

PLANNING COMMITTEE B

Date of Meeting: **THURSDAY, 17 AUGUST 2017 TIME 7.30 PM**

PLACE: **COMMITTEE ROOMS 1 & 2 - CIVIC SUITE**

Members of the Committee are summoned to attend this meeting:

**Membership
Councillors:**

**Joan Reid (Chair)
Olurotimi Ogunbadewa (Vice-Chair)
Mark Ingleby
Jim Mallory
Hilary Moore
John Muldoon
Gareth Siddorn
Susan Wise
Sophie McGeevor
Maja Hilton**

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.

**Barry Quirk
Chief Executive
Lewisham Town Hall
London SE6 4RU
Date: Tuesday, 8 August 2017**

**For further information please contact:
Andrew Harris Committee Co-ordinator
3rd Floor Laurence House
Catford Road SE6 4RU**

**Telephone No: 0208 314 2566
Email: planning@lewisham.gov.uk**



RECORDING AND USE OF SOCIAL MEDIA

You are welcome to record any part of any Council meeting that is open to the public.

The Council cannot guarantee that anyone present at a meeting will not be filmed or recorded by anyone who may then use your image or sound recording.

If you are intending to audio record or film this meeting, you must :

- tell the clerk to the meeting before the meeting starts
- only focus cameras / recordings on councillors, Council officers, and those members of the public who are participating in the conduct of the meeting and avoid other areas of the room, particularly where non-participating members of the public may be sitting.
- ensure that you never leave your recording equipment unattended in the meeting room.

If recording causes a disturbance or undermines the proper conduct of the meeting, then the Chair of the meeting may decide to stop the recording. In such circumstances, the decision of the Chair shall be final.

Order Of Business			
Item No	Title of Report	Ward	Page No.
1.	Declarations of Interests		1 - 4
2.	Minutes		5 - 10
3.	54 CHINBROOK ROAD, LONDON, SE12 9TH	Grove Park	11 - 50
4.	36 VICARS HILL, LONDON, SE13 7JL	Ladywell	51 - 60
5.	50 ST GERMAN'S ROAD, LONDON, SE23 1RX	Crofton Park	61 - 76

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee	PLANNING COMMITTEE (B)	
Report Title	DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS	
Class	PART 1	Date: 17 AUGUST 2017

Members are asked to declare any personal interest they have in any item on the agenda.

(1) Personal interests

There are three types of personal interest referred to in the Council's Member Code of Conduct :-

- (a) Disclosable pecuniary interests
- (b) Other registerable interests
- (c) Non-registerable interests

(2) Disclosable pecuniary interests are defined by regulation as:-

- (a) Employment, trade, profession or vocation of a relevant person* for profit or gain.
- (b) Sponsorship –payment or provision of any other financial benefit (other than by the Council) within the 12 months prior to giving notice for inclusion in the register in respect of expenses incurred by you in carrying out duties as a member or towards your election expenses (including payment or financial benefit from a Trade Union).
- (c) Undischarged contracts between a relevant person* (or a firm in which they are a partner or a body corporate in which they are a director, or in the securities of which they have a beneficial interest) and the Council for goods, services or works.
- (d) Beneficial interests in land in the borough.
- (e) Licence to occupy land in the borough for one month or more.
- (f) Corporate tenancies – any tenancy, where to the member's knowledge, the Council is landlord and the tenant is a firm in which the relevant person* is a partner, a body corporate in which they are a director, or in the securities of which they have a beneficial interest.
- (g) Beneficial interest in securities of a body where:-
 - (a) that body to the member's knowledge has a place of business or land in the borough; and
 - (b) either
 - (i) the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or 1/100 of the total issued share capital of that body; or

- (ii) if the share capital of that body is of more than one class, the total nominal value of the shares of any one class in which the relevant person* has a beneficial interest exceeds 1/100 of the total issued share capital of that class.

*A relevant person is the member, their spouse or civil partner, or a person with whom they live as spouse or civil partner.

(3) Other registerable interests

The Lewisham Member Code of Conduct requires members also to register the following interests:-

- (a) Membership or position of control or management in a body to which you were appointed or nominated by the Council;
- (b) Any body exercising functions of a public nature or directed to charitable purposes, or whose principal purposes include the influence of public opinion or policy, including any political party;
- (c) Any person from whom you have received a gift or hospitality with an estimated value of at least £25.

(4) Non registerable interests

Occasions may arise when a matter under consideration would or would be likely to affect the wellbeing of a member, their family, friend or close associate more than it would affect the wellbeing of those in the local area generally, but which is not required to be registered in the Register of Members' Interests (for example a matter concerning the closure of a school at which a Member's child attends).

(5) Declaration and Impact of interest on member's participation

- (a) Where a member has any registerable interest in a matter and they are present at a meeting at which that matter is to be discussed, they must declare the nature of the interest at the earliest opportunity and in any event before the matter is considered. The declaration will be recorded in the minutes of the meeting. If the matter is a disclosable pecuniary interest the member must take no part in consideration of the matter and withdraw from the room before it is considered. They must not seek improperly to influence the decision in any way. **Failure to declare such an interest which has not already been entered in the Register of Members' Interests, or participation where such an interest exists, is liable to prosecution and on conviction carries a fine of up to £5000**
- (b) Where a member has a registerable interest which falls short of a disclosable pecuniary interest they must still declare the nature of the interest to the meeting at the earliest opportunity and in any event before the matter is considered, but they may stay in the room, participate in consideration of the matter and vote on it unless paragraph (c) below applies.

- (c) Where a member has a registerable interest which falls short of a disclosable pecuniary interest, the member must consider whether a reasonable member of the public in possession of the facts would think that their interest is so significant that it would be likely to impair the member's judgement of the public interest. If so, the member must withdraw and take no part in consideration of the matter nor seek to influence the outcome improperly.
- (d) If a non-registerable interest arises which affects the wellbeing of a member, their, family, friend or close associate more than it would affect those in the local area generally, then the provisions relating to the declarations of interest and withdrawal apply as if it were a registerable interest.
- (e) Decisions relating to declarations of interests are for the member's personal judgement, though in cases of doubt they may wish to seek the advice of the Monitoring Officer.

(6) Sensitive information

There are special provisions relating to sensitive interests. These are interests the disclosure of which would be likely to expose the member to risk of violence or intimidation where the Monitoring Officer has agreed that such interest need not be registered. Members with such an interest are referred to the Code and advised to seek advice from the Monitoring Officer in advance.

(7) Exempt categories

There are exemptions to these provisions allowing members to participate in decisions notwithstanding interests that would otherwise prevent them doing so. These include:-

- (a) Housing – holding a tenancy or lease with the Council unless the matter relates to your particular tenancy or lease; (subject to arrears exception);
- (b) School meals, school transport and travelling expenses; if you are a parent or guardian of a child in full time education, or a school governor unless the matter relates particularly to the school your child attends or of which you are a governor;
- (c) Statutory sick pay; if you are in receipt;
- (d) Allowances, payment or indemnity for members;
- (e) Ceremonial honours for members;
- (f) Setting Council Tax or precept (subject to arrears exception).

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee	PLANNING COMMITTEE (B)	
Report Title	MINUTES	
Ward		
Contributors		
Class	PART 1	Date: 17TH AUGUST 1017

MINUTES

To approve the minutes of the meeting of Planning Committee (B) held on the 6th July 2017.

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

MINUTES of the meeting of the PLANNING COMMITTEE (B) held in THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, LEWISHAM TOWN HALL, CATFORD SE6 on 6th April 2017 at 7:30PM.

PRESENT:

Councillors: Reid (Chair), Ogunbadewa (Vice-Chair), Mallory, Moore, Muldoon, Siddorn, Wise, McGeevor

OFFICERS: Max Smith - Planning Service, Paula Young - Legal Services, Andrew Harris - Committee Co-ordinator.

APOLOGIES: Ingleby, Hilton

1. MINUTES

Councillor Reid (Chair), asked if Members agreed that the Minutes of the Planning Committee (B) meeting held on 25th May 2017 were a true and accurate record. Councillor Siddorn noted that his apologies had not been recorded.

2. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

There were no Declaration of Interests at the start of the meeting.

During the meeting Councillor McGeevor stated that she lived close to 101 Manor Avenue and that she would abstain from voting for this reason.

3. 1 Dacre Place

The Planning Officer Max Smith outlined the details of the case to Members, who sought clarification over the height and massing of the proposed new building. The Planning Officer Max Smith directed members to paragraph 6.15 of the Officer's report which showed a comparison diagram.

Councillor McGeevor arrived at 19:40.

The committee received verbal representation from Mr Simon Boobyer (agent). Mr Boobyer outlined to Members that the application had been previously submitted, but was withdrawn and had been amended multiple times through pre-application advice with Officers. He stated that the current application was now in line with council policy and had addressed issues of overlooking. He went on to state that there would be no overshadowing as a result of the development and that there would be no negative impact on the street scene.

