckenham BR3 5JE**

Description of application – Demolition of existing single storey scout huts and erection of part one/two storey front/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 with the addition of a further condition to read:-

6 The part one/two storey front/side extension hereby permitted shall only be used for purposes incidental to the lawful use of the Methodist Church, Bromley Road, Beckenham and for no other purpose.

Reason: In order to comply with Policies BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006) and in the interests of the residential amenities of the area.

**25.5
BICKLEY**

**(16/05857/FULL1) - 17 Park Farm Road,
Bromley BR1 2PE**

Description of application – Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of a two storey 6 bedroom dwelling with accommodation in the roofspace.

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

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

- 1 The proposed development constitutes an overdevelopment of the site by virtue of its size, siting and bulk on this exposed corner location and would be harmful to the visual amenities of the streetscene and character of the area, contrary to Policies H7 and BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006).
- 2 The development is considered to cause an unacceptable impact upon the neighbouring residential amenity in terms of outlook, prospect and loss of light by virtue of the extent of the rear projection and increased height of the dwelling contrary to Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006).

**25.6
BICKLEY**

**(16/05859/FULL1) - 45 Southlands Grove,
Bromley BR1 2DA**

Description of application – Sub-division of four bedroom dwelling into 1 x 2 bedroom dwelling and 1 x 3 bedroom dwelling and elevational alterations.

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

Further objections to the application received from Mr Simon Downing, Director of Holmedene Court Management Ltd, were circulated to Members.

The Development Control Manager advised that an enforcement action investigation in regard to parking was currently taking place but would have no impact on the outcome of this application. If Members were minded to grant permission, parking issues could be controlled by the addition of a parking condition.

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

1 The proposal, by reason of the subdivision of the plot would be out of character with the area and result in an overintensive use of the site contrary to Policies BE1 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006), chapter 7 of the London Plan (2016) and the aims and objectives of the NPPF (2012).

2 The proposed development would be lacking in on-site car parking provision to accord with the Council's standards and is therefore contrary to Policy T3 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006).

**25.7
WEST WICKHAM**

(17/00088/FULL6) - 90 Hayes Chase, West Wickham BR4 0JA

Description of application – Part one/two storey front/side and part one/two storey rear extensions and elevational alterations.

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

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 the addition of a further condition to read:-

5 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 Classes A and B of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the 2015 Order (as amended), shall be erected or made within the curtilage(s) of the dwelling(s) hereby permitted without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interest of the amenities of nearby residential properties and to prevent an overdevelopment of the site and to accord with Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006).

**25.8
PETTS WOOD AND KNOLL**

(17/00103/FULL6) - 5 Maybury Close, Petts Wood, Orpington BR5 1BL

Description amended to read: – 'Conversion of integral garage to habitable space including elevational alterations.'

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.

**25.9
BICKLEY**

**(17/00208/FULL1) - 16 Orchard Road,
Bromley BR1 2PS**

Description of application – Sub-division of property into two 4 bedroom houses, single storey rear extensions, two storey front extension, elevational alterations and associated hardstandings and landscaping.

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

Committee Member and Ward Member, Councillor Lymer, reported that Orchard Road had a variety of Arts and Crafts style houses and it was important to preserve and protect the established character of the area. A full copy of Councillor Lymer's representations is attached as an Annex to these Minutes.

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

1 The proposed development, due to the poor design of the two storey front extension including its height and scale, would result in an incongruous addition to the principal elevation and together with the proposed alterations to the front elevation of the property and the removal of the original chimney would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host Arts and Crafts building, harmful to the character of the area and street scene generally contrary to Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006).

**25.10
KELSEY AND EDEN PARK**

**(17/00277/FULL6) - 5 Forest Ridge,
Beckenham BR3 3NH**

Description of application – First floor side extension, roof alterations to incorporate rooflights to rear, elevational alterations.

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

1 The proposal does not comply with the Council's requirement for a minimum 1 metre side space to be maintained to the flank boundary in respect of a two-storey development in the absence of which the extension would constitute a cramped form of development, out of character with the street scene,

conducive to a retrograde lowering of the spatial standards to which the area is at present developed and contrary to Policy H9 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006).

**25.11
CHISLEHURST**

**(17/00477/FULL1) - Hillcroft, Southill Road,
Chislehurst BR7 5EE**

Description of application – Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of detached two storey building with accommodation in roof space comprising 4 two bedroom flats with associated car parking and landscaping.

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

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 of the Chief Planner.

The meeting ended at 7.45 pm

Chairman

ITEM 4.9 – 16 ORCHARD ROAD, BROMLEY

REPRESENTATIONS IN OBJECTION TO THE APPLICATION RECEIVED FROM COMMITTEE MEMBER AND WARD MEMBER, COUNCILLOR KATE LYMER

I find this whole report incredibly disappointing. Our planning department are supposed to be bastions of preserving our borough's architectural history and culture however, in recommending this application for permission they have completely failed in their duty.

Whilst acknowledging that this application is preferable to the previously refused block of flats and whilst the concept of splitting the house into two is acceptable, the plans submitted are not.

Orchard Road has a variety of Arts and Crafts style houses and the retention of this Arts and Crafts property is important to protect and preserve the established character of the area.

Architecturally the applicant has missed the point of Arts and Crafts design.

In attempting to impose elements of symmetry with the front centre extension to their design, they are actually creating a monster. Arts and Crafts houses should never be symmetrical. Their asymmetric design is one of the key principles of the design movement.

The planning report concurs that the addition of a further front gable and the first floor and second front extensions above the new entrance would add bulk but the planner considers that the design would be acceptable. The duplication of this front centre entrance and extension is not only unacceptable because of its symmetry but also because of its bulk. Two stone entrance porticos with columns and a pitched timbered gable positioned immediately side by side, would appear over dominant and visually imbalanced to the host building and again, this would be alien to the arts and craft style.

This front centre extension and entrance is reason enough for refusal but I must go on.

It is quite clear from the configuration at first and second floor levels that it is intended to install an extension of the staircase through the attic storeroom to form fifth bedrooms.

Furthermore the cavity brickwork will not match the solid brickwork unless Flemish bonding is used and bricks are carefully matched. Materials matter in the Arts and Crafts style and using traditional bonding and sympathetic brick work is essential. It is also highly unlikely that the window and door shaped brick arch and apron detailing will be faithfully replicated. It would be impractical with modern techniques and materials to do this and even if this was achieved, the existence of a duplicated door is inconsistent with the Arts and Crafts style.

Lastly, looking at both the internal and external plans, there is no apparent need to lose the two attractive chimney stacks, so to remove them would be historical architectural vandalism.

It is perfectly possible to convert this house into two without the 3 storey extension and duplicated entrance in the front which, disturbingly, ignores or misinterprets the principles of Arts and Crafts design.

It is fundamentally important to fight for the protection of our Arts and Crafts housing stock and therefore I propose refusal.