

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE C

Tuesday, 18 November 2014 at 7.30 pm

PRESENT: Councillors Paul Bell (Chair), Suzannah Clarke (Vice-Chair), Maja Hilton, Simon Hooks, Ami Ibitson, Helen Klier, Olurotimi Ogunbadewa, John Paschoud and Jonathan Slater

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor Stella Jeffrey

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor John Coughlin

1. Declarations of Interests

1. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

No interests were declared

2. Minutes

2. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 28 August 2014 were accepted as a true record and signed by the Chair.

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 October 2014 were not signed. It was asked that they be amended to reflect that Councillor Hilton had voted against the motion to defer determination of the proposal for 79 Culverley Road SE6 2LD (Item 5 on the Agenda)

3. Grove Park Railway Station, Baring Road SE12

3. GROVE PARK RAILWAY STATION, BARING ROAD SE12

The Planning Officer reported that the Planning Department had consulted with network Rail on alternative proposals set forward by local residents as resolved at the meeting held on 17 July 2014. Network Rail had however written to withdraw the application in a letter dated 22 September 2014, as they were unable to deliver the project within the agreed funding and timescales. They advised that the Department for Transport might wish to re-visit the proposal as part of the current funding period, which will run to April 2019 and would need to be confident of a successful outcome.

Councillor Clarke asked members to note that the report inaccurately states that Grove Park Station was inaccessible. She said only the furthest platform to the entrance was inaccessible, and asked that

Network Rail have an independent feasibility study done before the proposal was represented.

Councillor Ogunbadewa was concerned that the deferral and subsequent withdrawal of the application had adverse consequences for residents in his ward who used the station.

Councillor Bell (Chair) asked that the Transport Liaison Committee be asked to assess the proposal prior to future presentation at Committee while Councillor Paschoud asked that it also be looked at by the Transport Liaison Strategic Committee.

4. Brockley Police Station, Howson Road SE4 2AS

4. BROCKLEY POLICE STATION, 4 HOWSON ROAD, LONDON, SE4 2AS (Item 4 on the Agenda)

The Planning Officer outlined the details of the proposal for alterations and conversion of the former Police Station into 4 self contained dwellings together with the construction of 5 two storey terraced houses fronting Kneller Road with provision of associated refuse store/ bicycle storage and associated landscaping.

The Committee received verbal representation from Mr Mark Pender, the applicant's agent, who said that the applicant had sought pre-application advice and consulted local neighbours whose views had been taken into consideration in designing the proposal. He asked that planning permission be granted.

The Committee received verbal representation from a resident of Howson Road who objected to the proposal. She said the development had no provision for parking. She also said that the buildings were out of character with the streetscene and that it would be better if the proposed buildings matched the existing.

Following deliberation, Councillor Paschoud moved the motion to accept the officer's recommendation and grant planning permission subject to conditions. The motion was seconded by Councillor Ibitson.

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Councillors Hooks, Ibitson, Klier, Ogunbadewa, John Paschoud, Slater.

AGAINST: Councillor Paul Bell (Chair), Hilton, Clarke (Vice-Chair).

RESOLVED: that PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED in respect to planning application DC/14/88272, subject to conditions as stated in the report:

5. 79 Culverley Road SE6 2LD

5. 79 CULVERLEY ROAD, LONDON, SE6 2LD (Item 5 on the Agenda)

The Planning Officer outlined the details of the proposal for the construction of three dormer windows to the rear roof slope, the installation of one conservation roof light to the side roof slope together with a new window to the front facing gable end. He mentioned that Members had on 9 October 2014 resolved to defer determination of the application in order for further information to be provided by Officers with regard to precedents of gable end windows (historic and recent) within the street and the surrounding Conservation Area.

The Conservation Officer said there was increasing concern regarding the proliferation of rooflights as they damaged the character of the Conservation Area. She showed examples of gable end windows and mentioned that an additional window to the front elevation of the building - where the presence of window openings is wholly established – would not appear out of place nor detrimental to the appearance of the host building and the surrounding conservation area.

The Committee received verbal representation from Diana Cushing, secretary of the Culverley Green Conservation Area, who objected to the proposal. She said the gable end window ruined the symmetry and architectural cohesiveness of the Edwardian buildings in the conservation area and rooflights would be preferable. She asked members to refuse the proposal.

Following deliberation Councillor Paschoud moved the motion to accept the officer's recommendation and grant planning permission subject to conditions. The motion was seconded by Councillor Hooks.

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Councillors Clarke (Vice-Chair), Hilton, Hooks, Ibitson, Klier, Ogunbadewa, John Paschoud, Slater.

ABSTAINED: Councillor Paul Bell (Chair),

RESOLVED: that PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED in respect to planning application DC/14/87984, subject to conditions as stated in the report.

6. **3A Eliot Park SE13 7EG**

6. 3A ELIOT PARK, LONDON, SE13 7EG (Item 6 on the Agenda)

Councillor Bell (Chair) informed Members that this item had been withdrawn prior to the meeting and will therefore not be considered.

