

## PLANS SUB-COMMITTEE NO. 3

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.00 pm on 25 April 2018

### Present:

Councillor Katy Boughey (Chairman)  
Councillors Kevin Brooks, Simon Fawthrop,  
William Huntington-Thresher, Alexa Michael, Keith Onslow and  
Tony Owen

### 24 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Douglas Auld and Charles Joel and Councillors Simon Fawthrop and Tony Owen attended as their substitutes respectively.

### 25 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest reported.

### 26 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 22 FEBRUARY 2018

**RESOLVED** that the Minutes of the meeting held on 22 February 2018 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

### 27 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

#### SECTION 1

(Applications submitted by the London Borough of Bromley)

#### 27.1 CRAY VALLEY WEST

**(18/01095/RECON) - Poverest Primary School, Tillingbourne Green, Orpington, BR5 2JD**

Description of application – Proposed variation of condition 14 of application ref: 15/05633/REG3 to allow the partial use of the building as previously permitted prior to the completion of all of the car parking spaces.

Members having considered the report and objections, **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)

**27.2  
COPERS COPE  
CONSERVATION AREA**

**(17/02754/FULL1) - 210 High Street, Beckenham, BR3 1EN**

Description of application – Installation of a new shopfront (RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION).

Members having considered the report and objections, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION be GRANTED** as recommended, subject to the condition set out in the report of the Chief Planner.

**27.3  
COPERS COPE  
CONSERVATION AREA**

**(17/5646) - 8 Chancery Lane Beckenham BR3 6NR**

Description of application – Change of use of part of ground floor premises from office (B1)/shop(A1) to form 2 bedroom dwellinghouse (Class C3) in association with existing flat at ground and first floor level.

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

The Chairman and Councillor Alexa Michael supported the application as the premises had been empty for two years without offer and the proposed development would not change the appearance of the conservation area.

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 two further conditions to read:-

“3. No external changes shall be carried to the shopfront unless previously agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In order to comply with Policy S5, S10 and BE11 of the Unitary Development Plan to provide visual interest to the front of the premises and avoid an undesirable visual break in the shopping frontage.

4. 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 buildings, structures, alterations, walls or fences of any kind 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, BE11 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.”

### **SECTION 3**

(Applications recommended for permission, approval or consent)

#### **27.4 CHISLEHURST CONSERVATION AREA**

##### **(18/00018/ADV) - Queen Mary House, Manor Park Road, Chislehurst, BR7 5PY**

Description of application - Proposed hoarding, freestanding sign boards and flags.

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

The Chairman referred to the history of the site and although she appreciated the applicant's need to advertise she said the local residents objected to the proposed visual intrusion.

Councillors Simon Fawthrop and Michael agreed with the Chairman. Their view was that the proposed hoarding, sign boards and flags were excessive and should not be permitted in a conservation area. Councillor Onslow agreed and suggested the applicant advertise through various other means available.

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

1. The proposed signs due to their size and location would be in conflict with Policy BE21 of the Unitary Development Plan and Draft Local Plan Policy 102, being out of character with the surrounding area and detrimental to the visual amenities of the street scene in this Conservation Area.

#### **27.5 SHORTLANDS**

##### **(18/00458/FULL6) - 7 Bushey Way, Beckenham, BR3 6TA**

Description of application – Loft extension to include rear dormer and rooflights.

Oral representations in support of the application were received at the meeting. A letter of support from the neighbour had been received and circulated to Members.

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 an amendment to Condition 4 to read:-  
“4. Before the development hereby permitted is first occupied the proposed window(s) in the second floor east elevation shall be obscure glazed to a minimum of Pilkington privacy Level 3 and shall be non-opening unless the parts of the window which can be opened are more than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which the window is installed and the window (s) shall subsequently be permanently retained in accordance as such.  
REASON: In the interests of the amenities of nearby residential properties and to accord with Policies BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan.”

