

## **PLANS SUB-COMMITTEE NO. 1**

Minutes of the virtual meeting held at 6.00 pm on 8 April 2021

### **Present:**

Councillor Alexa Michael (Chairman)  
Councillor Angela Page (Vice-Chairman)  
Councillors Kathy Bance MBE, Katy Boughey, Kira Gabbert,  
Christine Harris, Tony Owen, Will Rowlands and Suraj Sharma

### **Also Present:**

Councillors Kate Lymer and Angela Wilkins

## **23 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS**

There were no apologies for absence

## **24 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

## **25 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 4 FEBRUARY 2021**

Councillor Harris referred to section 22.5 of the minutes relating to the meeting on 4<sup>th</sup> February 2021. This was the section relating to an application with respect to Land and Garages adjacent to Warwick Court, Park Hill Road, Shortlands. The minute stated that Councillor Harris and Councillor Stephen Wells had visited the site and that they objected to the application. Cllr Harris said that this was not correct, but rather they felt that the application should be accepted. It was agreed that this be noted and the minutes adjusted accordingly.

**RESOLVED that subject to the amendment noted above, the minutes be agreed as a correct record.**

## **26 PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

**26.1 (20/02021/TPO) - 70 Maberley Road, Anerley, London, SE19 2JD**  
**CRYSTAL PALACE**

Description of application—proposed felling of an oak tree in connection with a subsidence investigation at 70 Maberley Road.

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

Oral representations in objection from a visiting ward member were also received at the meeting.

Comments from the Tree Officer were received.

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

Oral representations from Ward Councillor Angela Wilkins in objection to the application were received. Councillor Wilkins stated that she shared the concern of local residents that this was a tree that was 160 years old, and that the only reason that the application was being made, was by insurers for financial reasons. She reminded Members that this tree was the beneficiary of a tree preservation order that had been granted by the Council. If Members agreed to fell the tree, then they would be going against their previous decision to save the tree. She felt that the report was imbalanced and did not refer to the possibility of legal challenge. She asked that the application be refused, or at the least, be deferred, and that the Council should stick by its previous decision to save the tree that was made in 2019.

Councillor Harris suggested that the application be deferred to allow time for an independent assessment of costs to occur.

Councillor Bance supported the refusal of the application, noting that the tree bordered a conservation area, and provided relief to local residents from noise and pollution.

Councillor Boughey was in favour of deferring the application to seek an independent assessment of costs.

Councillor Bance moved that the application be refused, and this was seconded by Councillor Tony Owen.

**RESOLVED that the application for Tree Works be refused for the following reason:**

**1. The application negates the objectives of the TPO and conflicts with Policies 73 and 74 of the Bromley Local Plan (adopted January 2019) and Policy G7 of the London Plan (adopted March 2021).**

**26.2  
PETTS WOOD AND KNOLL**

**(20/04607/FULL6) - 150 Kingsway, Petts Wood,  
Orpington, BR5 1PU**

Description of application—the demolition of an existing conservatory and replacement with a two storey front/side extension and single storey side/rear extension and elevational alterations.

This application had been looked at previously at the Plans 3 Sub-Committee meeting on 4<sup>th</sup> March. The application had been deferred and so the applicant had contested the non-determination with the Planning Inspectorate. The Committee had to decide whether or not to contest the appeal.

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

The Committee noted the written submissions in objection that had also been received.

Councillor Owen stated that the application should be rejected on the grounds of being harmful to the amenity and as an over-development.

Councillor Harris felt that the proposal was beneficial to the amenity and was not an over-development.

It was moved by Councillor Owen that the appeal be contested, and this was seconded by the Vice Chairman.

**RESOLVED to contest the appeal for the following reason:**

1. The proposed development by reason of its design, scale and proximity to the site boundary would result in a cramped overdevelopment of the site, harmful to the character and appearance of the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character, and would have a detrimental impact on the amenities of the neighbouring property at No. 16 Towncourt Crescent by way of loss of light, contrary to Policies 6, 8, 37 and 44 of the Bromley Local Plan.

