

SECTION '2' – Applications meriting special consideration

Application No : 11/00904/FULL1

Ward:
Chislehurst

Address : Beaverwood Lodge Sports And Leisure
Club Beaverwood Road Chislehurst
BR7 6HF

OS Grid Ref: E: 545467 N: 170958

Applicant : Mrs S J Johnson

Objections : NO

Description of Development:

Two storey replacement sports/ leisure and functions/ pavilion building including bar/ kitchen/ function room, indoor leisure, changing rooms, basement storage, ancillary offices and caretakers flat

Key designations:

Conservation Area: Chislehurst
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Birds
Biggin Hill Safeguarding Area
Green Belt
London City Airport Safeguarding
London City Airport Safeguarding Birds

Joint report with application ref. 11/00910

Proposal

This planning application is to replace the existing sports club with a new two storey pavilion building comprising sports and leisure elements, as well as facilities for functions, including a bar, kitchen, function room, changing room, basement storage, ancillary offices, and caretaker's flat within the building. The application is made in full rather than in outline.

The applicant states it is proposed to continue the existing use of the site. Within the existing pavilion there is currently a caretaker's flat. The applicant states that the existing uses will be re-housed within the new pavilion building, but in a more appropriate manner with improved facilities. The replacement building would be in a very similar location to the existing one, and it is not proposed to encroach on the open part of the Green Belt.

No trees would be affected by the development.

Consent has also been applied for to demolish the existing building as it falls within the Chislehurst Conservation Area (ref. 11/00910) also on this agenda.

Location

The application site is on Beaverwood Road, Chislehurst and comprises a sports ground with football pitches, tennis courts and a two storey sports pavilion building. It falls within the Green Belt and Chislehurst Conservation Area. Nearby is Beaverwood Girls School, and adjacent is the Council Depot and there is a car dealership and petrol garage to the south.

Comments from Local Residents

No objections were received from nearby owners/occupiers that were notified of the application.

Comments from Consultees

From an Environmental Health standpoint, no objections are raised subject to an appropriate condition.

From a Heritage and Design standpoint, no objections are raised subject to appropriate materials and landscaping conditions being imposed.

The Advisory Panel for Conservation Areas (APCA) objects to the proposal because of its bulk, materials and design, which is considered inappropriate to its conservation area and green belt location.

English Heritage has not raised any concerns and commented that the application should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance.

From a Highways standpoint, Transport for London has no strategic concerns with the application.

The Council's Highways Section has no overall objections are raised in principle, although it is suggested that a transport assessment be submitted, as it is over the threshold suggested by the DoT for such assessments.

No objections are raised from a refuse point of view

From a crime prevention point of view, no objections are raised subject to the imposition of a standard 'secured by design' condition.

The application has been referred to the Greater London Authority (GLA) as the floor space proposed within the Green Belt exceeds the referral threshold in the relevant Order. The GLA has raised various concerns, mainly concerning whether very special circumstances exist to justify inappropriate development within the Green Belt. Other issues such as urban design, inclusive design, and climate change / mitigation have also been raised. The applicant has sought to address

these concerns. Should Members be minded to grant permission, the application will have to be referred back to the GLA.

Planning Considerations

The application should be determined in accordance with the following policies of the Unitary Development Plan:

BE1 Design of New Development
BE11 Conservation Areas
G1 Green Belt
T1 Transport Demand
T2 Assessment of Transport Effects

PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development
PPG2 Green Belts
PPS5 Planning for the historical environment

London Plan 2011 - specifically those policies relating to the green belt, design, sustainable development and climate change.

As part of the application process, it is necessary for the Council to give a Screening Opinion by virtue of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 as to whether the Council considers the proposal to be "EIA development" within the meaning of the 2011 Regulations.

Having carefully examined the proposals, it is considered that the development falls within the descriptions at paragraphs 10 (b) of Column 1 and exceeds the thresholds in Column 2 of the table in Schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011. Therefore, the proposals would be "Schedule 2 Development" within the meaning of the 2011 Regulations.

However, having taken into account the selection criteria in Schedule 3 of the Regulations and the terms of the relevant European Directive, it is considered that the proposed development would not be likely to have significant effects on the environment by virtue of factors such as its nature, size or location. This opinion is expressed taking into account all the relevant matters including the information submitted with the application, advice from technical consultees, and the scale of the proposed development on the site.

Accordingly, the proposed development is not considered "EIA development" within the meaning of the 2011 Regulations.

Conclusions

The main issues to be considered are: (i) the principle of the development within the Green Belt; (ii) the impact of the new building on the amenities of residents of nearby properties; (iii) the impact on the character and appearance of the Chislehurst Conservation Area, specifically whether it would preserve or enhance

its character; (iv) the impact on highway safety; and (v) energy / climate change measures.

In terms of the Green Belt, the main issue is whether the proposal is inappropriate development for the purposes of PPG2 and development plan policy (UDP G1), and if so whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development.

In this case, whilst the proposal contains some elements that could be considered essential for outdoor sports, as specified in PPG2, the proposal is too large to meet all the criteria of paragraph 3.5 of PPG2. The proposal therefore constitutes inappropriate development in the Green Belt. PPG2 states that inappropriate development is by definition harmful to the Green Belt and it is for the applicant to show why permission should be granted. The applicant is required to demonstrate 'very special circumstances'. In this case, the applicant has put forward reasons as follows: that the building is beyond economic repair and is not sustainable or carbon or energy efficient. A comprehensive list of fundamental defects within the existing building is listed. The applicant has argued that these factors constitute the very special circumstances necessary to justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Members will need to carefully consider whether they are satisfied such factors constitute very special circumstances, to justify such inappropriate development. On balance, given the poor state of repair of the existing building, Members may accept that such factors do in this case constitute 'very special circumstances'.

