

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.30 pm on 1 December 2021

Present:

Councillor Alexa Michael (Chairman)
Councillor Yvonne Bear (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Vanessa Allen, Julian Benington,
Nicholas Bennett MA J.P., Katy Boughey, Peter Dean,
Simon Fawthrop, Christine Harris, Colin Hitchins,
Samaris Huntington-Thresher, Charles Joel, Josh King,
Richard Scoates and Kieran Terry

Also Present:

Councillor Christopher Marlow

68 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

Apologies were received from Councillor Michael Turner, Councillor Tony Owen and Councillor William Huntington-Thresher. Councillor Nicholas Bennett attended as substitute for Councillor Huntington-Thresher.

69 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

In respect of Minute 75 (Item 8), Councillors Benington and Hitchins declared that they were aware of the applicant through the Biggin Hill Memorial Trust.

70 QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ATTENDING THE MEETING

No questions were received.

71 MATTERS OUTSTANDING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES

The report provided an update on matters outstanding from the Committee meeting on 2 November 2021.

The Chairman reported that the Shop Front Guides had not yet been uploaded onto the website as a result of the corporate website content freeze for non-essential updates currently in operation as part of the ongoing review of the Council's website. The Chairman confirmed that Officers had been asked to expedite this and ensure that the Shop Front Guides were loaded onto the website by January 2022.

Councillor Bennett requested that as Design and Heritage Champion he be consulted concerning the development of the Design Guides.

Members requested that they be provided with more information concerning the website content freeze – why it was in operation, until when the freeze was effective, and how emergency updates were actioned.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

**72 PLANNING APPLICATION (20/04838/FULL1) - UNIT 2A
FARNBOROUGH WAY, BROMLEY (Farnborough and Crofton
Ward)**

Description of application – Demolition of existing buildings on site.
Redevelopment to provide a food store (Class E) and associated access, car parking, and landscaping works.

The Planning Officer gave a brief presentation, overview of the application and update on the report.

Oral representations in support of the application were received from the applicant who gave the following responses to Member questions:-

- Over time the scheme had evolved and care had been taken, especially in relation to the side elevation, to ensure that it was in keeping with the residential area. A more contemporary approach had been taken to entice people to the area.
- Access onto the A21 Farnborough Way was designed as left in and left out to minimise traffic disruption. The traffic island in the A21 was intended to prevent drivers turning right onto the A21.
- In designing the proposals, there had been an awareness of concerns around overdevelopment. As such, the proposed store was of average size for an Aldi store.
- There had been extensive engagement in terms of design and the applicants considered that they had developed a sensitive design with the most recent proposals receiving support from local residents.
- Delivery times were set out within the noise statement which had been submitted with the application and there was currently no intention to vary delivery times.
- There had been a request to quantify the number of cars travelling into Farnborough Village and the view had been reached that it would be an insignificant number in terms of a quantifiable impact.

- It was not considered that a new Aldi Store would have a significant impact on the local stores in Farnborough Village. Aldi offered a limited number of lines and did not have in-house concessions such as a butcher. Only 20% of sales space was dedicated to non-food products.

Committee Member and Ward Member Councillor Joel reported that while the applicants had made an attempt to address concerns around bulk, size, traffic movement, deliveries and the impact on the A21 and Farnborough Village, concerns had not been entirely addressed. It was noted that at peak times there was bad traffic congestion on Farnborough Way heading into Bromley. There were also concerns that staff travelling to the site by car may park in surrounding roads. Cllr Joel cited problems with car parking at the Lidl store in Locksbottom and suggested that a similar issue may arise with this site if approved. Consequently, on the basis of design and car parking, Councillor Joel supported the Officer recommendation and moved that the application be refused.

Councillor Terry reported that he generally supported the application but considered that there was some further work needed in terms of design and landscaping. The proposals offered welcome opportunities for local employment. Councillor Terry suggested that some of the comments in the report around car parking were confusing and the comments from Transport for London around the lack of a local bus service were unhelpful given that they were the responsible authority for contracting out bus services and could therefore extend a bus route if there was a concern. Councillor Terry moved that the application be deferred to enable the applicants to review and amend the design.

Councillor Bear noted that it was a finely balanced application with no overwhelming support either way. However, Councillor Bear agreed that more work could be undertaken on the design of the proposal and seconded the motion for deferral on that basis.

Councillor Bennett expressed support for the application noting that the site had been used for retail/industrial purposes for some time. Whilst the impact on other shops in the area should not be a material planning consideration, there was evidence that shops could compete and survive, with the free market having a part to play. Councillor Bennett expressed the view that the design was in keeping with the industrial site and therefore moved that approval be granted. He added that TfL could extend the 261-bus route from the Princess Royal University Hospital to Farnborough Way to meet passenger needs. The motion for approval was seconded by Councillor Hitchins.

