

PLANS SUB-COMMITTEE NO. 2

Minutes of the meeting held at 6.00 pm on 15 October 2020

Present:

Councillor Peter Dean (Chairman)
Councillor Michael Turner (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Mark Brock, Nicky Dykes, Simon Fawthrop,
Colin Hitchins, Josh King, Neil Reddin FCCA and
Richard Scoates

Also Present:

Councillors Vanessa Allen, Christine Harris and Kate Lymer

5 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

All Members were present.

6 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

In regard to Item 4.3, Councillor Dean declared he knew the owner of No. 96 Wickham Road however, he had cleared this with the legal team who advised he did not have an interest in this matter.

7 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 20 AUGUST 2020

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 20 August 2020 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

8 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

8.1 CLOCK HOUSE (20/01037/FULL6) - 6 Queens Road, Beckenham, BR3 4JW

Description of application – Single storey rear extension (RETROSPECTIVE).

Oral representations in objection to and in support of the application were received. Oral representations from Ward Member, Councillor Vanessa Allen, in support of the application were received at the meeting.

It was reported that on page 25, of the Assistant Director (Planning and Building Control) report, paragraph 6.4.2 was amended to read:

“The neighbouring objections are noted. The neighbour has provided a sunlight report claiming that compared to the approved 3m-high extension, the proposal would result in the centre of the rear sitting room window receiving no sunlight for 6 months in autumn and winter, failing to meet the minimum requirement set out in BS 8206-2. The Building Research Establishment (BRE) guidance states that when assessing the potential loss of sunlight/ daylight impact, there are three measures of diffuse daylight (vertical sky component; average daylight factor; and, no-sky line), and one measure of sunlight. In this case, the neighbours only provide the sunlight assessment for the living room windows. The objectors’ submission on sunlight impact has been acknowledged. However, sunlight and daylight impacts should be assessed together, rather than in isolation. It is considered that this sunlight assessment is insufficient to outweigh the officer’s recommendation”.

It was also reported that additional comments had been received.

Members having considered the report, objection and representations, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION be GRANTED** as recommended, subject to the condition set out in the report of the Assistant Director, (Planning and Building Control).

8.2 BICKLEY

(19/05362/FULL1) - 9 Brookmead Avenue, Bickley, Bromley, BR1 2JX.

Description of application – Demolition of garage and construction of new detached 4 person 3 bedroom two storey dwelling with parking and bin stores and retention of adjacent existing house with loft conversion incorporating pitched roof extension, side dormer and rooflights, elevational alterations and new front porch demolition of pedestrian link and subdivision of the site curtilage.

Oral representations in objection to and 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 condition set out in the report of the Assistant Director, (Planning and Building Control) with an amendment to Condition 8 and three further conditions to read:-

“8. Before the development hereby permitted is first occupied the proposed window(s) in the first and second storey flank elevations shall be obscure glazed to a minimum of Pilkington privacy Level 3 and left-hand hinge opening (as looking from The Fairway). The window (s) shall subsequently be permanently retained as such.

REASON: In the interests of protecting residential amenity in accordance with Policy 37 of the Bromley Local Plan.

13. Notwithstanding condition 5, before the development hereby permitted is first occupied a 2.6m high close boarded feather-edged side gate/fence shall be installed between the proposed dwelling and western side boundary with The Fairway and shall be permanently retained as such.

REASON: In the interests of protecting residential amenity in accordance with Policy 37 of the Bromley Local Plan.

14. Notwithstanding the provisions of Class L of Part 3 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order amending, revoking and re-enacting this Order), no change of use of a building from a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouses) of the Schedule to the Use Classes Order, to a use falling within Class C4 (houses in multiple occupation) of that Schedule or vice versa shall be provided within the curtilage of the dwelling(s) without the prior approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In order to comply with Policies 3, 4 and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan and in the interest of the visual and residential amenities of the area.

15. Prior to the commencement of above ground works, details of green technologies to be used in the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be completed in complete accordance with the approved details and shall be permanently retained as such thereafter.

REASON: Details are required prior to the commencement of development in order to limit carbon dioxide emissions, to ensure a sustainable design and construction can be achieved and to comply with policy 123 of the Bromley Local Plan.”

8.3
KELSEY AND EDEN PARK

**(20/02339/FULL1) - 94a Wickham Road,
Beckenham, BR3 6QH**

Description of application - Sub-division of the existing duplex apartment into 2 x two bedroom flats and the construction of a rear, second floor dormer extension.

Oral representations from Ward Member, Councillor Christine Harris, in objection to the application were received at the meeting. She referred to application reference 20/00732/FULL1 permitted on 2 June 2020 and, at the time, she had considered that application to be an overdevelopment and she had not approved of the reduction from four to two parking spaces. The current application was for two parking spaces, for use of the apartment and businesses, which would lead to less parking for residents and customers that would cause congestion and affect the turning point for deliveries. The application made no provision for a refuse area or cycle spaces. She was also concerned that the juliette balcony would affect the neighbouring business with the loss of privacy and daylight and she objected to the application.

The Assistant Director (Planning and Building Control) representative advised Members that permission had previously been granted for the erection of a single storey rear extension and stairs to the rear elevation, and it was shown on the current drawings and incorporated in the heading of the application. He also advised that Highways Division had not objected to the application and that the applicant had confirmed that the flat roof extension granted in June 2020 was not for café use.

The Chairman appreciated the local knowledge of Councillor Harris and he referred to the limited parking along the parade of shops and agreed that the parking allocation was inadequate.

Councillor Simon Fawthrop was familiar with the site and, whilst he had supported the previous application, his view was that this was an over intensification of the site.

