## North Copers Cope Road Action Group (NCCRAG)

## Round robin letters

Year and month of	Item on	Content - summary
letter	Application	
	Schedule	
2021 - July	23	CPFC has been required to make additional planning applications in relation to its Academy Ground: the additional planning applications relate to the proposed "Guardhouse" in the entrance between 151 and 153 CCR and the canopy above the stand next to the show pitch. There are considerable concerns about these applications and the general approach of CPFC: they have sought to subvert the normal planning rules in order to do exactly what they want. This is unacceptable to local residents and should be resisted by Bromley Council.
2020 – July	23	CPFC now have to satisfy a considerable number of conditions in relation to the planning consent. The letter sets out the conditions which will be of most concern to local residents. Bromley Council has served an extensive Tree Preservation Order on the CPFC Academy Ground, not least as a result of NCCRAG representations. CPFC has circulated its own, first, round robin letter which should be one of many in relation to a development of such complexity.
2020 - March	23	CPFC development plan was approved by Bromley Council in March subject to approval by the Greater London Authority (GLA) and the requirements of the Environment Agency (EA) and Thames Water. The development includes a large, indoor pitch building to be built on the edge of Copers Cope Road. NCCRAG objected to such a large building as it is inappropriate on MOL land. The letter announced the launching of the NCCRAG website.
2020 - January	10	Kent County Cricket licence for outdoor events needs to be challenged and objections were required by 6 February. KCCC presented a more reasonable & limited licence request to the subsequent meeting of the Bromley Licensing Sub-Committee based very largely on our representations. Very sensible limitations were agreed for 2020. If successful it is likely that Kent will seek an expansion of the licence in the future.
2019 - December	23	The CPFC planning application "objection period" ends on 19 December. The view of the NCCRAG Committee is that CPFC is a welcome neighbour in Copers Cope Road but the current planning application would result in far too large an indoor pitch building (the largest in the

		country) which would contravene the planning laws
		causing significant damage to the openness of the MOL. It does not need to be so large to satisfy the Premier League rules.
		NCCRAG recommended residents to ask Bromley Council to reject the application and ask CPFC to submit a more modest proposal in keeping with planning law and one which would be more sympathetic to the local environment <del>.</del>
2019 - October		The Bromley Local Plan, to 2030, was approved in January 2019.
		The most northerly part of Copers Cope Road is now included as an Area of Special Residential Character (ASRC) as proposed by NCCRAG. CPFC has secured a long, 75 year, lease on the old Nat West site on the western side of north Copers Cope Road and residents were encouraged to attend the information meeting organised by CPFC on 31 October 2019 prior to the launch of the formal planning application. We amended the name of the Action Group to include the word "Road" so that it is clearer that we are not representing the interests of part of the Beckenham Copers Cope Electoral Ward.
		The amended "letter heading" is:
		North Copers Cope Road
		Action Group
2018 - January	22	An appeal against Bromley's refusal to allow a car wash facility to be introduced on the Nat West site on the western side of north Copers Cope Road was to take place in January, it was postponed and eventually held in March. NCCAG concern was that the application would remove the MOL designation from the land involved and was a "stalking horse" paving the way for the eventual removal of the designation for the whole site. This would facilitate planning permission for residential development.
2016 - July	40	Planning application at 56a/b to build four semi-
	5	detached town houses on the site, compared with the previous application to build a block of five town houses. The revised application was approved by the Council. The CPFC application to double the size of their existing pavilion on their First Team training ground on the east side of Copers Cope Road was rejected by Bromley Council with NCCAG speaking at the Committee against the application.
2016 - February	37	The decision has been taken not to redevelop 56 Copers Cope Road with flats but to sell the property to a private individual who will renovate and refurbish the property as a single family residence. There were also updates on 56a and 56b and the

		and the developer of the left
		prospective development of the site, the proposed extension of the pavilion on the CPFC first team site, the acceptance of our ASRC proposal into the Bromley Local Plan process.
2015 - December	39	<ul> <li>56a and 56b Copers Cope Road: alerting local residents to the appeal by the developers against the refusal of Bromley Council to allow the building of a 5 townhouse development.</li> <li>We asked for contributions to allow us to be professionally represented at the appeal hearing which was to take place before the planning inspector appointed by the Secretary of State.</li> <li>We raised just under £1,000 as a result of that appeal.</li> </ul>
2015 - October	37	56 Copers Cope Road – the Planning Committee turned down the developer's subsequent application to knock down the property and build a block of 9 flats, despite it being recommended for approval by the planners. The previous application had been for 10 flats. 56a and 56b Copers Cope Road: Bromley Council has turned down the application to replace the existing two houses with a 5 townhouse development.
	39	CPFC applied in the summer to extend the pavilion on their training ground and we explained why we were concerned. We also noted we had been advised that the time was now right to apply for north Copers Cope Road to be designated as an Area of Special Residential Character (ASRC) as part of the new Bromley Local Plan. Our proposal was accepted and part of north Copers Cope Road became as ASRC when the Local Plan was adopted in January 2019.
2015 - July	5	CPFC had applied to double the size of the existing pavilion on their training ground on the eastern side of Copers Cope Road to enable it to be the training ground for their first team, its football academy and administrative headquarters. We reported on our discussions with CPFC and Bromley Council about this proposal and the detrimental impact the development would have on the MOL land on which it would be built if permitted plus concerns about other unauthorised development on the site which had already been carried out by CPFC.
2015 - May	36	56 Copers Cope Road – there is a planning application to demolish the existing building and replace it with a 3 to 4 storey block of 10 flats. We stated our objection to flatted development in this, northern, part of Copers Cope Road and encouraged residents to support our objections. The Council refused permission.

