

## **PLANS SUB-COMMITTEE NO. 2**

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.00 pm on 17 August 2023

### **Present:**

Councillor Peter Dean (Chairman)  
Councillor Charles Joel (Vice-Chairman)  
Councillors Will Connolly, Sophie Dunbar, Simon Fawthrop,  
Christine Harris, Josh King, Keith Onslow, Will Rowlands and  
Ryan Thomson

### **Also Present:**

Councillor Colin Smith

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

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mark Brock and Chris Price, and Councillors Christine Harris and Josh King attended as their respective substitutes.

## **9 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

## **10 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 22ND JUNE 2023**

The minutes of the meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2023 were agreed and signed as a correct record.

## **11 PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

### **11.1 BICKLEY & SUNDRIDGE (21/03541/FULL1) - 1 St Augustine's Avenue, Bickley, BR2 8AG**

Description of application – proposed demolition of existing bungalow and the construction of two pairs of semi-detached houses (4 x 2 bed units), with off street parking and amenity space.

The Head of Development Management reported that further objections had been received from local residents which raised concerns in relation to over development, parking stress and the parking surveys

being non-representative. Comments had been received from the agent in response to the objections which highlighted that:

- the proposal met the relevant requirements for parking provision;
- the parking issues caused by the dance studio were incorrectly being directed at this application; and,
- the parking surveys were undertaken at the time requested by the Sub-Committee

It was noted that photographs and information had been received from Ward Member Councillor Kate Lymer. This had been circulated to Members and was also tabled at the meeting.

Oral representations in support of the application were received at the meeting. The agent gave the following responses to Members' questions:

- it was confirmed that an independent consultancy had undertaken the parking surveys. The Sub-Committee had specifically asked that the survey be undertaken at 5.15pm on a Friday as they had been advised that this represented peak demand in terms of change over between classes at the dance studio. Parking surveys had been carried out on two Fridays, and a 3.00pm survey had also been undertaken to cover another time period.
- it was acknowledged that the people living in the proposed dwellings would have visitors, however this would not necessarily create additional parking demand – they could travel by a number of means, and many of the dwellings on the road had off-street parking. The survey demonstrated that the real impact on parking related to the dance studio.
- if the photos taken were of the same parking space this highlighted that some remained free for a several minutes and therefore every space was not being used continuously. The survey showed that turnover reached 100% but the methodology did not necessarily account for spaces being available at the northern end of the street.
- with regards to parking, they felt they had done enough. It was noted that when they had originally undertaken the work they had carried out overnight parking surveys to look at

demand for residents – this had been low as it was the daytime impact that caused stress on parking. Daytime surveys had been carried out at a time agreed with Highways Officers, and the Sub-Committee had then requested surveys be undertaken at 5.15pm. They had therefore undertaken parking surveys at multiple times, on multiple days and overnight. The application itself proposed the loss of 1 on-street parking bay – this would not have an impact on the amenity of residents or users of the dance studio.

Oral representations from visiting Ward Member Councillor Colin Smith in objection to the application were also received at the meeting. Councillor Smith said that the Bickley and Sundridge Ward Councillors did not object to the site being developed, but felt the proposal was too big for the location. However, this was considered to be secondary to the contentious issue of parking aspects. Parking at this location was already an issue and any additional intensity would make this situation even worse.

The new parking survey demonstrated residents' concerns. At 5.15pm on a Friday the parking stress was 120%, and this was a regular occurrence – as illustrated by the dance studio timetable circulated, lessons were held at numerous times during the day. In addition to the classes held, the dance studio also hosted parties, holiday courses and workshops – the studios were also available for external hire. Southborough Library was also adjacent to the dance studio and a new supermarket was proposed around the corner – there was no respite for residents. It was highlighted that the additional negative impact could not be objectively assessed as it had not yet happened. As local Ward Councillors they were aware that an additional 4 houses did not mean there would be only 4 extra cars – a number of households had more than one car. The photos circulated demonstrated that currently there was not enough parking. The Sub-Committee were respectfully asked to refuse the application on the grounds of over development and insufficient parking. Councillor Smith's comments, and documents received from Councillor Lymer, are attached at Appendix A.

Councillor Fawthrop agreed with the comments made by Councillor Smith. The residents were impacted by

parking stresses on most days – there was no respite for residents. It was acknowledged that the applicant should be applauded for the amendments made in relation to EV charging and water retention, however this did not overcome the issues highlighted. Councillor Fawthrop moved that the application be refused on the grounds stated by Councillor Smith. It was suggested that a reason for refusal be based on the extensive local knowledge of the Ward Councillors, which was demonstrated by the photographs, dance studio timetable and Councillor Smith's statement.

Councillor Rowlands echoed the comments made by Councillor Fawthrop and seconded the motion for refusal.

The Chairman considered that the applicant had done as much as they could since the application was deferred, introducing additional EV charging points and addressing the water conservation measures. Parking was the contentious issue; however, it was highlighted that the application complied with the minimum parking requirements stated in the London Plan. The Chairman moved that the application be approved.

The Vice-Chairman seconded the motion for approval.

The Head of Development Management advised that paragraphs 7.5.20 and 7.5.21 (page 30) of the agenda pack provided a summary of the position in term of highways impact and the relevant elements for Members to consider. The advice received from Highways Engineers was that there were no grounds to refuse the application in relation to highways safety. It was recognised that there was an existing issue related to on-street parking, however this was attributed to the dance studio, and the proposed development exceeded the maximum parking requirements stated in the London Plan. Therefore there were no technical grounds for refusal related to Highways and there was a risk of an award of costs at appeal.