While supportive of the application which would be of benefit to the residential area, Councillor Samaris Huntington-Thresher reported that she would like to see the design softened slightly. On that basis Councillor Huntington-Thresher supported deferral.

Councillor Scoates noted that the site was on the edge of a rural village next to a main road. As such, he would not describe the site as 'industrial'. Councillor Scoates expressed the view that the proposals amounted to overdevelopment of the site. His main concern was the bulk of the development which was not in-keeping with the local area. As such, Councillor Scoates supported refusal.

Councillor Boughey noted that it was a commercial site. However, there was scope for improving the design of the proposal and she therefore supported the motion for deferral.

Having considered the report, objections and representations, Members RESOLVED that the application be DEFERRED without prejudice to any future consideration for the following reasons:-

- 1 For further work to be carried out on the design, materials, bulk and landscaping of the proposal.

73 PLANNING APPLICATION (21/02861/FULL1) - CROFTON HALLS (SOUTH), YORK RISE, ORPINGTON (Farnborough and Crofton Ward)

Description of application – Erection of new part 2, part 3 storey terraced maisonettes, and 4 storey apartment building, accommodating 35 new dwellings, with associated substation, hard and soft landscaping, and car parking.

The Planning Officer gave a brief presentation and overview of the application.

Oral representations in objection to the application were received from a neighbour who in response to a question from Members confirmed that they lived at number 6 Crofton Road.

Oral representations in support of the application were received from the applicant's agent who gave the following responses to Member questions:-

- It was likely to prove impractical to do major scale earth works as there were already retaining structures around the edges of the site. As such, digging out may not be practical or provide an acceptable environment for some of the ground floor homes.
- The agents had been working with a team of civil engineers to evaluate the retaining structures on the site. One of the things that had been identified was that the brick facing on York Rise was not actually the structural part of the wall but was an aesthetic facing with a heavy-weight concrete structure behind it.

- The existing access was steep and sloping and the agents were working with the Council's Highways Team to develop a scheme to make the gradient more shallow.
- The issue of biodiversity was complicated to unravel, although the proposed development had a high Urban Green Score.
- Alternative site layouts had been considered early in the project and with the current arrangement the bulk of the new homes were within the terrace. A layout was tested with them at the back of the site, but they then had a proximity to the gardens of Yeovil Close. With the current proposed layout the bulk was away from all surrounding properties. In the most balanced way possible, efforts had been made to maximise the distance with the surrounding properties.
- Details of the maturity of the 40 trees to be planted would be worked out by conditions. However, the mature oak tree on the site would be retained and overall, the quality of trees on the site would improve.
- The road would be adopted and policed by Borough Parking Enforcement. This would be a car-free development. However, in the event that a resident required a car a small payment to MyTime could be made for a space in their car park.

In opening the discussion, Committee Member and Ward Member Councillor Joel acknowledged the need to provide accommodation for homeless families in the Borough with York Rise listed in the Local Plan to provide around 35 residential units. During the preliminary consultation with Officers, Ward Councillors had expressed the opinion that the 4-storey block of flats should be reduced to 3 storeys, reducing the number of units to 31. Ward Councillors still considered that the block of flats was too high. Councillor Joel further expressed the opinion that issues regarding drainage, flooding and archaeology could have been clarified earlier and not left as a condition with planning consent. Councillor Joel also questioned the need to remove 20 trees and provide 40 new trees, highlighting the need to protect the wildlife on the land. Car parking would also be a potential problem as there was only limited parking available in the surrounding roads and during the working week the available space was used by commuters. Councillor Joel expressed the view that the proposals before the committee did not complement the area. Consequently, Councillor Joel moved to defer consideration of the application in order to reduce the height of the 4-storey block, review the mass and design of the building, and provide more information on elements of the scheme. The motion was seconded by Councillor Samaris Huntington-Thresher who expressed concerns around the bulk of the building.

Councillor Fawthrop moved refusal for reasons of biodiversity and impact on local residents, noting that the design of the site should be further reviewed.

Councillor Dean expressed the view that the scheme was acceptable and was well designed and thought out. The scheme would also make a valuable

contribution to the Borough's housing supply and the units would be 100% affordable. Consequently, Councillor Dean proposed that permission be granted in line with Officer recommendations. The motion was seconded by Councillor Harris.

In response to a question from Councillor Terry, the Planning Officer explained that in the view of Officers, it was considered that there was no direct overlooking, and the impact was not adverse enough to justify refusal as there were options for additional screening if necessary.

The Committee requested that an additional condition be added requiring obscure glazing to mitigate the impact of any potential overlooking.