There was a hiatus in residential development proposals, and planning applications, following on from the financial crisis of 2009/ As there were no important developments there were no round robin letters in the period 2012 to 2014.

2011 - March	8	Notifying receipt of and copying a letter from Leander (owners of the KCCC Ground) regarding the proposed addition of an Indoor Cricket Academy and other buildings to secure Kent's continued presence at Beckenham for the mid term. The letter warned that without the additional facilities Kent's tenure would be unstainable and the club could leave the ground before that Summer. The Action Group took a neutral position on the development and residents were neither lobbied to support nor to object.
2010 - November	33	"Century Way" development at the rear of 91 – 117 CCR Further details about the Castlefort development including possible access via Grangewood Lane. As the result of our intervention the Council agreed that the lane should not be part of the development and that it should be retained in its current unmade and somewhat rural state.
2010 - August	33	"Century Way" development at the rear of 91 – 117 CCR The need to comment on the revised planning application of August 2010 and concerns about encroachment of the new development into the woodland area covered by a TPO (Tree Preservation Order) and the need to remove Grangewood Lane from the development
2009 - October	32	"Century Way" – outlined concerns about the TPO woodland area in relation to the amended planning application
2009 - August		An update on the Copers Cope Road Controlled Parking Zone with a review meeting to take place in October. Updates on other planning issues.
2009 - January		The new Copers Cope Road Controlled Parking Zone scheme was outlined and the need to make comments to the Council. Plus car parking, and licences, on the Nat West site.
2008 - October	17	Nat West ground Goals Soccer – an amended music and alcohol licence application which was significantly amended in the light of NCCAG objections.
2008 - July	18	Information about a new car parking scheme at Nat West ground increasing provision from 128 to 187 as a compensatory planning remediation for the improper siting of the 5-a-side pitches.
2008 - March	29	Notification that the developer's appeal against refusal to build a block of flats at 84 CCR was being considered by an appointee of the Secretary of State in April 2008. The appeal was dismissed.
2008 - February	18	Details about revised planning applications on the Nat West ground to sort out the siting of the 5-a-side pitches and other issues. Plus information about a new local car parking scheme
2007 - November	31B	"Century Way" – NCCAG had encouraged Bromley Council to take judicial review proceedings in the High Court to argue that the decision of the Planning Inspector to allow the development, and overturn the decision of the Council, should be overruled. The case was heard in the Administrative Division of the High

		Court on 25 September 2007 and the decision was that the
		Secretary of State's judgment should stand and the
		development could go ahead.
2007 - October	31B	"Century Way" – we reported that the High Court hearing had
2007 0000001	UID I	taken place on 25 September: result reported in the November
		2007 letter above.
	29	The prospective developers of 84 CCR had appealed to the
		Secretary of State to overturn the Council's refusal of planning
		permission and local residents had to put in their views by 17
		October 2007.
		The Nat West Goals Soccer licensing application had been
		appropriately amended to safeguard the interests of local
		residents.
2007 - August		Finance – we reported on fund raising in advance of the High
		Court hearing. In 2006 and 2007 NCCAG raised £22,000 to
		cover professional fees and other expenses to further the interests of local residents.
		We reported on other local developments including the
		Worsley Bridge Road / Headingly Drive development on the
		eastern part of the Old Lloyd's sports ground which Bromley
		Council approved in 2002, re-categorising the land as
		developable rather than MOL, and giving permission to build
		49 houses and 34 flats on the site.
		We also noted the government White and Green consultation
		papers published in the summer and noted the concerns of the
		Financial Times:
		"Easing planning restrictions on new homes is sensible.
		Setting precise targets a decade ahead betrays a Soviet disregard for markets."
2007 - June	31B	"Century Way" – NCCAG took independent legal advice
2007 - 30110	010	including counsel's opinion and convinced Bromley Council to
		instigate Judicial Review proceedings, with NCCAG being
		joined in its action, against the Planning Inspector's decision to
		allow development of the site. We subsequently instructed a
		separate QC to put forward what we considered to be more
		pertinent arguments against the Planning Inspector's decision.
		Finance – we needed funding from local residents to allow us
		to proceed with this legal action and asked for contributions of
		£100 from households interested in supporting us.
		Our formal presence in the High Court action in September
		required us to set up more formal constitutional arrangements
2007 Echryony	31B	and we set out the officers of NCCAG for the first time.
2007 - February	310	"Century Way" – the Planning Inspector's decision to allow the development was going to be challenged by Bromley
		Council under Judicial Review proceedings in the High Court.
		More details were given in our subsequent letter of June 2007.
		NCCAG reminded residents that it needed funds to cover the
		costs incurred so far and the potential future costs. We were
		asking for contributions of £150 per household.
2006 - December		Finance – we noted we had raised £6,000 following the
		November letter.
	31B	"Century Way" – the hearing before the Planning Inspector, as
		part of the examination of the new Bromley Unitary
		Development Plan, had taken place on 21/22 November and

