

PLANS SUB-COMMITTEE NO. 4

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.00 pm on 27 May 2021

Present:

Councillor Richard Scoates (Chairman)
Councillor Colin Hitchins (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Gareth Allatt, Aisha Cuthbert, Ian Dunn,
Kate Lymer, Keith Onslow, Kieran Terry and Michael Turner

Also Present:

Councillors Peter Dean and Simon Fawthrop

9 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Neil Reddin; Councillor Keith Onslow attended as substitute.

10 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were received.

11 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 18 MARCH 2021

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 18 March 2021 be confirmed and signed as a correct record.

12 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

12.1 MOTTINGHAM AND CHISLEHURST NORTH

(19/01865/FULL1) - Eltham College, Grove Park Road, Mottingham, London SE9 4QF

Description of application – New astro turf hockey pitch, hockey training area and associated floodlighting.

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 informative set out in the report of the Assistant Director, Planning.

**12.2
CRYSTAL PALACE**

**(20/01236/FULL1) - 94 Crystal Palace Park Road,
Sydenham SE26 6UP**

Description of application – Construction of a four storey side extension including undercroft to create 2 self-contained flats.

It was reported that a letter from applicant's agent had been received and circulated to Members. It was also reported that there were no permitted development rights for blocks of flats.

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 Assistant Director, Planning.

**12.3
DARWIN**

**(20/03545/FULL1) - Land Adjacent Bramlyns,
Cudham Lane North, Cudham, Sevenoaks**

Description of application – Installation of crossover to provide vehicular access with access gate.

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 Assistant Director, Planning with condition 4 amended to read:-

'4 (i) Details of replacement planting of native hedgerow adjacent to the vehicular access shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to **the first use** of the vehicular accessway. The replacement hedgerow planting shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details **in the first planting season following the approval of said details.**

(ii) Any hedgerow planting that is found to be dead, dying, severely damaged or diseased within five years of the completion of the building works OR five years of the carrying out of the landscaping scheme (whichever is the later), shall be replaced in the next planting season by specimens of similar size and species.'

**12.4
CHISLEHURST
CONSERVATION AREA**

**(20/04094/FULL6) - Cameron, Mead Road,
Chislehurst BR7 6AD**

Description of application – Summerhouse enclosure to the rear.

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 Assistant Director, Planning with the addition of two further conditions to read:-

4. No windows or doors shall at any time be inserted into the rear elevation of the summerhouse enclosure hereby permitted.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of nearby residential properties and to accord with Policy 37 of the Bromley Local Plan.

5. The summerhouse hereby permitted shall only be used for purposes incidental to the residential use of Cameron Mead Road and for no other purpose (either as a separate residential unit or separate commercial/business use).

Reason: In order to comply with Policy 37 of the Bromley Local Plan and in the interests of the residential amenities of the area.

**12.5
PETTS WOOD AND KNOLL**

**(20/05155/FULL6) - 63 Kingsway, Petts Wood,
Orpington BR5 1PN**

Description of application – Erection of part single storey/part two storey side and rear extensions in connection with loft conversion.

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

Oral representations from visiting Ward Member Councillor Simon Fawthrop in objection to the application were received at the meeting. He urged Members to refuse the application on the grounds of over-development. Councillor Fawthrop's comments can be viewed as Annex A to these Minutes.

It was reported that further objections from the Petts Wood & District Residents' Association had been received and circulated to Members.

Committee Member and Ward Member Councillor Onslow advised that all three Ward Members were in favour of refusing the application. The proposals would result in an over-development of the site and be out-of-keeping with the surrounding area. As the road dropped down, properties on the opposite side were likely to experience loss of light. The proposals were contrary to the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character.

Councillor Terry supported refusal stating that the Petts Wood and District Residents' Association had raised valid points.