Councillor Allen expressed the view that it was a well thought out design which made good use of the land.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, RESOLVED that PERMISSION BE GRANTED SUBJECT TO PLANNING CONDITIONS AND DIRECTOR ASSURANCE AGREEMENT as recommended and subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report of the Assistant Director, Planning.

It was further RESOLVED that a condition be added requiring obscure glazing.

74 PLANNING APPLICATION (21/03145/FULL1) - 208-212 HIGH STREET ORPINGTON, BR6 0JN (Orpington Ward)

Description of application – Demolition of existing building and erection of a part three, four and five storey building consisting of ground floor commercial retail and office/workshop floorspace (Class E), with 40 residential units (10 x one bed, 28 x two bed and 2 x three bed), together with ground level communal space, cycle parking, 2 x disabled off-street parking spaces at the rear (accessed via Vinson Close), communal gardens/landscaping and all associated ancillary development.

The Planning Officer gave a brief presentation and overview of the application.

Oral representations in support of the application were received from the applicant's agent who gave the following responses to Member questions:-

- The starting point had been to provide affordable housing. However, on the basis of what was presented, the current scheme could not provide affordable housing.
- Issues of insulation would be addressed through Building Regulations and London Plan requirements. The building would meet the required standards and would be built to the highest specification.

- Disabled parking would be provided at the rear of the development in Vincent Close. Distances had been checked by Highways and were deemed to be DDA compliant.
- Flats for disabled residents would be across a range of levels with access via a lift.
- The rooms in the flats would meet both national space standards and GLA standards but would vary depending on the size of the individual units.
- If approved, the aim would be to start works in summer 2022 with a two year build programme.

The Chairman noted that comments in support of the application had been received from Ward Councillor and Committee Member Cllr William Huntington-Thresher and these had been circulated to the Committee. Ward Councillors Pauline Tunnicliffe and Kim Botting had also written to the Chairman expressing support for the application. The Chairman read out the comments from Cllr Tunnicliffe.

Councillor Terry welcomed the proposals, noting the increase in biodiversity and proposed that permission be granted. The motion was seconded by the Chairman, Councillor Michael who noted that the building was well designed and provided good biodiversity. However, the lack of affordable housing was a draw-back.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, RESOLVED that PERMISSION BE GRANTED SUBJECT TO A SECTION 106 LEGAL AGREEMENT as recommended and subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report of the Assistant Director, Planning.

75 PLANNING APPLICATION (21/03220/FULL1) - 32 HOMEFIELD RISE, ORPINGTON (Orpington Ward)

Description of application – Demolition of number 34 and 36 Homefield Rise, retention of number 32 Homefield Rise. Formation of new access and erection of a part 3/part 4 storey block containing 17 apartments with 14 car parking spaces, cycle store and refuse store.

The Development Management Team Leader – Major Developments gave a brief presentation and overview of the application.

Oral representations in support of the application were received from the applicant's agent who gave the following responses to Member questions:-

- The intention was to renovate and rent out 32 Homefield Rise.

The Chairman noted that comments from Ward Councillor and Committee Member Councillor William Huntington-Thresher had been circulated to the

Committee. The Chairman read out comments from Ward Councillor Pauline Tunnicliffe who supported the application.

The Chairman noted that the site was allocated in the Local Plan for housing and that it was a good scheme before Members. She moved that permission be granted. The motion was seconded by Councillor Terry.

Councillor Harris welcomed the 35% social housing provision on such a small development noting that the development would provide a good social mix. As such, Councillor Harris expressed support for the application.

Councillor Fawthrop expressed the view that when the impact of the development on numbers 30 and 32 was considered, it was over-bearing on those properties and on that basis he could not support the development.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, RESOLVED that PERMISSION BE GRANTED SUBJECT TO A SECTION 106 LEGAL AGREEMENT as recommended and subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report of the Assistant Director, Planning.

**76 DELEGATED ENFORCEMENT ACTION (JULY 2021 TO SEPTEMBER 2021)
Report HPR2021/064**

Enforcement action had been authorised under Delegated Authority for the following alleged breaches of planning control. In accordance with agreed procedures the report advised Members of the action taken.

The Chairman requested that in future the list be provided in Ward order rather than date order. It was also noted that in the past the Committee had asked for a glossary of the recommendations which had not yet been provided. Officers were asked to provide this for future reports.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

77 COUNCILLOR PLANNING APPLICATION 'CALL-INS'

The report provided the regular update on Councillor 'call-ins' for planning applications.

The Chairman requested that future reports set out the outcome of those applications called in to committee, whether the officer recommendation was overturned and if so, the outcome at appeal.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

The Meeting ended at 9.55 am

Chairman