1		we summarised the key issue as:
		"The technical argument boiled down to whether the current deficit in Bromley's housing completions, and the possibility that there would be further shortfalls over the ten years of the Unitary Development Plan up to 2016, constitute 'very special circumstances' which would lead the Inspector to agree that this particular plot of land should no longer be treated as Metropolitan Open Land and be released for housing." We reported on a consultation to help traffic flow on Southend Road which had not extended to residents served by NCCAG.
2006 - November	31B	"Century Way" – the hearing before the Planning Inspector to consider the refusal of planning permission by Bromley
		Council will take place on 21 November 2006. The letter asks for contributions of £150 per household to
		cover the cost of the hearing.
		Note: When there is an appeal against a decision by
		the Council a Planning Inspector, from the Planning
		Inspectorate, is appointed to represent the Secretary of State and review the Council decision. We refer to this
		planning process in this summary document by stating
		the existence of a "Planning Inspector".
		The letter sets out some issues raised by the application e.g.
		wildlife and traffic. It took a couple more years before the
		Copers Cope Road Controlled Parking Zone emerged – see
2006 - August		letter of January 2009 above. We used an "official heading" on our letter for the first time:
2000 / laguet		
		North Copers Cope Action Group
		The logo, and the name of the Action Group, was extended to included "Road" in September 2019 to avoid confusion about
	26	the area covered by the Action Group: it is delimited by reference to the road and not the northern part of the Beckenham Copers Cope ward. The Appeal for the proposed development of 82 CCR was dismissed by the Planning Inspector. A key concern was the traffic in the road and the report we had commissioned, and paid for, by a traffic consultant, played a major role in the eventual decision.
2006 - July	26	the area covered by the Action Group: it is delimited by reference to the road and not the northern part of the Beckenham Copers Cope ward. The Appeal for the proposed development of 82 CCR was dismissed by the Planning Inspector. A key concern was the traffic in the road and the report we had commissioned, and paid for, by a traffic consultant, played a major role in the eventual decision. The Appeal Hearing on 82 CCR took place on 14 June and
2006 - July		the area covered by the Action Group: it is delimited by reference to the road and not the northern part of the Beckenham Copers Cope ward. The Appeal for the proposed development of 82 CCR was dismissed by the Planning Inspector. A key concern was the traffic in the road and the report we had commissioned, and paid for, by a traffic consultant, played a major role in the eventual decision.
2006 - July 2006 - May	26	the area covered by the Action Group: it is delimited by reference to the road and not the northern part of the Beckenham Copers Cope ward. The Appeal for the proposed development of 82 CCR was dismissed by the Planning Inspector. A key concern was the traffic in the road and the report we had commissioned, and paid for, by a traffic consultant, played a major role in the eventual decision. The Appeal Hearing on 82 CCR took place on 14 June and the equivalent Hearing on 84-86 takes place on 7 July. "Century Way" – the appeal against the refusal of planning permission has been lodged by the developer and residents were advised that they had until 14 July to put in their representations. NCCAG set out the various grounds to support the refusal. The Action Group, NCCAG, has been registered with Bromley
	26	the area covered by the Action Group: it is delimited by reference to the road and not the northern part of the Beckenham Copers Cope ward. The Appeal for the proposed development of 82 CCR was dismissed by the Planning Inspector. A key concern was the traffic in the road and the report we had commissioned, and paid for, by a traffic consultant, played a major role in the eventual decision. The Appeal Hearing on 82 CCR took place on 14 June and the equivalent Hearing on 84-86 takes place on 7 July. "Century Way" – the appeal against the refusal of planning permission has been lodged by the developer and residents were advised that they had until 14 July to put in their representations. NCCAG set out the various grounds to support the refusal. The Action Group, NCCAG, has been registered with Bromley Council.
	26	the area covered by the Action Group: it is delimited by reference to the road and not the northern part of the Beckenham Copers Cope ward. The Appeal for the proposed development of 82 CCR was dismissed by the Planning Inspector. A key concern was the traffic in the road and the report we had commissioned, and paid for, by a traffic consultant, played a major role in the eventual decision. The Appeal Hearing on 82 CCR took place on 14 June and the equivalent Hearing on 84-86 takes place on 7 July. "Century Way" – the appeal against the refusal of planning permission has been lodged by the developer and residents were advised that they had until 14 July to put in their representations. NCCAG set out the various grounds to support the refusal. The Action Group, NCCAG, has been registered with Bromley Council. An appeal for funds was made to cover the cost dealing with
	26	the area covered by the Action Group: it is delimited by reference to the road and not the northern part of the Beckenham Copers Cope ward. The Appeal for the proposed development of 82 CCR was dismissed by the Planning Inspector. A key concern was the traffic in the road and the report we had commissioned, and paid for, by a traffic consultant, played a major role in the eventual decision. The Appeal Hearing on 82 CCR took place on 14 June and the equivalent Hearing on 84-86 takes place on 7 July. "Century Way" – the appeal against the refusal of planning permission has been lodged by the developer and residents were advised that they had until 14 July to put in their representations. NCCAG set out the various grounds to support the refusal. The Action Group, NCCAG, has been registered with Bromley Council. An appeal for funds was made to cover the cost dealing with the "Century Way" planning application on which the
	26	the area covered by the Action Group: it is delimited by reference to the road and not the northern part of the Beckenham Copers Cope ward. The Appeal for the proposed development of 82 CCR was dismissed by the Planning Inspector. A key concern was the traffic in the road and the report we had commissioned, and paid for, by a traffic consultant, played a major role in the eventual decision. The Appeal Hearing on 82 CCR took place on 14 June and the equivalent Hearing on 84-86 takes place on 7 July. "Century Way" – the appeal against the refusal of planning permission has been lodged by the developer and residents were advised that they had until 14 July to put in their representations. NCCAG set out the various grounds to support the refusal. The Action Group, NCCAG, has been registered with Bromley Council. An appeal for funds was made to cover the cost dealing with