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

1 The proposed development, by reason of its depth, scale and bulk would result in an overdevelopment of the site, harmful to the character and appearance of the Petts Wood Area of Special Residential Character within which it lies, and thereby contrary to Policies 6, 37 and 44 of the Bromley Local Plan.

12.6 SHORTLANDS

(21/00125/TPO) - 45 Broadoaks Way, Bromley BR2 OUA

Description of application – T1 Oak - Remove.

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

Committee Member and Ward Member Councillor Cuthbert referred to the historic importance of the oak trees in the locality. Tree Protection Orders should be taken seriously and allowing this tree to be felled would set a precedent for future applications.

The Chairman acknowledged that the foundations of the extension to the property were inadequate.

Councillor Onslow considered that the insurance company should have taken steps to prevent further damage by inserting a root barrier.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that the application to remove one oak tree BE REFUSED** as recommended, for the reason and informatives set out in the report of the Assistant Director, Planning.

**12.7
CHISLEHURST**

(21/00126/TPO) - Amenity Land And Footpaths At Barham Road And Fronting Red Hill, Barham Road, Chislehurst

Description of application – T3 Oak - Remove.

In response to questions from Councillor Terry, the Principal Tree Officer reported that:-

- insufficient data/information was available to assess the cost value of the tree;
- the application referred to the tree furthest away from the property; and
- an informative included in the recommendations encouraged the agent to undertake an appraisal of a root barrier which should be included in any further submission; and
- in future, if concerns were raised in relation to subsidence issues with close neighbouring properties, this would be assessed and if proven, a new application could be submitted.

Members having considered the report, **RESOLVED that the application to remove one oak tree be REFUSED** as recommended, for the reason and informatives set out in the report of the Assistant Director, Planning.

**12.8
KELSEY AND EDEN PARK**

(21/00271/FULL6) - 42 Bucknall Way, Beckenham BR3 3XN

Description of application – Loft conversion incorporating dormers to the rear and front and rooflights to the sides, enlargement of the rear ground floor bay window and partial conversion of the garage.

Members having considered the report, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION BE GRANTED** as recommended, subject to the conditions set out in the report of the Assistant Director, Planning.

**12.9
DARWIN**

**(21/00480/FULL1) - 19 Edward Road, Biggin Hill
TN16 3HN**

Description of application – Demolition of existing bungalow and construction of a detached two storey 4 bedroom house and a detached 3 bedroom bungalow. Additional dropped kerb and driveway.

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 Assistant Director, Planning.

**12.10
KELSEY AND EDEN PARK**

**(21/00548/FULL1) - 26 Manor Road, Beckenham
BR3 5LE**

Description of application – Elevational alterations and second/third floor upward extension to existing building incorporating mansard roof and front and rear dormers, excavation of basement and lightwells and construction of four storey rear extension. Conversion of resultant building into 5 no. residential flats (3 no. two bedroom and 2 no. 1 bedroom) with balconies/terraces at first, second and third floor. Formation of surface car parking spaces at rear, provision of rear cycle and refuse storage and 2 no. electric car charging points at front.

Oral representations from visiting Ward Member Councillor Peter Dean in support of the application were received at the meeting. Councillor Dean considered that this large building (the bulk of which was towards the rear), would not be visible from the road and would be no higher than the neighbouring property. The five flats were a welcome addition to the Council's five year land supply. The back garden would be well screened and there would be no loss of privacy, no overlooking, no loss of light or loss of amenity to neighbouring properties. He reported that the developer had agreed to increase the width of the alleyway to improve vehicular access.

The Chairman considered the application to be very bulky and ugly and would stand out within the street scene. Councillor Dunn agreed stating the development would be out-of-character with the surrounding area.

Councillor Terry sought deferral of the application to seek a reduction in bulk and design improvements to fit in with the surrounding area.

Members having considered the report and objections, **RESOLVED that the application be DEFERRED** without prejudice to any future consideration to seek a reduction in bulk and a design which is more in character with the streetscene.