Councillor Colin Hitchens used the local shops frequently and he objected to the lack of parking.

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

REASON: The proposed development, by reason of the extensions and subdivision of the existing duplex apartment and the proposed parking arrangement would result in an over-intensification of use, an overdevelopment of the application site and lack of parking provision for the commercial and residential uses. This is contrary to policies 4, 6, 30 and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan.

**8.4
BICKLEY**

(20/00495/FULL1) - Ellesmere Lodge, 34 Sundridge Avenue, Bromley, BR1 2QD

Description of application – Demolition of existing house and erection of part two/part three/part four storey building comprising 5 x two bedroom and 2 x one bedroom flats with 7 parking spaces, cycle storage and refuse storage.

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.

Councillor Lymer referred to the history of the site, the application permitted on appeal (18/01062/FULL1), the impact on surrounding residents and to the many objections from local residents who had been dismayed at the appeal decision. She also referred to the design and access statement with regard to two additional bedrooms at the new third floor level that would overlook the 'Blanding' site to its left, and also number 36 Sundridge Avenue to the rear, with the possible loss of mature vegetation. Although the Inspector had suggested that the rear balconies would not adversely affect the amenity of housing on Mavelstone Road, the additional proposed balcony at an additional floor level would do so. It would overlook numbers 34, 36 and 38 Mavelstone Road and significantly detract from their amenity and privacy. A four storey development immediately adjacent to the highway in place of a chalet bungalow style building, which was former Gatehouse from the late nineteenth century, would be out of keeping with the character of the vicinity and detrimental to the street scene. Sundridge Avenue was a busy primary distributor road and the application site was located on the bend in the road. The application was for one parking space per flat with no allowance for visitor or delivery parking without blocking access to the ground floor garage. The front forecourt was too shallow to allow turning

therefore vehicles would have to reverse into the busy fast moving road, causing a significant traffic hazard. There was also a cycle lane in front of the property.

Councillor Lymer's view was that the proposed development was

- an incongruous cramped overdevelopment due to its increased height and bulk in roof floor, its refigured garage level with inadequate space for refuse, cycles, disabled spaces and electronic points, its inadequately small forecourt for a development this large,
- out of character and detrimental to the street scene due, to its inconsistency with the roof ridgeline in the road, its largeness far closer to the road than its neighbours, the density of the development and its overall bulky appearance,
- detrimental to the amenity of the neighbouring residents in terms of increased overlooking and lack of privacy to all neighbouring properties due to the extra floor with additional windows and balcony and
- inadequate parking and road safety concerns based on local knowledge.

The Chairman also referred to the permitted appeal decision and agreed the proposed development would be out of character and a significant loss of amenity to neighbouring properties and his view was that highways/safety issues had not been addressed and the provision for parking was inadequate and he objected to the application.

The Assistant Director (Planning and Building Control) representative reminded Members to determine the application on its merits and, if they were to refuse the application and it were to be appealed, the Council may be liable for costs as the Planning Inspector had found the parking provision acceptable.

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

"1. The proposed development, by reason of its increased height and bulk in the roof, would result in a cramped overdevelopment of the site that appears at odds with surrounding buildings and out of keeping with the character of the area and the appearance of the street scene. This is contrary to policies 4 and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan.

2. The proposed development, by reason of the increased height, the creation of an additional unit in the roof space and the addition of roof windows, would result increased overlooking, a loss of privacy and would be detrimental to the visual amenities of nearby neighbours. This is contrary to policy 37 of the Bromley Local Plan.

3. The proposed development would result in an intensification of use of an inadequate vehicle access, inadequate parking provision (including electric charging points) and space for manoeuvring and would provide insufficient space to access the cycle and refuse stores. This is contrary to policies 30 and 32 of the Bromley Local Plan.”

9. TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS

9.1 BICKLEY CONSERVATION AREA

Confirmation of TPO 2693 at Land at The Beechins and 2 Wells Road, Bromley BR1 2AJ

Description of application – Confirmation of Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 2693.

Members having considered the report and objection, **RESOLVED that TREE PRESERVATION ORDER NO 2693** relating to all trees within the grounds of 2 Wells Road and The Beechins, Wells Road, **BE CONFIRMED WITHOUT MODIFICATION**, as recommended in the report of the Assistant Director, (Planning and Building Control).

9.2 SHORTLANDS

Confirmation of TPO 2695 at 15 Den Close, Beckenham, BR3 6RP

Description of application - Confirmation of Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 2695.

Oral representations in objection to the tree preservation order being made were received at the meeting.

The following correspondence had been received and circulated to Members:-

- a letter dated 3 July 2020 addressed to the Planning Department from the occupiers of number 17 Den Road.
- an email with an attached objection dated 14 October 2020 from a resident of Den Road.

- emails dated 13 and 14 July 2020 from the occupier with a petition attached to the latter signed by local residents.

Members having considered the report and objections, **RESOLVED that TREE PRESERVATION ORDER NO 2695** relating to an Oak tree within the front garden of 15 Den Close **BE CONFIRMED WITHOUT MODIFICATION**, as recommended in the report of the Assistant Director, (Planning and Building Control).

**9.3
PETTS WOOD AND KNOLL**

(20/02734/PLUD) - 39 Silverdale Road, Petts Wood, Orpington, BR5 1NH

Description of application – Hip to gable loft conversion with rear dormer and window to gable end elevation (Proposed Lawful Development Certificate).

Members having considered the report and objection, **RESOLVED that a CERTIFICATE OF LAWFUL DEVELOPMENT be GRANTED** as recommended, as set out in the report of the Assistant Director, (Planning and Building Control).

The meeting ended at 7.40 pm

Chairman