PLANS SUB-COMMITTEE NO. 4

Minutes of the meeting held at 7.00 pm on 9 November 2023

Present:

Councillor Simon Fawthrop (Chairman)
Councillor Will Rowlands (Vice-Chairman)
Councillors Felicity Bainbridge, Kathy Bance MBE, Peter Dean, Charles Joel, Kevin Kennedy-Brooks, Keith Onslow and Sam Webber

Also Present:

Councillors Alison Stammers and Pauline Tunnicliffe

31 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

There were no apologies for absence.

32 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Visiting Member Councillor Stammers declared she was a neighbour of the speaker in support of item 4.2.

33 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 14TH SEPTEMBER 2023

The minutes of the meeting held on 14th September 2023 were agreed and signed as a correct record.

34 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

34.1
CRYSTAL PALACE AND ANERLEY

(22/03824/FULL1) - 15 Madeline Road, Penge, London, SE20 8AY

Description of application – demolition of existing 5 bedroom three storey detached house and erection of detached building for 6 self-contained flats over four storeys with associated parking and amenity spaces.

The Planner – Development Management (West) advised of the following:

- the front sheet of the report referred to the site

being adjacent to Metropolitan Open Land, however this was not the case;
- a revised drawing of the upper ground floor plan was submitted on the 22nd of June 2023; and,
- a revised drawing indicating car parking spaces of sufficient size and adequate manoeuvring space was received on the 3rd October 2023. It included the provision of an electric vehicle charging point and a condition relating to this was recommended.

It was reported that a statement in support of the application had been received from the agent. This had been circulated to Members and was also tabled at the meeting.

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

The Chairman considered that if permission was to be granted, further conditions should be added in relation to slab levels; ridge height; additional electric vehicle charging points; renewable sources of energy; and water harvesting, which could address concerns raised by Thames Water.

In response to questions, the Planner – Development Management (West) advised that the application site was in an area with a PTAL (Public Transport Accessibility Levels) rating of 5. The London Plan suggested that for sites within PTAL 5-6, the starting point should be car free development rather than providing car parking spaces. There was an oversupply in relation to this, but LBB Highways Officers were happy with the proposals.

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 and with the addition of further conditions relating to slab levels; ridge height; additional electric vehicle charging points; renewable sources of energy; and water harvesting.

34.2
ORPINGTON

(23/02527/FULL1) - Pavilion and Public Conveniences, Goddington Park, Goddington Lane, Orpington, BR6 9DH

Description of application – demolition of the existing sports clubhouse. Erection of repositioned sports pavilion, external equipment store, cycle and bin store, perimeter fencing and associated works, including new access from car park and landscaping.

The Development Management Area Team Leader (East) reported that an artist's impression image had been received from the applicant. This had been circulated to Members and was also tabled at the meeting. The Chairman noted that the applicant had also circulated a comprehensive planning summary to Members.

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

- It was believed that the neighbouring rugby club was a two storey building, consisting of a ground floor and a floor in the eaves of the roof.
- Staff of Millwall Community Trust, established as a charity in 1985, would deliver additional programmes. They had been delivering these services in Southwark, and most recently in Sevenoaks. The Trust had a number of resources which the club did not. These programmes would be offered at times other than Saturdays and Sundays, when the park was used by Orpington Football Club, to bring different users into the park to experience recreation and sport.
- The footprint of the new building was smaller than that of the existing pavilion as the proposal was for a two storey build.
- The applicant had consulted with LBB Planning Officers over four years, spending £40k. They initially sought pre-planning advice which had helped determine the location and proposals. The first application was refused as it was felt to be too large, invasive and overbearing. Following this they worked with the Football Foundation to reduce the size as much as they could.
- Two consultations had been undertaken, the first during the pandemic lockdown period in March 2020. However it had been well publicised online, and 322 questionnaires had been hand delivered. Over 600 responses were received, mostly online, but 35 were returned

questionnaires. Approximately 300 of the responders were connected with Orpington Football Club, but the other 300 were not. Overall, 93% of responses were in favour of new facilities in the park, so that indicated that there was a broad consensus for them to proceed. Following the first application being refused they had appealed to the local MP and Ward Councillors, and it was suggested that an in person consultation be held for local residents. In May 2023, an evening consultation had been held, attended by 35 local residents. They were provided with an opportunity to view the drawings and plans. Some residents had expressed concerns regarding late night parties, alcohol licences and football taking over the park – however assurances were offered in relation to these points and most attendees had left feeling reassured. They wanted to provide an excellent grassroots facility that supported its members and other park users.