The committee received verbal representation from Mrs E S Palmer of 121 Dacre Park and Ms Katherine Hardcastle of 117 Dacre Park. Mrs Palmer outlined concerns regarding loss of privacy, loss of light, as well as inaccuracies and omissions within the Officer's report. Ms Hardcastle then raised concerns regarding overlooking, loss of light, and impacts on 117 Dacre Place which is a listed building. She went on to state that the application had already been rejected once and that the previous issues had not been addressed.

Members then sought clarification regarding the extent of overlooking and loss of light. The Planning Officer Max Smith outlined to members that there is existing overlooking on the site and that obscured windows had been incorporated to lessen the impact. He also confirmed the distances from the objector's windows and that the overlooking would be to the rear of the neighbouring garden. He went on to state that the listed building at 117 Dacre Place was a significant distance away from the proposed development and would therefore be unaffected by its construction. He continued that the existing building did not contribute to the streetscene and that the proposed was an improvement.

Members sought further clarification over the proposed distances, with Councillor Mallory stating that the wording of the report was misleading.

Councillor Wise stated that while the objection from 117 raised loss of light as a concern, she could not see how this would occur. The Planning Officer Max Smith confirmed that as the application site was to the North of No.117, there would be no overshadowing to the neighbouring site as a result of the development.

Councillor Reid (Chair) and Siddorn then discussed the definition of overlooking and whether it had been accurately reflected in the Officer's report. The Planning Officer Max Smith clarified and stated that the report was accurate while showing pictures of the site.

Councillor Mallory added that a clarification of 'overhang' within the report would have been made it clearer.

Councillor Ogunbadewa moved a motion to accept the Officer's recommendation, subject to conditions. It was seconded by Councillor Wise.

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Councillors Reid (Chair), Ogunbadewa (Vice-Chair), Siddorn, Moore, Wise, Mallory and Muldoon.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted in respect of application No. DC/16/095938, subject to the conditions outlined in the report.

4. Flat 2, 42 Cranfield Road

The Planning Officer Max Smith then outlined the details of the case.

The committee received verbal representation from Mr Simon Boobyer (agent). Mr Boobyer outlined to Members that the application had been previously submitted, but was withdrawn and had been amended multiple times through pre-application advice with Officers. He stated that the current application was now in line with council policy and had addressed issues of overlooking. He went on to state that there would be no overshadowing as a result of the development and that there would be no negative impact on the street scene.

Ms Beatrice Garnett (applicant).

The committee received verbal representation from Ms Beatrice Garnett (applicant). Ms Garnett outlined to members that the changes to the front elevation were traditional in style and would have little to no impact on the streetscene. The changes to the rear, while not traditional in nature, would not be more appropriate for use and would not be visible from the rear. She also highlighted other examples of similar developments within the rear.

No objectors were present. It was noted that the Brockley Society had withdrawn their objection.

Councillor Wise stated that the Article (4) was very confusing and that she was happy to support the application.

Councillor Reid (Chair) moved a motion to accept the Officer's recommendation, subject to conditions. It was seconded by Councillor Ogunbadewa (Vice-Chair).

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Councillors Reid (Chair), Ogunbadewa (Vice-Chair), Siddorn, Moore, Wise, Mallory, Muldoon and McGeevor.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted in respect of application No. DC/17/100686, subject to the conditions outlined in the report.

5. Flat 5, 101 Manor Avenue

Councillor McGeevor stated that she lived close to the application site and as such would abstain from the vote.

The Planning Officer Max Smith outlined details of the application to members. He stated that there had been two objections from the Brockley Society, both of which had been withdrawn.

No applicant or objectors were present at the meeting.

Councillor Muldoon moved a motion to accept the Officer's recommendation, subject to conditions. It was seconded by Councillor Moore.

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Councillors Reid (Chair), Ogunbadewa (Vice-Chair), Siddorn, Moore, Wise, Mallory and Muldoon.

ABSTAINED: McGeevor

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted in respect of application No. DC/16/98755, subject to the conditions outlined in the report.

6. 82A Upper Brockley Road

The Planning Officer Max Smith outlined details of the application to members. Councillor Reid (Chair) sought clarification over the principle of rooflights within conservation areas. The Planning Officer Max Smith stated that where they were resisted where there is an unaltered streetscene, or where they would impact the historic fabric of the host dwelling or those surrounding it. He added that they were more acceptable to the rear of properties and in this case the proposed would not be visible.

The committee received verbal representation from Ms Emma Bockhop (applicant) and Mr Bertino Ramirez. Ms Bockhop outlined to members that pre-application advice had been undertaken and subsequent changes made to the scheme as a result. She went on to state that she had met with the freeholders and neighbours, who had not objected to the scheme. Mr Bertino then stated to members that the applicant was the freeholder of the property. He then added that there was no legal internal daylight/sunlight requirement for residential extensions, and that the internal layout complied with the government's internal standards requirements. Finally he added that proposed treatments were due to site constraints and that it was similar to developments at other sites.

The committee received verbal representation from Ms Claire Cowan speaking on behalf of the Brockley Society. She stated that the proposed extension was not laid out well and that the daylight which would be provided was not adequate. She added that she wanted to enter into positive discussions with the applicant regarding the layout of the extension.

Following further deliberation between Members, Councillor Muldoon moved a motion to accept the Officer's recommendation, subject to conditions. It was seconded by Councillor Siddorn.

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Councillors Reid (Chair), Ogunbadewa (Vice-Chair), Siddorn, Moore, Wise, Mallory, Muldoon and McGeevor.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted in respect of application No. DC/16/100481, subject to the conditions outlined in the report.

7. 10A Wickham Road

The Planning Officer Max Smith outlined details of the application to members.

The committee received verbal representation from Mr Rahul Taheem (Agent). Mr Taheem outlined to members that several of the concerns which had been raised were not planning considerations and should be addressed at a later stage. He stated that the development would have an acceptable impact on design and neighbouring amenity, and that the

development complied with council policy. He added that the extension had a lowered boundary height and that the green roof improved the view for the flat above.

The committee received verbal representation from Mr Rob Pearson who has representing his daughter who lives at 10B Wickham Road and Mr Chris Johnson of 12 Wickham Road. Mr Pearson outlined concerns regarding loss of outlook, light spillage, freeholder objections and loss of amenity to the existing balcony. Mr Johnson outlined concerns regarding security and fire safety.

Councillor Reid (Chair) confirmed that only planning matters could be considered in the determination of the application, which in this instance were the impact in light and fire safety.

Councillor Mallory asked for confirmation that Building Control would conduct a site visit to inspect the structure. Paula Young (Legal Services) confirmed that the scheme would have to be approved by Building Control.

Councillor Wise sought clarification regarding the proposed green roof, to which the Planning Officer Max Smith confirmed that it would be a seeded roof.

Councillor Reid (Chair) commented that at 1m from the neighbouring window, the proposed rooflight was very close. The Planning Officer Max Smith stated that obscure glazing could be incorporated to lessen the impact of this. He added that the impact of the rooflight along was not considered adequate justification to refuse the application. Further discussion took place regarding the positioning of the proposed rooflight and ways in which the impact of light spillage could be mitigated.

Councillor Reid (Chair) sought clarification as to whether the existing balcony serving 10B would be removed as stated by the objector. The Planning Officer Max Smith confirmed that the balcony would remain unchanged as part of the development.

Following further deliberations between members, Councillor Ogunbadewa (Vice-Chair) moved a motion to approve the application but to add a condition to address light spillage. It was seconded by Councillor Muldoon.

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Councillors Reid (Chair), Ogunbadewa (Vice-Chair), Siddorn, Moore, Wise, Mallory and Muldoon.

ABSTAINED: McGeevor

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted in respect of application No. DC/17/100532, but with the addition of the following condition:

Prior to the commencement of development, details of measures to reduce light spillage from the rooflights (for instance, tinted glazing), shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The approved measures shall be implemented in full prior to the beneficial occupation of the extension hereby approved and retained as such in perpetuity.

Reason: To prevent light spillage from the rooflights from harming the amenities of residents of the flat above in accordance with DM Policy 31 (Alterations and extensions to existing

buildings including residential extensions) of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).

8. 2 Radlet Avenue

The Planning Officer Max Smith outlined details of the application to members.

The committee received verbal representation from Mr James Taylor (Applicant).

No objectors were present at the meeting.

Councillor Muldoon moved a motion to accept the Officer's recommendation, subject to conditions. It was seconded by Councillor Ogunbadewa (Vice-Chair).

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Councillors Reid (Chair), Ogunbadewa (Vice-Chair), Siddorn, Moore, Wise, Mallory, Muldoon and McGeevor.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted in respect of application No. DC/17/099905, subject to the conditions outlined in the report.

