

PLANNING COMMITTEE C

Date of Meeting: **THURSDAY, 19 SEPTEMBER 2019 TIME 7.30 PM**

PLACE: **ROOM 1 & 2, CIVIC SUITE, LEWISHAM TOWN HALL, CATFORD, SE6 4RU**

Members of the Committee are summoned to attend this meeting:

**Membership
Councillors:**

Olurotimi Ogunbadewa (Chair)
Stephen Penfold (Vice-Chair)
John Paschoud
Peter Bernards
James Rathbone
Louise Krupski
Hilary Moore
Lionel Openshaw
Paul Maslin
Liz Johnston-Franklin

The public are welcome to attend our committee meetings, however, occasionally committees may have to consider some business in private. Copies of reports can be made available in additional formats on request.

Janet Senior
Acting Chief Executive
Lewisham Town Hall
London SE6 4RU
Date: Tuesday, 10 September
2019

For further information please contact:
Claudette Minott Committee Co-ordinator
2nd Floor Civic Suite
Catford Road SE6 4RU

Telephone No:
Email: committee@lewisham.gov.uk



	Order Of Business		
Item No	Title of Report	Ward	Page No.
4.	11 Havelock Walk		1 - 4

Committee	PLANNING COMMITTEE C
Report Title	ADDENDUM
Contributors	James Hughes
Date	19 th September 2019

1 **ADDENDUM**

1 This is an addendum to the committee agenda published on 9th September 2019 in respect of Planning Committee C on 19th September 2019.

2 This addendum outlines additional representations received following publication of the committee report for Item 4 (11 Havelock Walk). Additional corrections, conditions and clarifications are also set out. There are no updates for the other agenda items.

2 **ITEM 4 – 11 Havelock Walk, SE23 3HG**

Additional representations

3 As noted in committee report at Paragraph 20, a second round of consultation was undertaken to publicise changes to the scheme and clarify the description of the development (to confirm the proposal does not comprise live/work units).

4 There were no new objections from any individual who did not previously object or sign a petition opposing the development in the second round of consultation. There were 4 additional objections received from individuals that previously objected in the first round of consultation. An additional petition was also received from Havelock Walk residents. This petition included one additional signatory who did not sign the first petition; otherwise the same individuals who signed the first petition signed the second.

5 The total number of objections from both rounds of consultation was 11 however accounting for individual who objected twice, the number of unique objections was 8 (excluding the two petitions).

6 There were no new material planning issues raised by objectors in the second consultation. Several objectors stated a view that the amendments to the scheme did not sufficiently address their initial concerns regarding privacy, parking and other planning issues, as set out below.

7 The objections received in the second round of consultation related to:

- The lack of a link between to the re-provided workspace and the residential development.
- The bulk and scale of proposal
- Loss of day/sunlight to adjoining properties
- A reduction in outlook to adjoining properties
- Size of proposed windows and loss of privacy to adjoining properties

- Parking stress in the local area and the lack of on-site parking provided
- That the development would be out of character with area

8 The issues above have all previously been addressed in the committee report. Officers are also satisfied the impacts of the amended scheme on the amenity of adjoining occupiers has also been addressed. For member's reference, the table setting out where the material issues are considered in the committee report is Table 4.4.1 (Objections) in Section 4. The recommendation to grant planning permission subject to conditions the remains unchanged.

9 Objections in the second round of consultation also noted concerns regarding the viability of the artistic community in the area, although this is not a material planning consideration.

10 An objector also submitted annotated plans and 3D images of the scheme showing the relationship between the amended scheme and adjoining development. Officers have reviewed these submissions in detail.

Objector Request to Use Virtual Reality (VR) Goggles

11 An objector has requested that committee have the opportunity to use VR goggle to view the impacts of the scheme. Officers have discussed the issue with the objector. The Head of Development Management has confirmed the use of VR goggles at committee cannot be permitted, as officers and members would be unable to verify the accuracy of the imagery being provided and the equipment would only usable by one person at a time, which would unreasonably delay the meeting. Members of the public attending the meeting would also be unable to see the images.