Councillor Onslow considered that in relation to paragraph 7.5.20, and a parking-related ground for refusal, the photographs provided by Councillor Lymer demonstrated that there was already overspill parking. It had been suggested that overspill parking would be

on Salisbury Road, and the road opposite, however when the supermarket opened there would be no overspill parking at all. With regards to the second point, that this would occur when the demand for the dance studio was at its highest, it was noted that the area was always busy, and parking was at a premium. It was highlighted that the photographs again demonstrated that there would be a severe impact on the road network, with double parking on a narrow road, and questions as to whether an emergency vehicle could access the end of the road.

The Motion for refusal was put to a vote and CARRIED.

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

1. **The site is located in an area which in particular experiences significant levels of parking stress arising from the operation of existing non-residential activities in the vicinity which can limit the opportunities for safe on street parking and manoeuvring. As a consequence of the overdevelopment of the site the proposal, by replacing a single dwelling with four semi-detached houses with a parking provision requiring several manoeuvres to exit after having gained entry in a forward gear and the loss of an existing on street parking space available to all road users, would result in an unacceptably cramped layout that is likely to have a harmful impact on the use of this area of highway, contrary to Policy 32 of the Bromley Local Plan, Policy T4 of the London Plan and paragraph 111 of the NPPF.**

**11.2  
WEST WICKHAM**

**(22/04833/FULL1) - Justin Hall Beckenham Road,  
West Wickham, BR4 0QS**

Description of application – proposal for the erection of a new school building, the refurbishment of existing buildings and an extension to Justin Hall, together with access, parking and landscaping at St David's Prep.

The Principal Planner – Major Developments advised that an additional condition would be recommended, if the application was permitted, to restrict the number of pupils to a maximum of 298.

Oral representations in objection to the application were received at the meeting. The following responses were given to Members' questions:

- neighbours had not looked into whether there were any European protected species in the location.
- although they had not been on the school grounds in recent years, they remembered there being an area of 'scrubland' which could be levelled and converted into a car park.

Oral representations in support of the application were also received at the meeting. The Head Teacher gave the following response to Members' questions:

- Block A would be located on the 'scrubland' previously referred to – this was an area of self-seeded trees which had been cleared, and there was a track down to the school field. The new building would move nearer to the existing building, creating a wider gap between the first neighbouring house. The school was on quite a large green site, which was important to them – lots more planting would be undertaken, and a company were already looking into native trees that would enhance the whole area.
- if permission was granted they would be happy to accept the conditions suggested by the Orpington Field Club & Bromley Biodiversity Partnership Sub-Group – *to retain and protect of as many remaining trees as possible; retain of as much scrub as possible; and retain and protect the remaining ancient woodland flora (ground cover species) both during construction and afterwards, and retained trees and woodland to be protected as per Tree Survey Arboricultural Integration Report.*
- they had considered the balance between biodiversity and parking at length. Additional parking areas would be allocated as part of the development. Some members of staff lived within walking distance of the school, but this was not the case for all. If a condition was added in relation to parking, this was something that could be looked at further.

- it was understood that a condition relating to the use of swift nest bricks had already been included. If permission was granted they would be happy to accept conditions relating to having 5 active EV charging points and water retention/conservation, as well as an informative to look at parking mitigation.
- the school travel plan was doing quite well, but there was always room for improvement. The school had followed the LBB plan to introduce Year 6 Travel Ambassadors. Through the Smart Moves scheme children and their parents were encouraged to walk, scoot and cycle to school, and there had been a significant increase in the numbers doing so. A number of families came to school through the local park, whilst others parked further away and walked the rest of the journey. Over half the school achieved their Smart Move badges most months.
- it was not thought that the service road could be used to lead into parking on another part of the site as this would be an area where children would be walking. However, this stretch could potentially be used for side-on parking. They were aware that parking was a key issue, and they wanted to help as much as they could.

In response to some of the points raised, the Principal Planner – Major Developments advised that there would be conditions relating to a pre-clearance strategy, tree protection measures and full details of hard and soft landscaping on site. In response to a question, the Principal Planner – Major Developments confirmed that this condition could state that this would be undertaken by a professional ecologist or arboriculturist. In relation to biodiversity enhancements, there would be a condition which would include the targeting of habitat and nesting opportunities. The drainage condition would look at any rainwater harvesting that could be appropriate on site – this would require the applicant to submit the details for consideration. The condition relating to the additional active EV charging points was noted. With regards to the parking mitigation informative, the Principal Planner – Major Developments advised that any additional parking on site would require a formal planning application, to be considered on its own merits.

The Chairman read out a written statement in support of the application, which had been received from Councillor Nicholas Bennett on behalf of the West Wickham Ward Councillors.

Members having considered the report, objections and representations, **RESOLVED** that **PERMISSION BE GRANTED**, and **SUBJECT TO THE PRIOR COMPLETION OF A S106 LEGAL AGREEMENT** as recommended, subject to conditions outlined within the report with wording added to conditions relating to biodiversity enhancements and landscaping, water retention, and additional active EV charging points, and an additional condition as follows;

- **Restrict No. of pupils to 298**

And an informative as follows;

**The applicant should consider further mitigation measures to improve staff car parking at the site.**

**11.3  
BECKENHAM TOWN &  
COPERS COPE**

**(23/01225/FULL1) - Land at Grangewood Lane,  
Beckenham.**

Description of application – construction of a detached single storey 2 bedroom dwellinghouse with associated car parking, landscaping and refuse storage.

The Development Management Team Leader – Major Developments advised Members that the application was a resubmission of a previously consented scheme which was approved on appeal. It was noted that the proposed amendments to the development were list on pages 102-103 of the agenda pack.

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.

**12**

**CONTRAVENTIONS AND OTHER ISSUES**

NO REPORTS



**13**

**TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS**

NO REPORTS

The Meeting ended at 8.21 pm

Chairman