**27.6  
PLAISTOW AND  
SUNDRIDGE**

**(18/00501/FULL1) - Garages Adjacent 19 Howard Road, Bromley, BR1 3QJ**

Description of application – Demolition of existing garage block and erection of 2 x 1bed apartments with associated parking.

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.

**27.7  
PETTS WOOD AND KNOLL**

**(18/00805/OUT) - 80 Crescent Drive, Petts Wood, Orpington, BR5 1BD**

Description of application - Erection of detached bungalow OUTLINE APPLICATION.

Oral representations in support of the application were received at the meeting. An email had been received from the agent in support of the application and circulated to Members. It was reported that on page 94 of the Chief Planner’s report the last paragraph under the heading, ‘Conclusion’ should be amended to read, “Having regard to the above it is considered that the development in the manner proposed is acceptable in that it would not impact harmfully on the character of the area. It is therefore recommended that planning permission be granted.”

Councillor Fawthrop referred to previous planning inspectors’ reports and comments. In his view the proposed development would have an impact on the

street scene, be out of character and out of keeping in the area and he objected to the application. He emphasised the potential impact on traffic and road safety in the area and referred to his and also to Councillor Owen's local knowledge.

The Chief Planner's representative advised Members the application was outline and they should only take into consideration the principle of development. He reminded Members that Highways had raised no objection and that the Council may be open to costs if the applicant appealed a decision on highway grounds.

Councillor Owen also had traffic concerns as Crescent Drive was a bus route and it was also used for parking for Petts Wood station. Councillor Michael also objected to the application and highlighted the affect it would have on the amenity of neighbours and in her opinion the proposed development was inappropriate at this location.

Councillor William Huntington-Thresher was concerned at the loss of a valuable crossover that could be used for parking and also the lack of detail regarding scale and massing.

Councillor Kevin Brooks supported the application.

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

1. The proposal would, by reason of its character, nature and principle of residential unit in this location, represent the introduction of a conspicuous and unacceptable form of development that would be out of keeping and harmful to the character, spatial standards and form, along with existing views to the rear of the site and detrimental impact to highway safety, thereby contrary to Policies BE1, H7 and T18 of the Unitary Development Plan, Policies 37, 4 and 32 of the Draft Local Plan The London Plan, and the Paragraph 53 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

**27.8  
CHISLEHURST**

**(18/00917/FULL6) - 85 Holmdale Road,  
Chislehurst, BR7 6BY**

Description of application – First floor side and single storey front extensions and part conversion of garage to habitable room.

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.

#### **SECTION 4**

(Applications recommended for refusal or disapproval of details)

#### **27.9 ORPINGTON**

#### **(18/00006/OUT)- 14 Knoll Rise, Orpington, BR6 0DD**

Description of application – Proposed outline development in respect of access, appearance, layout and scale for the demolition of 14-20 Knoll Rise and the erection of a part three, part four and part five-storey building to contain 58 flats with associate parking, access and amenity areas.

Oral representations in objection to the application were received at the meeting. It was reported that the application had been amended by documents received on 23 April 2018 and that further objections to the application had been received together with comments from Environmental Health.

Ward Member, Councillor Huntington-Thresher objected to the application on a number of aspects, scale, mass, being over-prominent and the general disturbance of privacy and outlook. He reminded Members that Vincent Close was a partial service road to Orpington High Street shops that generated noise and that daytime parking had not be taken into consideration. Also evidence of bats and reptiles had been found on the site that should be preserved.

The Chief Planner's representative referred Members to the comments from Highways in the Chief Planner's report.

Councillor Fawthrop's view was that suburban family housing was in short supply and the proposed development would be a back garden development. He respected Councillor Huntington-Thresher's local knowledge of the area and reminded Members that the local residents had previously voted for it to become an area of special residential character which had not met the requirements of the Council but nevertheless the area had character.

Councillor Owen had called in the application as the proposed development would be out of keeping in a residential area. He had highway and road safety concerns due to Post Office traffic movements in and out of Vincent Close. He also referred to the presence of underground streams in the vicinity of the Tesco site.