Committee	PLANNING COMMITTEE B	
Report Title	54 Chinbrook Road, Grove Park SE12	
Ward	Grove Park	
Contributors	Suzanne White	
Class	PART 1	17 August 2017

<u>Reg. Nos.</u>	DC/17/101268
<u>Application dated</u>	24.04.2017 [as revised on 04.08.17]
<u>Applicant</u>	Planning Co-operative on behalf of ICO Health Group
<u>Proposal</u>	Demolition of existing dwellinghouse at 54 Chinbrook Road, SE12 and the construction of a four storey building to provide a new Medical Centre (Use Class D1) containing 8 clinical rooms (six GP consulting rooms and two treatment rooms) and ancillary clinical, administrative and meeting space, together with the provision of car and cycle parking and landscaping.
<u>Applicant's Plan Nos.</u>	1124-SP-03; 1124-SP-01-(PL3); 1124-EX-01; 1124-EX-02; 1124-EX-03; 1124-EX-04; 1124-EX-05; 1124-EX-06; 1124-EX-06; 1124-GA-03-(PL8); 1124-GA-04-(PL8); 1124-GA-05-(PL8); 1124-GA-13; 1124-GA-06-(PL3); 1124-GA-07-(PL3); 1124-GA-08-(PL3); 1124-GA-09-(PL3); 1124-GA-10-(PL3); 1124-3D-02-(PL3); 1124-3D-03-(PL3); 1124-3D-04-(PL3);; 1124-WD-01; Materials Board; 17.2065.01.A; Transport Statement; Planning Statement; Public Consultation Statement; BREEAM Pre-Assessment Report; Tree Survey-Arbicultural Impact-Assessment; Secured By Design/Crime Prevention Note; Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (received 24th April 2017); Bat Report (Landscape Planning, June 2017) (received 3rd July 2017); Traffic Note (ADL, July 2017); 1124-SP-02-(PL8)-Proposed Site Plan (received 28th July 2017); 1124-3D-101-(PL3); 1124-3D-102-(PL3); 1124-GA-02-(PL9); 1124-GA-13-(PL9); 1124-SP-02-(PL8) (received 1 st August 2017); and 1124-GA-11-(PL4); 1124-GA-09-(PL4) (received 4 th August 2017)
<u>Background Papers</u>	(1) Case File LE/348/54/TP (2) Local Development Framework Documents (3) The London Plan
<u>Designation</u>	Undesignated Land Existing C3 Use

1.0 Background

- 1.1 The ICO Health Group consists of four practices located in the vicinity of the Grove Park area of Lewisham. The practices are:
- Boundfield Medical Centre, Boundfield Road SE6
 - Chinbrook Practice, 32 Chinbrook Road, SE12
 - Moorside Clinic (formerly Downham Way Practice), BR1
 - Marvels Lane Clinic, Marvels Lane SE12
- 1.2 The ICO group formed through merging of the four practices in January 2013. They propose to consolidate Boundfield, Chinbrook and Marvels Lane practices and part-consolidate Moorside practice into one new purpose built medical centre at No. 54 Chinbrook Road. The Chinbrook Practice, located at 32 Chinbrook Road (a former dwellinghouse 114m west of the application site) would close and the applicant states that it would revert to residential use.

2.0 Property/Site Description

- 2.1 The application site is located on a corner plot on the south-western side of the junction of Chinbrook and Amblecote Roads, and presently contains a three-storey, five-bedroom detached dwellinghouse. The site has two existing vehicular accesses, one from Chinbrook Road providing access to the front garden and parking area and one from Amblecote Road providing access to two garages.
- 2.2 The subject property is not located within a Conservation Area, nor is it subject to an Article 4 Direction. It is not a listed building, nor is it in proximity to any listed buildings.
- 2.3 The site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating of 4 (good), within a range of 1-6, where 6 is 'excellent'. Grove Park station is located 400 metres (a 5-minute walk) west of the site. Bus stops are located on both sides of Chinbrook Road, within approximately 40 metres of the subject site.
- 2.4 The surrounding area is residential, of predominantly two and three storey semi-detached and terraced housing, though there are elements of infill on Chinbrook Road of a larger scale and footprint. The surrounding residential development is in a variety of styles relating to the particular era in which development was built. Amblecote Road generally dates back to early 20th Century development, Chinbrook Road is from the interwar period and there is evidence of post war local authority development diagonally opposite the site and further up the street towards Baring Road.
- 2.5 The Quaggy River is located east of the site. The site is not located in an area at risk of flooding.

3.0 Planning History

- 3.1 A Certificate of Lawful Development was issued on 19 August 1993 for the use of the subject site for occasional respite care of up to two persons with learning difficulties.

4.0 Current Planning Application

The Proposals

- 4.1 The proposal involves the demolition of the existing three-storey, five bedroom dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) and outbuildings on the site, and construction of a part single/part two/part three/part four storey purpose built building to provide a new medical centre (Use Class D1).

- 4.2 The proposed building would contain 8 clinical rooms (six GP consulting rooms and two treatment rooms), together with ancillary clinical space, admin offices, staff areas and meeting rooms. It is expected that up to 11 medical staff (GPs/nurses) and 5 administrative staff would be on site at any given time i.e. 16 total.
- 4.3 It is proposed that the new building would consolidate existing GP surgeries at Boundfield Road, 32 Chinbrook Road and Marvels Lane and part-consolidate the Moorside Practice into one new purpose built medical facility.
- 4.4 The Design & Access Statement states that the new health centre would coordinate and complement the facilities at the Moorside Clinic. All 12,000 patients of the group are free to book and attend appointments at any of the four sites currently. Within the Grove Park Ward approximately 6,000 patients currently utilise services from Marvels Lane Clinic and Chinbrook Surgery.
- 4.5 The proposed building would be of part 3/4 storeys in height facing Chinbrook Road, with this mass focused largely on the footprint of the existing dwelling, though extending closer to the boundary with Amblecote Road. The three storey element would be adjacent to the neighbouring property at 52 Chinbrook Road, with the four storey element located closer to Amblecote Road and set back from the front and side. To the rear, the building would project at a height of two storeys along Amblecote Road, reducing to a single storey (3.6m in height) closest to the boundary with No. 52, from which it would be set back by 3.6m.
- 4.6 At ground floor level, the building would include a patient waiting room and reception, together with four GP consulting rooms, two treatment rooms and ancillary facilities including an admin office, interview room and storage etc.
- 4.7 On the first floor would be two further GP consulting rooms, a sub wait room, counselling room, GP hot desk room, clinical pharmacist room, trainee room and ancillary facilities. The second floor would contain mainly offices, together with a staff room, while the third floor would provide a library/study area, meeting room and IT room. A living roof would be installed on the single storey roof and PV panels on the two storey element.
- 4.8 The design is contemporary in appearance, incorporating flat roofs at each level and a curved wall as the building turns the corner between Chinbrook Road and Amblecote Road. It features full height glazing to the ground floor waiting room and third floor meeting room, facing brickwork in contrasting light and darker grey tones, marley eternit cladding to the two and three storey elements and aluminium framed windows throughout.
- 4.9 The proposals include three car parking spaces at the rear for clinical staff, utilising an existing crossover. Three car parking spaces would be provided for visitors at the front of the development, one of which would be for disabled users.
- 4.10 Parking and bin storage is located at the rear of the site, together with covered cycle parking for staff. Visitor cycle parking is provided within the forecourt, beside the main entrance.
- 4.11 Soft landscaping is proposed in the form of three trees, two at the front and one to the rear, together with hedgeplanting on the public boundaries and shrub planting in the front and rear parking areas, which would be finished in block paving.

5.0 Consultation

- 5.1 This section outlines the consultation carried out by the applicant prior to submission and by the Council following the submission of the application and summarises the responses received.

Pre-application consultation by applicant

5.2 The applicant submitted a Public Consultation Statement in support of the application. The pre-application consultation carried out by the applicant, as stated in this document, can be summarised as follows:

- questionnaire undertaken from January 2017 asking patients where they lived and how they travelled to the Chinbrook Surgery and Marvels Lane Medical Centre.
- 250 patients surveyed at the current Chinbrook Road Surgery. Of the 176 patients that responded over 89% supported the provision of new services at an enlarged new medical centre (survey date not stated).
- public consultation event held on the 22nd March 2017. Invitations were sent to the Patient Partnership Group and 50 Neighbours. Illustrative material, including a CGI of the proposed design at that point, was also circulated. 22 people attended the public consultation meeting. 7 people completed a comments sheet and an additional comment was e-mailed in later. The main themes raised were:
 - the design of the new medical centre
 - the proposed location of the medical centre considering alternatives
 - transport and car parking issues
 - residential amenity particularly for direct neighbours
- meeting of the Patient Participation Group held on the 28th March 2017
- meeting with the neighbours at 52 Chinbrook Road on the 20th of April

5.3 The statement summarises the issues raised during the consultation process and how the applicant has sought to address these in the submitted application.