- A preliminary ecological appraisal had been undertaken – the report concluded that no harm would be caused by the proposed plans as they would "make good" the site of the old pavilion. There was an opportunity for improvement and expansion of the woodland – planting new trees would protect the older trees behind. It was proposed that a hedgerow would be planted, surrounding the new fencing, softening the appearance of the building and providing new habitats for different wildlife. It was noted that the location chosen was considered to be acceptable by the LBB arboriculture team.
- They would be applying for an alcohol licence – income was a necessity to maintain a £2m building. They currently spent £45k a year maintaining the old pavilion and pitches. The hours proposed were dusk plus an hour – this would only be extended six times a year when they had club events. This could be controlled by conditions, and they would be happy to work with the Council in relation to this.
- Sport England and the Football Foundation both said that a clubhouse, a multipurpose club room which could be used for training were appropriate facilities – this was stated in the appendices submitted. They would be unhappy

if approval was not given for this element.

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

- They were representing over 40 local residents, as part of an organisation called Friends of Goddington Park, and many lived less than a mile from the park. High levels of traffic and issues were being experienced on both sides of the park.
- Sports operating in the park had been taken into consideration when moving to the area – it had been much quieter, and they had not experienced parking issues. In the last five years they had seen exponential usage with more football pitches created and more matches being played in the park.
- They had worked with Orpington Football Club over recent years to manage the roads on a Saturday and Sunday to allow people access from Court Road to Goddington Lane, and up to the park. From 10.00am on a Sunday morning people could not get into, or exit, Goddington Lane – there were lots of issues, including driveways being blocked.
- The traffic assessment had been undertaken in March 2020 during the pandemic lockdown – this was a quiet time as people were asked to stay at home. The traffic assessment should have been completed at 10.00am on a Saturday or Sunday morning to be more accurate. The rugby club also had issues with people parking for the football club – it created massive issues in terms of congestion around the area, with 600-700 people coming to the park for football matches. Friends of people living on Goddington Lane did not visit at weekends because of this. Discussions regarding infrastructure needed to be part of the planning process to alleviate the flow of vehicles. The car parks needed to be larger, but it was not known how could happen without encroaching on the green belt and making the park even smaller.

Oral representations from Ward Member Councillor Tunnicliffe in support of the application were received at the meeting. Councillor Tunnicliffe highlighted that

as Ward Member, only a couple of emails had been received opposing the application. The concerns of local residents were understood, and many had been addressed by the applicant over the last couple of years. The views of the Friends of Goddington Park were also respected and they were thanked for all the work they undertook.

Members were asked to consider the following when making their decision – investment into the borough should be welcomed, especially in the current economic climate. Not just financial investment, but the investment of time – the applicant, and those supporting Orpington Football Club, had given their time in abundance to make the club the success it was today. Some of the most vulnerable children and young people played there regularly – for those with difficult home backgrounds, this was the only safe place they had, and the club was like family for them. Obesity and mental health issues were an increasing problem – sport was valuable in alleviating the stresses of modern day life and should be encouraged.

Councillor Tunnicliffe said that a site visit had been undertaken with her Ward colleague, Councillor Botting – the old pavilion was not fit for purpose and an eyesore. The existing pavilion had set a precedent years ago for building on the greenbelt belt, so replacing it, although in a slightly different location within the park, was a logical move for the club – consideration could be given to other facilities that the building could offer to the local community. The new pavilion and its facilities were welcomed – it was considered that the advantages of the application far outweighed the disadvantages, and Members were urged to support it.

The Chairman advised Members that he had requested a list of the postcodes for those that made comments on the application. Some in support were from as far away as Herne Bay, Sidcup, Croydon and Tonbridge – those objecting all lived relatively local to the application site.

Councillor Rowlands considered that if the application was in another location, it would not be an issue and he supported what the Football Club were trying to do. However there needed to be extremely good grounds to go against the officer recommendation. The

application site was in the greenbelt and went against elements of the Bromley Local Plan, London Plan and the NPPF – he therefore moved that the application be refused.