7. **41 Gellatly Road SE14 5TU**

7. 41 GELLATLY ROAD, LONDON, SE14 5TU (Item 3 on the Agenda)

The Planning Officer outlined the details of the proposal for the construction of a two single storey extension to the rear. She mentioned that the proposed development was not visible from the public realm.

The Committee received verbal representation from Mr M Bacchus, Chair of the Telegraph Hill Society. He was pleased the initial proposal had been revised, but was saddened by the loss of the bay window as they were a rare feature in the area. He was also concerned the rooflights would negatively affect the upper floors of the property contrary to UDP Policy HSG 12 Residential Amenities.

Following deliberation, during which Councillor Klier left the room and took no part in the further deliberation of this item, Councillor Clarke moved the motion to reject the Officer's recommendation and refuse permission on the grounds that the proposal was overbearing on neighbouring properties, unsuitable for future occupants and presented an unacceptable level of light overspill from the rooflights. The motion was seconded by Councillor Bell.

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Councillor Paul Bell (Chair), Hilton, Clarke (Vice-Chair).
Ibitson, John Paschoud

AGAINST: Councillors Hooks, Slater. Ogunbadewa

RESOLVED: that planning permission be Refused in respect to planning application DC/14/87791, for the following reasons:

The proposed side extension, by reason of its height, depth and location would result in an overbearing, visually intrusive and bulky form of development for the neighbouring property at No. 39 Gellatly Road, resulting in an increased sense of enclosure. It is therefore contrary to saved Policies HSG4 and HSG 12 Residential Extensions of the adopted Unitary Development Plan (July 2004) and emerging DM Policy 31 Alterations and Extensions to existing buildings including residential extensions of the Development Management Local Plan Post Examination Modifications (June 2014).

The proposed courtyard, by reason of its small size and location would result in a poor outlook and level of light to the rear window of No. 41 Gellatly Road resulting in an unacceptable residential environment for future occupiers. It is therefore contrary to saved Policy HSG 12 Residential Extensions of the adopted Unitary Development Plan (July 2004) and emerging DM Policy

31 Alterations and Extensions to existing buildings including residential extensions of the Development Management Local Plan Post Examination Modifications (June 2014).

The proposed roof lights, by reason of their size and location would result in an unacceptable level of light overspill and consequent negative impact on the residential amenities of the occupiers of the upstairs flat at no. 41 Gellatly Road. It is therefore contrary to saved Policy HSG 12 Residential Extensions of the adopted Unitary Development Plan (July 2004) and emerging DM Policy 31 Alterations and Extensions to existing buildings including residential extensions of the Development Management Local Plan Post Examination Modifications (April 2014).

8. 4 Leathwell Road SE8 4JL

8. 4 LEATHWELL ROAD, DEPTFORD SE8 4JL (Item 3 on the Agenda)

The Planning Officer outlined the details of the proposal for the construction of a mansard roof extension, incorporating two dormer windows to the front and dormer window and French doors with Juliette balcony to the rear roof slopes.

The Committee received verbal representation from Mr Waite, the applicant, who said the proposed development was intended for the use of his growing family. He said the photographs shown in the Planning Officer's presentation were out of date, and presented photographs which he claimed were more recent and which showed similar development as what proposed. He disagreed that the proposed materials were of poor quality but was willing to accept a condition requiring the submission of materials to be used.

Councillor Jeffrey spoke Under Standing Orders as a Ward Member in support of the application. She said she had asked that the proposal be brought to committee because similar proposals were not being determined consistently. She said neighbours were in support of the proposal and had written in to say so. She read the following comments made by Councillor Phoenix as recorded in the minutes of Planning Committee B held on 20 September 2007:

“She considered the proposed extension to blend in well with the surroundings and felt that it would encourage similar development of the terrace, creating a row of such extensions, which she envisaged would be better. The aesthetics worked well and the extension made little difference, especially compared with large unattractive developments in the area, which had far greater impact. She also expressed her concern that recent increases in house prices and the lack of family accommodation had made it much more difficult for

couples to have families and remain in London, within their communities.”

Upon deliberation, whereby the Legal Officer reminded Members that the proposal to be determined was as stated in the report, Councillor John Paschoud moved the motion to defer decision of the application to allow officers and applicant to agree a proposal that meets London Plan room sizes and materials. The motion was seconded by Councillor Hilton.

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Councillors Paul Bell (Chair), Clarke (Vice-Chair), Hilton, Hooks, Ibitson, Klier, Ogunbadewa, John Paschoud, Slater.

RESOLVED: that planning permission be deferred in respect to planning application DC/14/89216, to enable the Planning Officer and the applicant to agree a proposal that meets room sizes as recommended in the London Plan, and agree the materials to be used.

Note: Councillor Clarke asked that up to date photographs be made available when the proposal is returned to Committee.

The meeting ended at 9:15pm

Chair

15 January 2015