Post-submission consultation by Council

5.4 The Council's consultation exceeded the minimum statutory requirements and those required by the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement.

5.5 Site notices were displayed and letters were sent to residents and businesses in the surrounding area and the ward Councillors.

Written Responses received from Local Residents and Organisations

5.6 In response to consultation, 36 objections and 9 letters of support were received.

5.7 The following planning concerns raised by objectors are summarised as follows:

- Impact on parking locally, particularly Amblecote Road and Luffmann Road (which is on the edge of the CPZ and already experiencing pressure)
- Inadequate parking provided on site
- Construction impacts, including heavy vehicles
- Lack of consultation
- Traffic safety concerns: Chinbrook Road very busy and site is on a junction plus increased vehicle manoeuvres on Amblecote Road, potentially affecting users of Chinbrook Meadows.
- Building too large and out of character with the area
- Loss of attractive, family house

- General noise and disturbance from high patient numbers
- Loss of daylight to 52 Chinbrook Road
- Loss of trees and wildlife habitat
- Drainage issues
- Concern that this application could set a precedent for houses to be demolished in place of flats
- Vehicles will need to turn around in Amblecote Road and facilities should be provided for this
- Proposal will remove the mature planting on the site
- Increased air pollution from traffic and tree removal

5.8 Comments of support are summarised as follows:

- Would provide much needed, fit for purpose GP facilities.
- Will provide disabled access and parking, which are not available at the existing surgery at 32 Chinbrook Road
- 32 Chinbrook Road surgery is outdated and cramped
- GP surgery supports local businesses, particularly pharmacies
- NHS considers existing premises unsatisfactory and will close them
- Consultation meetings well publicised
- Due to the nature of the public meetings, the results of the technical assessments undertaken did not come across fully

Local Meeting

5.9 The Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) requires that a local meeting be offered to those who have made representations and the applicant at least two weeks prior to a decision being made on a planning application, in the following circumstances:

- where one or more objection(s) have been received from a residents' association, community/amenity group or ward Councillor; and/or
- where a petition is received containing more than 25 signatures; and/or
- where 10 or more individual written objections are received from different residents.

5.10 As more than 10 objections were received, a Local Meeting was held on 19th June 2017. It was attended by approximately 50 local residents (41 signed attendance sheet), all ward councillors and Heidi Alexander. Representatives of the local NHS Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) also attended and confirmed their support for the proposals. The general consensus at the meeting was that a new GP surgery is needed in Grove Park, however the majority of attendees at the meeting expressed concern about the proposed site due mainly to parking generation issues.

5.11 The minutes of the Local Meeting are attached in full as Appendix A to this report.

Written Responses received from Statutory Agencies

Highways and Transportation

5.12 The site is well located in terms of proximity to bus stops and Grove Park Station, and the parking survey within the Transport Statement does identify that there is some on-street capacity within the surrounding CPZ (in Amblecote Road) to accommodate the parking demand generated by the proposal.

5.13 The parking survey does highlight that there is on-street parking stress in Luffman Road which doesn't benefit from being in the Grove Park CPZ and the proposal does have the potential to exacerbate the situation, particularly during the hours when the CPZ is in operation. In order to mitigate against the impact, the applicant would be required to make

a contribution towards consulting residents on extending the area of the CPZ to include Luffman Road.

- 5.14 As identified in the Transport Statement 66% of visitors to the site will travel to the site by sustainable modes of transport. The Transport Statement submitted with the application doesn't adequately assess the quality of the pedestrian environment in the vicinity of the site. Given the increase in the number of pedestrian and bus trips to the site, highways improvement works would be required to improve pedestrian and bus passengers accessibility to the site. So, the applicant should be required to contribute to securing improvements to crossing facilities in the vicinity of the site, including: providing an informal crossing facility on Chinbrook Road (a pedestrian refuge or road narrowing/build out) and entry treatment works on Amblecote Road (tactile paving) to improve pedestrian access to the site.
- 5.15 The applicant has since agreed to provide a financial contribution to deliver these works and the Council's Highways Officer has confirmed that the scheme is therefore acceptable in highways terms.

Ecological Regeneration Manager

- 5.16 No objection subject to the implementation of mitigation measures. These include the provision of artificial roosting features, the retention of as much landscaping as possible and keeping site lighting to a minimum.

Thames Water

- 5.17 No objection with regard to water and sewerage infrastructure capacity. With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. No piling should be permitted without provision and approval of a piling method statement.

Met Police

- 5.18 Have met with representatives of Alexander-Sedgley to discuss this scheme and provided site specific advice to them, following the guidelines contained within 'Secured by Design Guide for Commercial Developments, 2015'. Should this application proceed, there should be no reason why this development, should not be able to achieve the security requirements of Secured by Design with the guidance of Secured by Design Commercial Developments 2015 and with help and guidance from the South East Designing Out Crime Office. Further, I feel that the adoption of these standards will help to reduce the opportunity for crime, creating a safer, more secure and sustainable environment. Recommend that this is secured by condition.

6.0 Policy Context

Introduction

- 6.1 Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) sets out that in considering and determining applications for planning permission the local planning authority must have regard to:-
- (a) the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application,
 - (b) any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application, and
 - (c) any other material considerations.

A local finance consideration means:

- (a) a grant or other financial assistance that has been, or will or could be, provided to a relevant authority by a Minister of the Crown, or
- (b) sums that a relevant authority has received, or will or could receive, in payment of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

6.2 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) makes it clear that 'if regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise'. The development plan for Lewisham comprises the Core Strategy, the Development Management Local Plan, the Site Allocations Local Plan and the Lewisham Town Centre Local Plan, and the London Plan. The NPPF does not change the legal status of the development plan.

National Planning Policy Framework

6.3 The NPPF was published on 27 March 2012 and is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. It contains at paragraph 14, a 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. Annex 1 of the NPPF provides guidance on implementation of the NPPF. In summary, this states in paragraph 211, that policies in the development plan should not be considered out of date just because they were adopted prior to the publication of the NPPF. At paragraphs 214 and 215 guidance is given on the weight to be given to policies in the development plan. As the NPPF is now more than 12 months old paragraph 215 comes into effect. This states in part that '...due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with this framework (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given)'.

6.4 Officers have reviewed the Core Strategy for consistency with the NPPF and consider there is no issue of significant conflict. As such, full weight can be given to these policies in the decision making process in accordance with paragraphs 211, and 215 of the NPPF.

Other National Guidance

6.5 The other relevant national guidance is:

Design

Health and wellbeing

Planning obligations

Renewable and low carbon energy

Travel plans, transport assessments and statements in decision-taking

Use of Planning Conditions

London Plan (2016)

6.6 The London Plan policies relevant to this application are:

Policy 3.1 Ensuring equal life chances for all

Policy 3.2 Improving health and addressing health inequalities

Policy 3.14 Existing housing

Policy 3.15 Co-ordination of housing development and investment

Policy 3.16 Protection and enhancement of social infrastructure

Policy 3.17 Health and social care facilities

Policy 5.3 Sustainable design and construction

Policy 5.11 Green roofs and development site environs

Policy 5.13 Sustainable drainage
 Policy 5.18 Construction, excavation and demolition waste
 Policy 6.3 Assessing effects of development on transport capacity
 Policy 6.7 Better streets and surface transport
 Policy 6.9 Cycling
 Policy 6.10 Walking
 Policy 6.11 Smoothing traffic flow and tackling congestion
 Policy 6.12 Road network capacity
 Policy 6.13 Parking
 Policy 7.1 Building London's neighbourhoods and communities
 Policy 7.2 An inclusive environment
 Policy 7.3 Designing out crime
 Policy 7.4 Local character
 Policy 7.6 Architecture
 Policy 7.19 Biodiversity and access to nature
 Policy 8.2 Planning obligations
 Policy 8.3 Community infrastructure levy

London Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG)

6.7 The London Plan SPG's relevant to this application are:

Social Infrastructure (2015)
 Character and Context (2014)
 Accessible London: Achieving an Inclusive Environment (2014)
 Sustainable Design and Construction (2014)
 Planning for Equality and Diversity in London (2007)
 Control of dust and emissions from construction and demolition (2014)

Core Strategy

6.8 The Core Strategy was adopted by the Council at its meeting on 29 June 2011. The Core Strategy, together with the Site Allocations, the Lewisham Town Centre Local Plan, the Development Management Local Plan and the London Plan is the borough's statutory development plan. The following lists the relevant strategic objectives, spatial policies and cross cutting policies from the Lewisham Core Strategy as they relate to this application:

Spatial Policy 1 Lewisham Spatial Strategy
 Spatial Policy 5 Areas of Stability and Managed Change
 Core Strategy Policy 1 Housing provision, mix and affordability
 Core Strategy Policy 7 Climate change and adapting to the effects
 Core Strategy Policy 8 Sustainable design and construction and energy efficiency
 Core Strategy Policy 14 Sustainable movement and transport
 Core Strategy Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham
 Core Strategy Policy 19 Provision and maintenance of community and recreational facilities
 Core Strategy Policy 20 Delivering educational achievements, healthcare provision and promoting healthy lifestyles
 Core Strategy Policy 21 Planning obligations

Development Management Local Plan

6.9 The Development Management Local Plan was adopted by the Council at its meeting on 26 November 2014. The Development Management Local Plan, together with the Site Allocations, the Lewisham Town Centre Local Plan, the Core Strategy and the London Plan is the borough's statutory development plan. The following lists the relevant strategic

objectives, spatial policies and cross cutting policies from the Development Management Local Plan as they relate to this application:

6.10 The following policies are considered to be relevant to this application:

DM Policy 1	Presumption in favour of sustainable development
DM Policy 2	Prevention of loss of existing housing
DM Policy 22	Sustainable design and construction
DM Policy 23	Air quality
DM Policy 24	Biodiversity, living roofs and artificial playing pitches
DM Policy 25	Landscaping and trees
DM Policy 26	Noise and vibration
DM Policy 27	Lighting
DM Policy 28	Contaminated land
DM Policy 29	Car parking
DM Policy 30	Urban design and local character
DM Policy 41	Innovative community facility provision

Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (February 2015)

6.11 This document sets out guidance and standards relating to the provision of affordable housing within the Borough and provides detailed guidance on the likely type and quantum of financial obligations necessary to mitigate the impacts of different types of development.

7.0 Planning Considerations

7.1 The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:

- a) Principle of Development
- b) Design
- c) Highways and Traffic Issues
- d) Impact on Adjoining Properties
- e) Sustainability and Energy
- f) Ecology and Landscaping
- g) Planning Obligations

Principle of Development

7.2 The proposal involves the loss of an existing single-family dwelling house and in its place, a new building to provide a health care facility. The policies of the Local Plan generally discourage the loss of residential accommodation. Specifically, the Council's Development Management Local Plan (DMLP) DM Policy 2 sets out that the Council will only grant permission for the loss of housing where:

- the proposed redevelopment would result in housing gain which regenerate and replace older housing estates in line with an agreed plan or strategy.
- the land or premises are allocated for another use in an adopted Local Plan.
- a change of use to a local community service or facility is proposed that meets an identified need.
- an economic viability study confirms that the dwelling(s) cannot be rehabilitated to a satisfactory standard at reasonable cost.

- evidence shows that environmental problems are such that demolition and redevelopment is the only effective option.

- 7.3 A new health centre would constitute a local community service or facility and therefore the principle of the loss of housing on this site to accommodate this use would be acceptable in principle provided that it meets an identified need.
- 7.4 The submitted Design and Access Statement states that the ICO Group formed to help with a number of complex issues including the impending retirement of senior clinicians, inadequate premises and a number of relatively small patient list sizes which ran the risk of not being financially viable in the long term.
- 7.5 It is also stated that two other GP surgeries have closed within the area in recent years (Dr Sarker's & Dr Whitworth's), resulting in significant growth in the patient list sizes of Marvels Lane Clinic and Chinbrook Surgery leading to further strain on their existing, inadequate premises.
- 7.6 It is stated that, within the Grove Park Ward approximately 6,000 patients currently utilise services from Marvels Lane Clinic and Chinbrook Surgery. The practice merger and intended collaborative working has logistically posed difficulties for the overall Group e.g. Marvels Lane based patients need to go to Chinbrook for Child Health Checks, Chinbrook based patients go to Marvels Lane for Phlebotomy services.
- 7.7 The applicant states that a large proportion of Grove Park patients are forced to use Moorside Clinic due to lack of capacity at the other practices, which is evident from emergency appointments at the Grove Park locations filling up before those at Moorside. The proposal therefore seeks to 'balance' the Group's services according to patient need. The applicant estimates, based on the addresses of patients, that approximately 6,000 would favour the application site location, with the remainder opting for Moorside.
- 7.8 At present, 600 patients use the Boundfield Road site and it is only open Monday and Thursday from 8am-1pm. It is stated that many of these patients use Moorside and sometimes Marvels Lane and Chinbrook Road. Currently, the main administrative support and management base of the Group is located at Moorside Clinic. This is planned to move to the new health centre, freeing up space at Downham Health & Leisure Centre, which is recognised as a local hub, for more patient services to be developed.
- 7.9 It is further stated that it is financially not feasible for both Marvels Lane and Chinbrook Surgery to continue operating from separate sites, that both sites are inadequate for the future needs of primary care provision and neither site is suitable to accommodate the combined and growing patient lists. Specifically, the applicant states that it is extremely challenging to provide responsive healthcare to their patients when staff are spread across four sites. They state that both these premises are difficult to maintain and upgrade, and would not meet the requirements of the Care Quality Commission (CQC), particularly around infection control requirements. It is additionally noted that none of the three sites at Chinbrook Road, Marvels Lane and Boundfield Road operate 5 days a week.
- 7.10 The applicant also states that, any replacement premises for both the Chinbrook and Marvels Lane surgeries, would need to be equally accessible to both practice populations and would need to be within Grove Park Ward. At the local meeting it was stated that, since the ICO Health Group was formed, the practice has looked at 10 sites for potential consolidation, and this is the only one that was feasible and could be progressed to planning stage.
- 7.11 The applicant's Planning Statement sets out the need for the new health centre, stating that the new centre would be fit for purpose, and thereby able to provide significant health

benefits in the locality, helping to significantly improve health diagnostics and provide opportunities for new treatment pathways. The new medical centre would be fully wheelchair accessible, unlike existing provision. All clinical room spaces would be appropriately sized, with new up-to-date equipment and compliant with the latest NHS standards to allow for best clinical practice and help reduce patient infection risks.

- 7.12 At the local meeting the NHS Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) representative stated that the existing practice facilities were not fit for purpose and that the proposals have been through an approvals process to make sure that the building is the right size for the community. The applicant has also since confirmed that the CCG will no longer support the conversion of a dwelling and are seeking purpose built facilities for the delivery of healthcare.
- 7.13 Policy 3.17 of the London Plan 2016 states that the Mayor will support the provision of high quality health and social care appropriate for a growing and changing population, particularly in areas of underprovision or where there are particular needs. It goes on to state that development proposals which provide high quality health and social care facilities will be supported in areas of identified need, particularly in places easily accessible by public transport, cycling and walking.
- 7.14 Additionally, Policy 3.16, which relates more generally to social infrastructure, states that development proposals which provide high quality social infrastructure will be supported in light of local and strategic social infrastructure needs assessments and that facilities should be accessible to all sections of the community (including disabled and older people) and be located within easy reach by walking, cycling and public transport.
- 7.15 In terms of the Council's own policies, Core Strategy Objective 11: Community Well-being seeks to provide *'physical, social and green infrastructure, including high quality health and education facilities, that are accessible and suitable to all of Lewisham's residents, to foster independent community living.'* Core Strategy Policy 19 states that the Council will work with its partners to ensure a range of health and other facilities are provided, protected and enhanced across the borough. The Council will apply the London Plan policies to ensure that: the needs of current and future populations are sufficiently provided for; the preferred location for new uses will be in areas that are easily accessible and located within close proximity of public transport, services and town centres; and a safe and secure environment is created and maintained. In addition, Core Strategy Policy 20 states that the Council will work with its partners to improve health and promote healthy lifestyles across the borough by supporting the Lewisham University Hospital, health centres and GP surgeries.
- 7.16 The proposed location is considered to have good accessibility, indicated by its PTAL rating of 4, being located on bus routes and within walking distance of Grove Park Station and town centre. It is accepted that there is a need for enhanced health facilities in Grove Park and that the loss of the existing dwelling house to provide this facility is in line with policy DM2. Therefore, it is considered that the principle of development is acceptable, subject to the proposals meeting other policy requirements, particularly in respect of design, highways and traffic issues, impact on adjoining occupiers, sustainability, ecology and landscaping. These matters are considered in turn below.

Design

- 7.17 Urban design is a key consideration in the planning process. The NPPF makes it clear that national government places great importance on the design of the built environment. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people. The NPPF states that it is important to plan positively for the achievement of high quality and

inclusive design for all development, including individual buildings, public and private spaces and wider area development schemes.