12 Officers are satisfied the impacts of the proposal can be fully considered by members from the assessment in the committee report and the officer presentation. The method of presenting or conveying objections to committee is not a material planning consideration and should not be taken into account when coming to decision on the planning merit of the scheme.

Accepting Objections after Report Publication

13 Members should note that as per the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) Lewisham will, in any circumstance, accept and consider objections following the publication of the committee report and up to the evening of committee.

14 Local Meeting Requirement

15 A local meeting is not required for the scheme based on the criteria in Lewisham's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). The total number of objections remains below 10 and the total number of individual and cumulative petition signatories remains below 25. There is no 'call in' request from a Councillor or an amenity society. Therefore the scheme is not required to be considered at a local meeting.

Revised Conditions

16 In response to representations regarding the privacy and following further discussion with the applicant, the following additional conditions are

recommended for insertion following Condition 9. The conditions will ensure amenity to adjoining occupiers is not unduly impacted.

- *Condition 10 – Stairwell Privacy Screening*

Prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved details of privacy screening to the external roof area stairwell shall be submitted in writing to and for approval by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall be implemented as approved and maintained for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: to protect the amenity adjoining occupiers.

- *Condition 11 – Obscure Glazing – Flat 1*

Notwithstanding any plan or drawing hereby approved, the window to the study room in Flat 1 on as shown on Plan P-01-D-014 – REV C shall be obscure glazed. This obscure glazing shall be maintained for the lifetime of the development.

Reason: to protect the amenity adjoining occupiers.

Minor Corrections to Report

- 17 Paragraph 37 cites London Plan Policy 4.4 (Managing Industrial Land Premises). This policy is reference in error and is not relevant to the application as the Havelock Walk area is not protected industrial land. This is a typographical error and does not impact any planning issues.
- 18 The head of the report notes the site is PTAL 4 whereas paragraph 6 notes the site to have a PTAL of 5. This site has a PTAL of 5 based on an assessment by officers using Transport for London's website. In any event, the site has excellent access to public transportation (including Forest Hill Rail Station) and the site is suitable for car-free development subject to condition.
- 19 Paragraph 51 makes reference to Draft London Plan Policy "D1(8)". This should read "D1B(7)". This is a typographical error. Dwelling units are required to achieve appropriate outlook, privacy and amenity in both the adopted and draft versions of the London Plan. The consolidated suggested changes version of the draft London Plan was published in July 2019 following an Examination in Public. The plan does not yet have full weight but can be given moderate weight by the decision maker given its progression in the plan making process.
- 20 Paragraph 49 of the report notes that Unit 3 lacks an amenity area. This version of the report was not updated following the amendments to the scheme. Both Unit 1 and Unit 3 do not have private external amenity space, as the second floor amenity area at the front of the building has been deleted. However, as noted in the report, there is policy flexibility to allow for situations where site constraints prevent external amenity from being delivered, provided the units exceed the London Plan space standard by an equivalent amount.
- 21 Both units 1 and 3 exceed the London Plan space standard for a 1B1P unit. Officers also consider this situation acceptable as the removal of the amenity space at the front of the building has significantly improved the inter-looking concerns and, more significantly, the proposal benefits from a high quality communal external roof top amenity area that is spilt between only 4 units.

Therefore on balance the lack of private external amenity space to Units 1 and 3 is acceptable and the proposal is considered to provide an satisfactory level of accommodation.

Clarification – Inter-looking between units

22 For clarity, it is not the officer position that no inter-looking will arise between the units and the properties on east side of Havelock Walk (as suggested by some objections) but that amendments to the scheme have sought to minimise and limit the inter-looking that may occur with the re-sizing and placement of the windows at second floor level. The report is clear at Paragraph 91 that due to the narrowness of Havelock Walk, there is an established sense of enclosure and the amenity impacts are acceptable in planning terms, as is set out in Paragraph 103.

3 ITEMS 3, 5 and 6

23 There were no additional updates for these items.