**12.11
BROMLEY COMMON AND
KESTON**

**(21/00857/FULL6) - 128 Jackson Road, Bromley
BR2 8NX**

Description of application – Conversion of existing side garage into habitable accommodation, construction of a single storey glazed link between the house and garage, side roof dormer, elevational alterations including new windows, construction of front porch and renewal of roof coverings. (Revised scheme to approved application DC/20/01687/FULL6 to allow for new main house roof (revised application following refusal of application 20/04217/FULL6).

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

The Chairman reported comments received from Ward Member Councillor Michael who supported refusal of the application.

The Development Management Area Team Leader (West) informed Members that a further letter of support had been received and circulated to Members.

Members having considered the report and representations, **RESOLVED that PERMISSION BE GRANTED** as recommended, subject to the conditions set out in the report and of the Assistant Director, Planning.

**12.12
PETTS WOOD AND KNOLL**

**(21/00910/PLUD) - 25 Woodland Way, Petts Wood,
Orpington BR5 1NB**

Description of application – Conversion of existing roof space to a habitable room including formation of a gable end with enlarged side window and rear dormer (LAWFUL DEVELOPMENT CERTIFICATE PROPOSED)

Oral representations in support of the application were received. Oral representations from visiting Ward Member Councillor Simon Fawthrop were also received. Councillor Fawthrop had called in the application to urge Members for a deferral to seek revised proposals for a half hip roof extension.

The Chairman reported that the applicant had already refused a request for a half hip roof extension. The proposals fell within permitted development rights and the criteria for this had been met.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that A CERTIFICATE OF LAWFUL DEVELOPMENT BE GRANTED** as recommended, for the reason set out in the report of the Assistant Director, Planning.

**12.13
PLAISTOW AND
SUNDRIDGE**

**(21/00936/FULL1) - 7 New Street Hill, Bromley
BR1 5AU**

Description of application – Erection of an attached two storey three bedroom house with associated parking and new for vehicular access for No. 7.

It was reported that a further letter in objection to the application had been received and circulated to Members.

Councillor Allatt strongly opposed the character and symmetry of the development. Councillor Turner agreed adding that the area consisted of large detached and semi-detached properties. The terracing effect of the proposals would be contrary to the design of the estate. This would result in an over-development of the site and be out-of-character with the surrounding area.

Members having considered the report and objections, **RESOLVED that the application be REFUSED** for the following reason:-

- 1 The proposed new dwelling would fail to respect the character, rhythm and symmetry of the streetscene and would result in a cramped overdevelopment of the site which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of New Street Hill, Ridgeway Drive and the wider Links Estate within which it lies; thereby contrary to Policies 4 and 37 of the Bromley Local Plan.

12.14
COPERS COPE

**(21/01265/FULL1) - 77B Bromley Road,
Beckenham BR3 5PA**

Description of application – Demolition of existing single family dwelling and construction of 7 new flats with associated landscaping and communal gardens.

The Chairman reported comments received from Ward Member and Mayor Councillor Russell Mellor. Councillor Mellor was not opposed to the application.

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 Assistant Director, Planning.

12.15
PETTS WOOD AND KNOLL

**(21/01310/FULL6) - 39 Crossway, Petts Wood,
Orpington BR5 1PE**

Description of application – Two storey front/side extension, a first floor rear extension and a replacement front porch/canopy.

Oral representations from visiting Ward Member Councillor Simon Fawthrop were received at the meeting. Councillor Fawthrop considered that the proposals were better than the previous application but still did not meet the standards required for the Petts Wood ASRC. He urged Members to defer the application, to allow the development to be brought into line with the front building line and to reduce the bulk a little more so that the application was acceptable.

Members supported Councillor Fawthrop's comments.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that the application be DEFFERED** without prejudice to future consideration to seek a set-back from the front and a reduction in bulk.