		refusal to allow a three storey block of 12 flats. The letter
		provided an update.
2006 - January		The letter asked residents to provide details of any recent traffic accidents in CCR and also notify the Action Group if they are approached by developers Castlefort in relation to the development of what we have referred to in the above summary as "Century Way" – in planning terms it was referred to as land at the rear of 91-117 CCR. (The Old Nursery Site)
2005 –	28	84/86 CCR – there is a new planning application for a 12 flat
September		development.
2005 – May	26	82 CCR – there is to be an appeal against the Council's
		refusal of planning permission
2005 – February	26	82 CCR – further information about the new planning application
	27	84/86 CCR – the Planning Inspector has rejected the appeal against the Council's refusal to grant planning permission.
	2A	CPFC has applied to be absolved from having to agree a new scheme of access/parking which was to replace the existing 1988 parking scheme introduced when the new pavilion was
		built: ta scheme allowed for 69 parking spaces.
2004 – November	26	82 CCR – there is a new planning application for flatted development after the refusal in June.
	27	84/86 CCR – a reminder to residents of the Appeal Hearing on 23 November.
2004 – July	25	82 CCR – Appeal Hearing took place on 15 June 2004.
	2/2A	CPFC inflatable dome building – there are two applications one for an astroturf pitch and the other for a re-siting of the building.
2004 - May	2/2A	CPFC inflatable dome building – the siting was approved at a meeting on 29 April 2004 but various conditions are still to be agreed including parking.
	25/27	82 and 84/86 planning application refusals to be heard on 15 June and 23 November 2004 respectively.
2004 – April	27	84/86 CCR – refused planning application for 14 flat development is to be appealed.
2004 – March	2/2A	CPFC inflatable dome building site visit took place but the planning committee still has to meet to decide on the necessary conditions before it can go ahead i.e. access and car parking.
2004 – February	2/2A	CPFC inflatable dome building was considered at a planning meeting on 5 February 2004 but a decision was deferred pending a site visit.
2004 - January	25	82 CCR – the application for a 13 flat development and parking was refused and the appeal hearing will take place in June 2004.
	27	84/86 CCR – the application for a 14 flat development was refused at a planning meeting on 15 January 2004
	2/2A	CPFC application for an inflatable dome building was deferred at a January planning meeting.
2003 – December	25	82 CCR – encouraging residents to write to the planning
(2)		inspector and setting out the grounds for objection that could be included in such letters
2003 – December	27	84/86 CCR – details of the planning application for 14 flat
(1)		development