**26.3  
BICKLEY**

**(20/04614/FULL1) - Foxhollow, Merlewood Drive,  
Chislehurst, BR7 5LQ**

Description of application—Demolition of outbuildings and erection of a detached two storey/five bedroom dwelling on land to the rear of Foxhollow with associated car parking and amenity space.

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

The Committee noted the written submissions that had been received Objecting to the application.

Oral representations from Ward Member Councillor Kate Lymer in objection to the application were received at the meeting. She reminded the Committee that the application had been refused previously, and that nothing much had changed since the previous refusal. She described the development as looming over local residents from a great height if approval was granted. She referred to the comments made previously by a planning inspector who described the development as an oppressive presence. She said that there would be a loss of light and privacy for local residents and that the suggested tweaks in the application were not sufficient to warrant permission. In her view the application was an over-development.

Councillor Gabbert agreed with Councillor Lymer and urged refusal.

Councillor Sharma also agreed that the application should be refused.

Councillor Harris said that in her view the application was a very clever use of land and supported the granting of permission for the development. Councillor Bance agreed with the view of Councillor Harris.

The Head of Development Management for Regeneration and Transformation informed Members that the issue of 'over-development' was not something that was included in the reasons for the previous refusal.

Councillor Boughey stated that she thought the application was a clever design, and that permission should be granted.

**RESOLVED that the application be refused for the following reason:**

1. The proposed development would, by reason of its size, height and close proximity to neighbouring properties in Oakhurst Close, have a detrimental impact on the amenities of the neighbouring properties through loss of light, outlook and privacy, thereby contrary to Policy 37 of the Bromley Local Plan.

**26.4  
BICKLEY**

**(20/04648/PLUD) - Flat 3, 20 Orchard Road,  
Bromley, BR1 2PS**

Description of Application: The proposed change of use of flat (use class C3) to HMO (use class C4) for 3 - 5 persons and minor internal works. **LAWFUL DEVELOPMENT CERTIFICATE (PROPOSED)**

Councillor Gabbert had called in this application because she was concerned with issues relating to parking, highways and disposal of rubbish.

Councillor Owen expressed the view that the parking issues needed to be clarified, and so the Committee should consider a deferral of the application.

Members were briefed by the Head of Development Management for Regeneration and Transformation that Highways comments were not needed with respect to an application for a certificate of lawfulness, and so the issues relating to parking were not relevant.

Councillor Harris stated that that HMO was well maintained and would provide much needed accommodation. She motioned that the certificate should be granted.

Councillor Boughey said that the application ticked all the boxes for the granting of the certificate and she seconded the motion to grant the certificate.

**1. RESOLVED that the Lawful Development Certificate be granted for the reasons set out in the report.**

**26.5  
PETTS WOOD AND KNOLL**

**(20/05062/FULL1) - 94 Towncourt Lane, Petts  
Wood, Orpington, BR5 1EJ**

Description of application—Erection of a two storey detached dwelling and a pair of semi-detached houses.

Oral representations in support of the application were received by the Committee.

Councillor Owen objected to the application and proposed that permission be refused.

Councillor Harris stated that she had visited the property, and that in her view it was the least attractive property in the road and was in dire need of renovation. She expressed the view that Members should support the officer recommendations for permission and that it would add two much needed family homes.

Councillor Boughey said that she did not feel that there would be any conflict with the character of the road or the area, and that the application should be permitted.

Councillor Gabbert was in favour of refusing the application.

Councillor Harris motioned that the application be permitted and this was seconded by Councillor Boughey.

**RESOLVED that permission is granted, subject to the conditions outlined in the report and amendments to Condition 13 as follows:**

13. An acoustic assessment shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing prior to commencement of the development. A scheme of mitigation, as necessary in light of the results of the assessment, (covering façade, glazing and ventilation specifications) shall achieve levels not exceeding 30dB LAeq (night) and 45dB LAm<sub>ax</sub> (measured with F time weighting) for bedrooms, 35dB LAeq (day) for other habitable rooms, with window shut and other means of ventilation provided. Once approved the mitigation shall be installed fully in accordance with the approved scheme and permanently maintained thereafter.

Reason: In order to comply with Policy 37 of the Bromley Local Plan and to ensure a satisfactory standard of residential amenity.

The meeting ended at 7.15 pm

Chairman

This page is left intentionally blank