12.16
PETTS WOOD AND KNOLL

**(21/01340/FULL6) - 150 Kingsway, Petts Wood,
Orpington BR5 1PU**

Description of application – Demolition of existing conservatory. Erection of part single storey/part two

storey front/side extension and elevational alterations.

Oral representations from visiting Ward Member Councillor Simon Fawthrop in support of the application were received at the meeting. Councillor Fawthrop considered this application to be an improvement on the one currently at appeal and informed Members that if approved, the applicant would be willing to withdraw the appeal. He urged Members to permit the application with conditions to withdraw permitted development rights including HMO and garden PDRs. A full copy of Councillor Fawthrop's comments can be viewed at Annex A to these Minutes.

The Development Management Area Team Leader (East) reported that further objections to the application and a letter in response to the objections had been received and circulated to Members.

Councillor Onslow reported that Ward Member Councillor Owen had submitted an e-mail with photographs which had been circulated to the Committee. Councillor Owen considered the proposals would result in an over-development of the site. The garage currently being built was under investigation by the Enforcement Team. This application barely differed from previous applications. The spatial effect was cause for concern with the bulk of the development running along the side of the property. Councillor Owen sought a deferral to seek a single storey flat roof extension.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED that the application be DEFERRED** without prejudice to any future consideration to seek a single storey extension only.

The meeting ended at 8.43 pm

Chairman

COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM COUNCILLOR FAWTHROP

Item 4.5 – 63 Kingsway, Petts Wood

Mr Chairman

First of all Mr Chairman can I compliment the report writer for extracting much of the Petts Wood ASRC description into the report.

What the report writer failed to do and every report writer seems to do this is ignore the ASRC guidelines contained within the Bromley Plan. Policy 44 refers in paragraph 5.1.10. which states that the Council will seek to protect the environmental character of these areas by requiring proposals to have regard to the guidelines.

I'm not going to go through the all the guidelines, but there are 12 in total.

No. 2 states that Residential density shall accord with that existing in the Area. There is no assessment against this criteria, but to suggest that a 66% increase in floor area accords with the existing density does not stack up mathematically.

No. 7 states new development will be required to take account of existing front and rear building lines. This development by extending by 6m doesn't accord with existing rear building lines and comparing it with what was a detached garage in the adjacent property is the wrong measure it has to be compared with the building lines of the existing buildings, which to coin a phrase makes this one stick out a mile. Not forgetting the obscure crown roof, which has been rejected by inspectors on numerous occasions.

All of these items taken together puts this in conflict with the no.1. guideline that developments likely to erode the quality and character of the ASRC will be resisted.

Let me just deal with Permitted Development Rights, under current rules a single storey rear extension could not extend by more than 4m at ground floor level and 3m at a two store level.

So when you compare this with what could be done without planning permission it is 50% more that would be allowed under PD rights.

Mr Chairman this application is a clear over development of the site. I would therefore urge you to refuse this under policy 44 with reference to guidelines 1, 2 and 7. This is also contrary to policy 6(a) given the scale of the proposals.

Item 4.16 - 150 Kingsway

This is a unique corner plot that sits on the corner of Kingsway and Towncourt Crescent.

This application differs from the previous application in that it is set back a further 0.5m from the boundary with Towncourt Crescent.

For the last application, the applicant had advised that if it was deferred, he would undertake to submit this reduction. Whilst he appealed the first decision the applicant would withdraw that appeal if this application were approved. The applicant has been good to his word, despite protestation from elsewhere that he would not keep to his word.

If there are concerns about this application, they can all be dealt with by way of conditions.

If this application is granted, there could be conditions

- 1) To remove all Permitted Development Rights, these would include home owner PD, HMO PD and garden PD to ensure the unique corner plot doesn't become a concrete jungle as a large area will be covered by development.
- 2) It can include a no severance clause, to prevent the home becoming two separate homes, as the plot size, doesn't lend itself to a high density pair of semi-detached houses.

I would recommend that you approve this application.