- 7.18 The NPPF requires Local Planning Authorities to undertake a design critique of planning proposals to ensure that developments would function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development.
- 7.19 London Plan and Core Strategy design policies further reinforce the principles of the NPPF setting out a clear rationale for high quality urban design. Core Strategy Policy 15 states that the Council will apply national and regional policy and guidance to ensure the highest quality design and the protection or enhancement of the historic and natural environment, which is sustainable, accessible to all, optimises the potential of sites, is sensitive to the local context, and responds to local character. DM Policy 30 states that the Council will require all development proposals to attain a high standard of design. Therefore the Council sets a high standard of design within the Borough.

Layout, scale, massing and appearance

- 7.20 The proposals would replace the existing dwelling house with a building significantly larger in terms of both its scale and footprint. The scheme was subject to pre-application discussions with officers and the scale of the building was reduced during that process. The 3/4 storey element of the building would sit approximately in the same position as the existing dwelling on the plot. This mass would sit within the front and rear building lines of the existing dwelling, though extending to the side to bring the side building line closer to Amblecote Road. The fourth floor would be set back from both Chinbrook and Amblecote Roads and the building steps down to three storeys adjacent to 52 Chinbrook Road. By maintaining the front and rear building lines of the adjacent dwelling, the potential for the proposed building to have an overbearing impact on the adjoining occupier is reduced. A biodiverse living roof would extend over the single storey element of the building, helping to soften the appearance of the structure in views from the neighbouring dwelling.
- 7.21 The proposed building would then extend back to the rear at part single/part two storey scale, with the two storey element focused along the Amblecote Road boundary. The side building line is set in from the boundary, providing a landscaped buffer, which is important to integrate the scheme within the residential character of the area.
- 7.22 The proposed four storey height across a small portion of the building is considered to be appropriate on a corner site such as the subject site, particularly given the community function of the building and to add architectural interest in the streetscene. The building incorporates a curve as it 'turns' the corner which, together with the level of fenestration and use of a lightweight material on the set back top floor and two storey element to the rear, serves to 'break down' the apparent mass of the building and aid its integration with the scale of the surrounding residential dwellings.
- 7.23 The primary facing material would be brick of two contrasting grey tones. The proposed brick adjacent to No.52 Chinbrook Road would be a slightly darker multi grey brick to provide a sympathetic transition between the existing dwelling and the main curved corner feature of the new building, treated in a lighter grey brick. A Marley Eternit 'Vertigo' slate cladding is proposed to all the upper floor levels to suggest an element of roof rather than wall. Windows would be in aluminium/wood composite. Based on the details submitted, the proposed materials are considered to be of a high quality.

Landscape and boundary treatment

- 7.24 Greenery and vegetation in the form of lawn, shrubs and trees is an obvious character of the residential surroundings. Due to the larger building footprint proposed compared with the existing dwelling, a reduction in green space at the property would occur which has

the potential to detract from the character of the area. Officers therefore advised at pre-application stage that landscaping would be an important aspect of the design, fundamental to integrating the building within its setting, and that proposals would need to be developed to a detailed level alongside the building design.

- 7.25 As a principle, the design ensures that the existing significant mature tree located on the public footpath on Chinbrook Road is retained. Three new trees are proposed within the site, two to the entrance forecourt and one to the rear, on the Amblecote Road boundary. Hedge planting is proposed on the north, east and west boundaries, except where pedestrian or vehicular access is proposed. On the public boundaries, galvanised black vertical railings are also proposed. Existing boundary fencing adjoining neighbouring properties to the west and south would be retained.
- 7.26 Shrub planting is proposed within the entrance forecourt, rear parking area and on the boundary with 52 Chinbrook Road. All planting is stated as being native/semi-native species. Paving is proposed for the parking areas to the front and rear, with contrasting paving to demarcate the pedestrian access.
- 7.27 It is considered that the landscaping and boundary proposals would serve to continue the strong green edge on the Chinbrook and Amblecote Road frontages. The trees, hedges and shrub planting would soften the appearance of the building and provide a welcoming entrance. It is considered that the landscaping proposals are well considered, relate to the building and its context and are of a high quality. Details of the planting specification and materials, including permeability, should be required by condition.

Summary

- 7.28 Taking all of the above elements together, it is considered that the design constitutes a successful, contemporary response to the local context and ensures that, while the building would be prominent, it would not be overly dominant or incongruous in the streetscene.

Highways and Traffic Issues

- 7.29 Core Strategy Policy 14 'Sustainable movement and transport' supports government policy and guidance which promotes more sustainable transport choices through walking, cycling and public transport, adopting a restricted approach on parking to aid the promotion of sustainable transport and ensuring all new and existing development of a certain size have travel plans.

Highway impacts

- 7.30 The Transport Statement submitted with the application provides an assessment of the impact of the proposed health centre on traffic generation in the area. The assessment is based on the surgery being open between the hours of 8.00am and 6.30pm Monday to Friday. Although Saturday opening is not anticipated, it is nevertheless assessed in the report.
- 7.31 The Statement provides an estimate of the traffic generated by the proposed centre based on data for comparable facilities, by use and location in relation to public transport, using the TRAVL database. This enables an estimate of the number of patients visiting the proposed health centre according to the number of consulting, treatment and other rooms provided.
- 7.32 The Statement identifies that each consulting room would have 5 appointments per hour mostly with one patient. Allowing that one of those 5 is accompanied, there would be 6 visits per hour over 5.5 hours (the daily appointment window), resulting in 33 visits per

room per day. If all 6 rooms are being used at the same time - which it is stated would be unlikely to be the case very often – then it would be on average 36 patients/visitors per hour.

- 7.33 Two treatment rooms are proposed, with an average of 3 appointments. Allowing for one patient to be accompanied per hour, this would result in 22 visits per room per day. If both rooms are being used at the same time – which is likely to be the case on many days – then there would be on average 8 visits per hour.
- 7.34 With the exception of staff, the other rooms are mostly rooms that patients already visiting the practice would subsequently use e.g. the clinical pharmacist, interview and counselling rooms.
- 7.35 Out of the four existing GP practices which would be consolidated as part of the proposal, Chinbrook Practice is located nearby, 114m west of the proposed site location. Therefore, the ‘net’ increase in traffic on Chinbrook Road as a result of the proposed development has been calculated by discounting the traffic associated with the existing Chinbrook Practice (5 consulting rooms).
- 7.36 Based on the above, the Transport Statement calculates the net increase in vehicular traffic on Chinbrook Road and other streets in the vicinity of the site during the development peak hours (Monday to Friday). These are:
- AM Peak Hour: 10 two-way vehicle trips
 - PM Peak Hour: 9 two-way vehicle trips
- 7.37 The Transport Statement identifies that a maximum net increase of 10 two-way vehicle trips equates to one additional vehicle approximately every six minutes. The Saturday increase is higher, at 21 trips, though this does not coincide with the Saturday peak of 11-12 noon.
- 7.38 A maximum net increase in walking/public transport trips by 13 trips (two-way) is calculated to occur on Chinbrook Road and other streets in the vicinity of the site between the hours of 10:00 – 11:00 hours which equates to one additional walking/public transport trip approximately every five minutes.
- 7.39 These levels of increased vehicular and pedestrian/public transport trips are not considered to be significant.

Highway safety

- 7.40 Concern has been raised in consultation responses from residents relating to highway safety, particularly around the junctions of Chinbrook Road with Luffmann Road and Amblecote Road and with regard to additional vehicles using Amblecote Road.
- 7.41 The Transport Statement includes road traffic accident data for a three year period to the end of July 2016 in the vicinity of the site, obtained from TfL. This shows that a total of five accidents occurred during the study period. There were no pedestrians involved in the accidents.
- 7.42 Out of the five accidents, four occurred at the Chinbrook Road junction with Luffman Road and one occurred at the Chinbrook Road junction with Amblecote Road. The accidents at the Chinbrook Road junction with Luffman Road occurred as a result of vehicles exiting Luffman Road onto Chinbrook Road either without looking properly or disobeying the give-way road markings.

- 7.43 The accident at the Chinbrook Road junction with Amblecote Road occurred as a result of one vehicle rear shunting another vehicle which braked suddenly. The vehicle behind was reported to travel too fast for the conditions.
- 7.44 As such, the accident analysis shows that all the accidents within the vicinity of the site were the result of driver error. It is noted that the accidents recorded occurred prior to the introduction of the 20mph speed limit in the Borough in September 2016. TfL have confirmed that no additional accidents occurred in the vicinity up to November 2016, which is the most recent data available. The applicant states in their Traffic Note dated July 2017 that patients usually drive in and reverse out of the two parking spaces at the 32 Chinbrook Road surgery and that no accidents have been reported at or in close proximity to that site.
- 7.45 The Council's Highways Officer has advised that, based on the nature of the scheme and trip generation together with the mitigation proposed, the proposal would not give rise to concerns over highway safety.