Further, it should be noted that the increase in footprint is not significant, the new building being of a different shape. Although the building will be higher than the existing structure, the increase in height is not considered to adversely affect the openness of the Green Belt. Following the comments of the GLA regarding height, the applicant has marginally lowered the overall ridge height. The new building is generally positioned in the same location as the existing one. Also, given the design of the proposed building, and the fact that there is already a substantial existing building on the site which will be demolished, it is not considered that the openness of the Green Belt will be impaired or affected in any significant way by the proposal.

In terms of the amenities of residents, the application is considered satisfactory. No objections were raised by residents. Regarding any overlooking and privacy, the proposed building is considered to be of sufficient distance from other properties in the vicinity not to cause any problems in this regard. In any event, the building is replacing an existing one in a similar position and of a similar footprint size. The proposal is considered to have a satisfactory relationship with the existing properties, including the locally listed ones. The overall layout, including the position of car parking is considered acceptable, very much following that of the existing building and parking area. Overall, the amenities of local residents are considered to be adequately protected.

In terms of character and appearance of the area, the existing building is not considered to be of any particular merit, is in a poor state of repair, and makes a

neutral contribution to the Conservation Area. As stated, the height of the new building would be higher than the existing building, although the footprint is much the same. Architecturally, the scheme is considered well articulated and attractively designed, with a pitched tiled roof, and would use high quality materials. A balcony is proposed at first floor level to take advantage of the views at the site. The proposed design is considered to represent an improvement over the existing building in terms of its design and form. It is not considered the proposed building would appear incongruous or out of place in this location. Overall, it is considered it would enhance the character and appearance of the Chislehurst Conservation Area.

Turning to highways matters, no strategic objections have been raised by Transport for London. Therefore, it is not considered the current application should be resisted on highways grounds.

In terms of renewable energy, the roof has been designed to allow for the installation of PV solar collectors and a detailed energy assessment was submitted with the application.

Overall, it is considered that the proposed scheme is acceptable in terms of its design, height and scale, and would not affect the openness of the Green Belt. The proposal would not result in a loss of amenity or privacy to the occupants of properties in the vicinity. There are no fundamental objections from a highway standpoint.

Background papers referred to during production of this report comprise all correspondence on file ref.11/00904, excluding exempt information.

RECOMMENDATION: PERMISSION SUBJECT TO ANY DIRECTION FROM THE GLA

Subject to the following conditions:

- | | | |
|---|--------|---|
| 1 | ACA01 | Commencement of development within 3 yrs |
| | ACA01R | A01 Reason 3 years |
| 2 | ACA02 | Details req. pursuant outline permission appearance and landscaping |
| | ACA04R | Reason A04 |
| 3 | ACA04 | Landscaping Scheme - full app no details |
| | ACA04R | Reason A04 |
| 4 | ACC01 | Satisfactory materials (ext'n'l surfaces) |
| | ACC01R | Reason C01 |
| 5 | ACD02 | Surface water drainage - no det. submitt |
| | ADD02R | Reason D02 |
| 6 | ACD04 | Foul water drainage - no details submitt |
| | ADD04R | Reason D04 |
| 7 | ACH03 | Satisfactory parking - full application |
| | ACH03R | Reason H03 |
| 8 | ACH16 | Hardstanding for wash-down facilities |
| | ACH16R | Reason H16 |

- | | | |
|----|--------|--------------------------------------|
| 9 | ACH22 | Bicycle Parking |
| | ACH22R | Reason H22 |
| 10 | ACH27 | Arrangements for construction period |
| | ACH27R | Reason H27 |
| 11 | ACI21 | Secured By Design |
| | ACI21R | I21 reason |
| 12 | ACK01 | Compliance with submitted plan |

Reason: In order to comply with Policy BE1 of the Unitary Development Plan.

Reasons for granting permission:

In granting permission the Local Planning Authority had regard to the following policies of the Unitary Development Plan

- BE1 Design of New Development
- BE11 Conservation Areas
- G1 Green Belt
- T1 Transport Demand
- T2 Assessment of Transport Effects
- T3 Parking
- T11 New accesses

The development is considered satisfactory in relation to the following:

- (a) the appearance of the development in the street scene
- (b) the relationship of the development to adjacent property
- (c) the character of the development in the surrounding areas
- (d) the impact on the amenities of the occupiers of adjacent and nearby properties, in relation to privacy, light and outlook
- (e) the safety of pedestrians and motorists on the adjacent highway
- (f) the safety and security of buildings and spaces around them
- (g) accessibility to buildings
- (h) the sustainability policies of the development plan
- (i) the transport policies of the development plan
- (j) the setting, character and appearance of the conservation area and green belt

and having regard to all other matters raised.

Application:11/00904/FULL1

Address: Beaverwood Lodge Sports And Leisure Club Beaverwood Road Chislehurst BR7 6HF

Proposal: Two storey replacement sports/ leisure and functions/ pavilion building including bar/ kitchen/ function room, indoor leisure, changing rooms, basement storage, ancillary offices and caretakers flat