Councillor Joel said that following a site visit he could see why the existing building needed to be replaced – it was in a dilapidated condition, having been in place for 50 years. The report gave the main reason for recommending refusal as the impact on the greenbelt and the openness of the area, and that there were no special circumstances. However, judging the application on its own merits, it was considered that there was a need to replace the existing building within the open grounds and greenbelt to meet the need for football and sports facilities. In addition to the points raised relating to the London Plan, Bromley Local Plan and NPPF there were also a number of points given as to why the proposal was acceptable. Although a two storey building was proposed, it would be screened by the trees and additional landscaping – it would integrate with the other sports in the playground areas and facilities. Councillor Joel moved that the application be approved.

Councillor Dean highlighted the importance of encouraging young people to participate in sport and pursue healthy activity in a safe environment. It was noted that the Football Club were also looking to introduce walking football for older participants. The comments made by Councillor Tunnicliffe were echoed – people should be encouraged to exercise wherever possible, and providing these much needed facilities demonstrated very special circumstances. The applicant had made great efforts to facilitate local residents and take their concerns on board – they had conducted their own consultation and would not be proceeding with the application if there were a significant number of people opposed. The building had a smaller footprint, noting an increased amount of floor space, because it had been designed with consideration in mind. Councillor Dean seconded the motion for approval.

Councillor Onslow echoed the comments made by Councillor Dean, and said he was fully in support of the application. There were very special circumstances, including the input from Millwall Community Trust to expand the facilities on site.

Councillor Bance agreed that the sports club did need modernisation, however it was disappointing that there was no consideration to make modifications. Councillor Bance seconded the motion for refusal as the very special circumstances did not outweigh the loss of the greenbelt, which was very precious in Bromley.

Councillor Webber echoed the comments made in support of the application on the grounds that very special circumstances had been met. The support from Millwall Community Trust, who did not have a footprint in the borough, was contingent on this application. The current pavilion had been described as an eyesore – its improvement and enhancement would bring a lot of support to that part of the borough. A number of the players, families and people connected may be from a different demographic to those using the neighbouring rugby club, and this should also be taken into consideration.

Councillor Kennedy-Brooks considered that the pavilion being used primarily for sports was an important point – however the issues related to the greenbelt were also hugely relevant. The pavilion was something he would be happy to support, as there was already an existing building, but the addition of a kitchen and bar was not something that the greenbelt should be used for. However, if the Committee were to approve the application he would like to see extra conditions included for these elements.

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

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

There were very special circumstances:

- The involvement of the Millwall Community Trust and the different users and activities that will be brought to the park.
- The social objectives of sustainable development, which would be delivered by allowing the club to continue, and to expand and to support other uses in the park.
- Encouraging exercise and providing activities for young people.

Delegated authority was granted to the Assistant Director (Planning) to impose such conditions as he considers necessary and to secure any planning obligation considered necessary.

34.3
BICKLEY AND SUNDRIDGE

(23/02774/NDFLAT) - Summerfield, Freelands Road, Bromley, BR1 3AG.

Description of application – erection of a one storey roof extension to provide 3no. flats and associated works, including cycle and bin store. (56 day application under Class A, Part 20, Schedule 2 to the General Permitted Development Order 2015 (as amended) with regards to transport and highways impacts, flooding risk, air traffic and defence assets impacts, contamination risks, external appearance of the building, provision of adequate natural light to habitable rooms and nationally described space standards, impact on residential amenities and protected views).

THIS REPORT WAS WITHDRAWN BY THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR: PLANNING.

34.4
KELSEY AND EDEN PARK

(23/01152/TPO) - 1 Kelsey Way, Beckenham, BR3 3LP

Description of application – Oak tree in rear garden – Removal.

Members having considered the report and objections **RESOLVED** that **consent to fell x 1 Oak tree be GRANTED** as recommended, subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the report of the Assistant Director, Planning.

34.5
HAYES AND CONEY HALL

(23/02995/TPO) - 54 Baston Road, Hayes, BR2 7BE

Description of application – Yew tree - Fell.

THIS REPORT WAS WITHDRAWN BY THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR: PLANNING.

35 **CONTRAVENTIONS AND OTHER ISSUES**

NO REPORTS

36 **TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS**

NO REPORTS

The Meeting ended at 8.25 pm

Chairman