Access

- 7.46 The existing site access arrangements (i.e. accesses on Chinbrook Road and Amblecote Road) will be retained as part of the proposals.
- 7.47 The site has a PTAL rating of 4 (good accessibility) and is located within 5 minutes walking distance of Grove Park Rail Station. Bus stops located within 40m on Chinbrook Road provide access via four bus routes to Downham, Catford, Lewisham and Bromley and other destinations.
- 7.48 The submitted Transport Statement identifies that 66% of visitors to the site will travel by sustainable modes of transport. Given the increase in the number of pedestrian and bus trips to the site, it is considered that highways improvement works are necessary to improve pedestrian and bus passenger accessibility to the site, including the provision of an informal crossing facility on Chinbrook Road (a pedestrian refuge) and entry treatment works on Amblecote Road (tactile paving), to improve pedestrian access to the site. These works have been costed at £7,500, which the applicant has agreed to cover, and would be secured by legal agreement.

Cycle Parking

- 7.49 Cycle parking should be provided in line with London Plan Policy 6.9 Cycling and Table 6.3 Cycle Parking minimum standards.
- 7.50 The proposed facility is expected to have a maximum of 11 medical staff (GPs/Nurses) and up to five administrative staff at any given time i.e. total of 16 staff. The plans include six cycle parking spaces by the front entrance of the building for patients and four secure and dry spaces to the rear for the use of staff, which exceeds the London Plan cycle parking standards by two. In addition, staff shower/changing facilities and lockers are shown within the building.
- 7.51 This level of provision is considered good and is therefore acceptable.

Car Parking

- 7.52 The proposed plans have been amended in response to comments during the consultation process to show a total of six parking spaces. Three spaces at the front of the site, accessed from Chinbrook Road, would provide 1 disabled space and two regular spaces for visitors. To the rear, three spaces would be provided for staff, accessed from Amblecote Road. Previously, 5 spaces were shown in this location in a tandem

arrangement (one directly behind the other). However, on further review, the Council's Highways Officer advised that this would give rise to concern as it may involve a significant amount of vehicle reversing manoeuvres on Amblecote Road, which would increase the potential for conflict and could have highway safety implications.

- 7.53 Paragraph 39 of the NPPF advises that local authorities should, when setting local parking standards for residential and non-residential development, take into account:
- the accessibility of the development;
 - the type, mix and use of development;
 - the availability of and opportunities for public transport;
 - local car ownership levels; and
 - an overall need to reduce the use of high-emission vehicles.
- 7.54 Table 6.2 of The London Plan sets out maximum parking standards according to land use, however does not cover GP surgeries or health centres. Core Strategy Policy 14 adopts a managed and constrained approach to car parking provision in order to contribute to the objectives of traffic reduction and promotes the potential use of Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs), which may be required to prevent parking demand being displaced from the development onto the surrounding streets.
- 7.55 In determining the actual number of spaces to be provided, an appropriate balance needs to be struck between supporting new development and preventing excessive car parking provision that can undermine cycling, walking and public transport use. The site has good access to public transport, local shops and other services and the proposal includes cycle parking for visitors and staff in accordance with the London Plan requirements.
- 7.56 Parking surveys were undertaken to provide an accurate picture of existing parking pressure in the area. These were undertaken on the 25th March 2017 (Saturday) and 27th March 2017 (Monday) between the hours of 09:00 – 14:00 hours and 08:00 – 20:00 hours respectively. Concern was raised in consultation responses that the surveys took place during half term break. Having checked the term times for Lewisham Schools officers can confirm that the second half of the Spring term ran from 20th February to 31st March, therefore the midweek survey took place during term time and is robust.
- 7.57 There are six short term parking spaces (maximum 2 hour stay) located on the western side of Amblecote Road, adjacent to the application site. The parking survey within the submitted Transport Statement identifies that, during the proposed opening hours of the health centre, there is generally sufficient capacity in these bays in conjunction with the spaces provided on site, to accommodate the visitor parking demand generated by the proposal. The survey identified one 1-hour period (3-4pm) when there was a shortfall of one space midweek. The Saturday survey showed no shortfall. The Council's Highways Officer advised that the actual parking demand would be likely to vary from day-to-day and they were therefore comfortable with the theoretical shortfall of one car parking space given the general policy direction towards limiting car use.
- 7.58 The proposals provide 3 spaces for staff of the health centre, intended to be used by the GPs so that they can make home visits. According to the travel survey of staff, 47% travel by car. With a staff quota of 16, this would mean that 7.5 people travel by car, giving an overspill of 5 spaces. These staff would be unable to park on Amblecote Road given the CPZ and would need to park further afield or travel by other means. The applicant states that there are 2 parking spaces at the current 32 Chinbrook Road surgery, which are unallocated and used primarily by patients, therefore staff presently need to park off site. It is also stated that the existing Chinbrook Road does not provide staff cycle parking and so the provision of such facilities at the proposed site would be expected to lead to a reduction in the use by staff of cars to journey to/from work.

- 7.59 Concerns were raised by the Council's Highways Officer that the proposal may add to parking stress levels on Luffmann Road, which sits on the edge of the Grove Park CPZ. The proposal has the potential to exacerbate this situation, particularly during the hours when the CPZ is in operation. In order to mitigate against this impact, it is recommended that the applicant be required to make a financial contribution towards consulting residents on extending the area of the CPZ to include Luffman Road. The level of contribution required is £10,000, which the applicant has agreed to and would be secured via legal agreement.
- 7.60 In addition, the applicant has submitted a Framework Travel Plan aimed at increasing travel to the site by sustainable means, the implementation of which could be a condition of approval. On the basis of the proposed mitigation measures, the application proposals are considered to be acceptable with regard to transport and parking.

Refuse

- 7.61 Delivery and servicing of the proposed facility would match existing arrangements. The number of deliveries is anticipated to be low. Refuse and waste would be collected via on-street from Amblecote Road.

Summary

- 7.62 The Council's Highways Officer has advised that the proposal is acceptable in transport terms, subject to the mitigation specified in the form of contributions towards CPZ review and pedestrian environment improvements, as well as conditions in respect of implementation of a Travel Plan, provision of a construction logistics plan for approval, provision of parking spaces as proposed and details of cycle parking.

Impact on Adjoining Properties

- 7.63 Core Strategy Policy 15 requires that any adverse impact on neighbouring amenity arising from development proposals will need to be addressed.

Overbearing impact

- 7.64 As covered earlier in this report, it is considered that the scale and proportions of the proposed scheme are appropriate to the context of the site and would not give rise to an overbearing impact on neighbouring occupiers.

Privacy

- 7.65 There are no windows proposed in the first floor rear projection facing west and therefore no direct overlooking of the rear garden of No 52 would arise. The proposed building includes windows on the rear façade at first and second floor levels which face the rear of the application site, towards 125 Amblecote Road. At first floor level, whilst a degree of overlooking towards the rear garden of No 52 could arise from this part of the building, it would be at an oblique angle and similar to the present situation as the existing dwelling has a similar amount of fenestration at 1st floor level. At second level, the proposed building would introduce an additional window compared to the existing situation, which would be closer to the boundary with No 52. As this would give rise to an increase in overlooking, officers requested that it be obscure glazed and this is reflected in the current plans. There are no facing windows on the side elevation of 125 Amblecote Road and therefore no impact arising on the privacy of those occupiers as a result of the proposal.

Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing

- 7.66 The applicant has submitted overshadowing studies showing the shadowing arising from the existing dwelling and proposed building during the equinox and summer solstice. During the equinox (March/September 21st) a greater level of overshadowing would occur to the front and rear gardens of 52 Chinbrook Road and to the front garden of 50 Chinbrook Road at 8am, however this would dissipate by 12 noon. The BRE Guidelines “Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight – A Good Practice Guide” are the accepted standard for assessment of daylight and overshadowing impacts. For overshadowing, the BRE guidelines state that any garden should have at least two hours of sunshine for at least half the garden. The submitted shadow studies indicate that the garden of No52 would retain over four hours sunlight for the whole of the garden during the equinox. During the summer solstice (21st June), the impact is reduced. Officers have reviewed the shadow diagrams and, given the southerly aspect of the rear gardens of 52 and 54 Chinbrook Road, consider that they are an accurate reflection of the likely impacts. These impacts are considered to be minor in the context of the BRE guidelines.
- 7.67 Overall, the assessment demonstrates that the proposed scheme will not give rise to any unacceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties in terms of an overbearing relationship, loss of privacy, daylight or overshadowing.