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

1. The development, as proposed, would result in a cramped overdevelopment of the site, out of character with, overly prominent and harmful to the visual amenities of the area and suburban character of the wider locale which this site is considered to contribute positively to as a result of its size, scale and massing contrary to Policies BE1 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan, policies 4 and 37 of the Draft Local Plan and policies 3.4 and Table 3.2, 7.4 and 7.15 of the London Plan and the Mayor's Housing SPG.
2. The proposed development fails to provide a satisfactory standard of living accommodation for future occupiers by virtue of the substandard layout of internal communal space, extent of north facing single aspect units, poor outlook from habitable rooms, transient pedestrian and vehicular movements within close proximity to amenity and habitable areas and loss of privacy as a result of the access, height and location of the raised deck area contrary to Policies BE1 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan, policies 4 and 37 of the Draft Local Plan and policies 7.4 and 7.15 of the London Plan and the Mayor's Housing SPG.
3. By virtue of the size, scale, massing and layout of external amenity areas the proposed development will result in an oppressive and harmful impact in respect of neighbouring owner/occupiers by reason of a loss of privacy and outlook and as a result of insufficient information to the contrary, would result in a harmful impact by way of noise and disturbance due to transient pedestrian and vehicular movements contrary to policy BE1 and H8 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policy 27 of the Draft Local Plan and policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan and the Mayor's Housing SPG.

4. Insufficient information has been provided as part of the application in the form of bat emergence surveys and measures to safeguard reptiles to properly assess the potential impacts of the scheme upon the protected species which, due to the demolition of existing buildings and the intensification of the site, may result in a prejudicial impact upon bats and reptiles contrary to Policies NE5 of the Unitary Development Plan, Policy 72 of the Draft Local Plan and Policy 7.19 of the London Plan.

5. The proposal, by reason of the insufficient information provided in the traffic statement, vehicular access from Vincent Close and service and delivery vehicles which use this road, loss of on-street parking bays and insufficient on-site car parking, would result in a prejudicial impact on road safety for road users and pedestrians and additional pressure on the provision of on-street car parking in the area, contrary to Policy T18 of the Unitary Development Plan and Policy 32 of the Draft Local Plan.

6. The development will result in the loss of important Sub urban family housing at this location this being an essential characteristic of the residential form of the area contrary to Policies BE1 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan, policies 4 and 37 of the Draft Local Plan 3 and 7.4 of the London Plan.

7. The development will result in the loss of important back garden at this location this being an essential characteristic of the area contrary to Policies BE1 and H7 of the Unitary Development Plan, policies 4 and 37 of the Draft Local Plan and 3.5 and 7.4 of the London Plan.

**27.10  
CLOCK HOUSE**

**(18/00200/FULL1) - 11 Wheathill Road, Penge,  
SE20 7XQ**

Description of application – Conversion of existing single dwelling into four flats (1 x 1 bed and 3 x 2 beds), single storey rear extension, rear dormer and three velux windows in the front roof slope, provision of onsite car parking, cycle parking and associated paving and landscaping.

An email had been received from the agent in support of the application and circulated to Members. It was reported that revised documents had been received on 17 April 2018.

The Chairman referred to the long history of the site and the three previous applications that had been refused and the current application at appeal. The

reason for refusal had been the principle of the loss of a family home into four flats.

Councillor Brooks' ward was adjacent to Clock House Ward and he had communicated with the Ward Members and they all objected to the application due to their local knowledge that family homes were required and should be retained.

Members having considered the report and objections, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION BE REFUSED** as recommended, for the reason set out in the report of the Chief Planner.

## **28 TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS**

### **28.1 BICKLEY**

#### **Confirmation of Tree Preservation Order 2640 at 34 Mavelstone Road, Bromley BR1 2PB**

Members having considered the report, **RESOLVED** that **Tree Preservation Order No 2640** relating to one oak tree **BE CONFIRMED WITHOUT MODIFICATION**, as recommended, in the report of the Chief Planner.

The meeting ended at 8.10 pm

Chairman