Sustainability and Energy

- 7.68 Policy 5.3 Sustainable Design and Construction of the London Plan states that the highest standards of sustainable design and construction should be achieved in London to improve the environmental performance of new developments and to adapt to the effects of climate change over their lifetime.
- 7.69 Policy 5.2 Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions of the London Plan states that development should make the fullest contribution to minimising carbon dioxide emissions in accordance with the following energy hierarchy:
- 1 Be Lean: use less energy
 - 2 Be clean: supply energy efficiently
 - 3 Be green: use renewable energy
- 7.70 Achieving more sustainable patterns of development and environmentally sustainable buildings is a key objective of national, regional and local planning policy. London Plan and Core Strategy Policies advocate the need for sustainable development. All new development should address climate change and reduce carbon emissions. Core Strategy Policy 8 requires all new non-residential development to achieve a BREEAM rating of ‘Excellent’.
- 7.71 The applicant has submitted a BREEAM Pre-Assessment Report in support of the application, prepared by BRE accredited assessors. The report assesses the performance of the proposed scheme in respect of the 10 BREEAM accreditation areas: management, health & wellbeing, energy, transport, water, materials, waste, landuse and ecology, pollution and innovation and concludes that a BREEAM score of 74.10% is achievable, giving a BREEAM rating of ‘Excellent’.
- 7.72 On this basis, the scheme would meet the requirements of Core Strategy Policy 8.

Other considerations

Ecology

- 7.73 The application site contains planting to the front, side and rear, typical of a mature residential garden. The trees are not subject to Tree Preservation Orders and the site is not located within an area of designated landscape or wildlife conservation value.
- 7.74 The application is supported by a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (February 2017), which identified that the site shows potential to support breeding birds and roosting bat. As bats are a protected species, a further survey was undertaken, the results of which were presented in a report submitted in June 2017. The report identifies that no bat activity was observed and therefore no mitigation is required in respect of bats in relation to the proposed works.
- 7.75 Both reports have been reviewed by the Council's Ecological Regeneration Manager and he has advised that the methodology and results are accepted. He has raised no objection, subject to the implementation of mitigation measures including the provision of artificial roosting features, the retention of as much landscaping as possible and keeping site lighting to a minimum. A condition has been specified to require details of artificial bird and bat nests to be provided for approval. Although limited existing vegetation would be retained, the landscape proposals indicate native/semi-native species and this can be controlled by condition. Similarly, details of lighting can be adequately controlled by condition.
- 7.76 In summary, the site is not designated for its nature conservation value and has been assessed by a qualified ecologist as being of low ecological value. Provided that the specified mitigation measures are put in place, the proposals are considered to have a neutral impact on local biodiversity.

Construction

- 7.77 Concern has been raised regarding disruption to local residents arising from construction works. A condition requiring a Construction Management Plan, plus the Council's normal Code of Construction Practice will enable to Council to limit working hours to reasonable times in order to address these concerns, although it is inevitable that some disruption would occur during the demolition and construction phases.

Planning Obligations

- 7.78 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that in dealing with planning applications, local planning authorities should consider whether otherwise unacceptable development could be made acceptable through the use of conditions or planning obligations. Planning obligations should only be used where it is not possible to address unacceptable impacts through a planning condition. It further states that where obligations are being sought or revised, local planning authorities should take account of changes in market conditions over time and, wherever appropriate, be sufficiently flexible to prevent planned development being stalled. The NPPF also sets out that planning obligations should only be secured when they meet the following three tests:
- (a) Necessary to make the development acceptable
 - (b) Directly related to the development; and
 - (c) Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development

7.79 Paragraph 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (April 2010) puts the above three tests on a statutory basis, making it illegal to secure a planning obligation unless it meets the three tests.

7.80 The obligations sought are as follows:

- Financial contribution in respect of CPZ review: £10,000
- Financial contributions in respect of highways improvements:
 - Informal crossing facility (Chinbrook Road): £5,000
 - Tactile paving (Chinbrook/Amblecote junction): £2,500
- Monitoring, legal and professional costs

7.81 As set out elsewhere in this report, the obligations outlined above are directly related to the development. They are considered to be fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development and to be necessary and appropriate in order to secure policy objectives, to mitigate the proposed development's impact and make the development acceptable in planning terms. Officers are therefore satisfied the proposed obligations meet the three legal tests as set out in the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.

8.0 Local Finance Considerations

8.1 Under Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), a local finance consideration means:

- (a) a grant or other financial assistance that has been, or will or could be, provided to a relevant authority by a Minister of the Crown; or
- (b) sums that a relevant authority has received, or will or could receive, in payment of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

8.2 The weight to be attached to a local finance consideration remains a matter for the decision maker.

8.3 The Mayor of London's CIL is therefore a material consideration. CIL is payable on this application and the applicant has completed the relevant form.

9.0 Community Infrastructure Levy

9.1 The above development is CIL liable.

10.0 Equalities Considerations

10.1 Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 ("the Act") imposes a duty that the Council must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to:-

- (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act;
- (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not;
- (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

10.2 The protected characteristics under the Act are: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

- 10.3 The duty is a “have regard duty” and the weight to attach to it is a matter for the decision maker bearing in mind the issues of relevance and proportionality.
- 10.4 The planning issues set out above do not include any factors that relate specifically to any of the equalities categories set out in the Act, and therefore it has been concluded that there is no impact on equality.

11.0 Conclusion

- 11.1 This application has been considered in the light of policies set out in the development plan and other material considerations.
- 11.2 The proposed development would provide a new purpose built healthcare facility in an accessible location. It would consolidate existing services, replacing inadequate premises with modern clinical facilities and ancillary services and would be fully wheelchair accessible. It would therefore meet an identified local need, meeting the policy exception to the loss of a dwelling and being in line with policy objectives to improve health facilities.
- 11.3 The new facility would replace 3 existing local GP surgeries, including the nearby 32 Chinbrook Road premises, resulting in a net increase in the immediate area of one consulting room and two treatment rooms, together with additional patient facilities. The net increase in vehicular and pedestrian movements in the area would not therefore be significant.
- 11.4 Parking survey results show that most of the parking demand generated by the proposal could be accommodated in Amblecote Road. The proposal has the potential to exacerbate existing parking stress on Luffmann Road, and to mitigate this a financial contribution towards consultation on an extension of the existing CPZ is proposed. The majority of visitors to the site are expected to travel by sustainable modes of transport and, to improve pedestrian and bus passenger accessibility to the site, a further contribution towards highways works in the vicinity of the site is required.
- 11.5 It is considered that the design constitutes a successful, contemporary response to the local context and ensures that, while the building would be prominent, it would not be overly dominant or incongruous in the streetscene.
- 11.6 The proposals are considered to accord with the development plan. Officers have also had regard to other material considerations, including guidance set out in adopted supplementary planning documents and in other policy and guidance documents and the responses from consultees, which lead to the conclusions that have been reached in this case. Such material considerations are not considered to outweigh a determination in accordance with the development plan and the application is accordingly recommended for approval.

12.0 RECOMMENDATION (A)

To agree the proposals and authorise the Head of Law to complete a legal agreement under Section 106 of the 1990 Act (and other appropriate powers) to cover the following principal matters:-

- Financial contribution in respect of CPZ review: £10,000
- Financial contributions in respect of highways improvements:
 - Informal crossing facility (Chinbrook Road): £5,000
 - Tactile paving (Chinbrook/Amblecote junction): £2,500
- Monitoring, legal and professional costs

RECOMMENDATION (B)

Upon the completion of a satisfactory Section 106, in relation to the matters set out above, authorise the Head of Planning to Grant Permission subject to the following conditions:-

Conditions

1. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date on which the permission is granted.

Reason: As required by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the application plans, drawings and documents hereby approved and as detailed below:

1124-SP-03; 1124-SP-01-(PL3); 1124-EX-01; 1124-EX-02; 1124-EX-03; 1124-EX-04; 1124-EX-05; 1124-EX-06; 1124-EX-06; 1124-GA-03-(PL8); 1124-GA-04-(PL8); 1124-GA-05-(PL8); 1124-GA-13; 1124-GA-06-(PL3); 1124-GA-07-(PL3); 1124-GA-08-(PL3); 1124-GA-09-(PL3); 1124-GA-10-(PL3); 1124-3D-02-(PL3); 1124-3D-03-(PL3); 1124-3D-04-(PL3);; 1124-WD-01; Materials Board; 17.2065.01.A; (received 24th April 2017);

Bat Report (Landscape Planning, June 2017) (received 3rd July 2017);

Traffic Note (ADL, July 2017); 1124-SP-02-(PL8)-Proposed Site Plan (received 28th July 2017);

1124-3D-101-(PL3); 1124-3D-102-(PL3); 1124-GA-02-(PL9); 1124-GA-13-(PL9); 1124-SP-02-(PL8) (received 1st August 2017); and

1124-GA-11-(PL4); 1124-GA-09-(PL4) (received 4th August 2017).

Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved documents, plans and drawings submitted with the application and is acceptable to the local planning authority.

3. No development (including demolition) shall commence on site until such time as a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The plan shall cover:-

- (a) Dust mitigation measures.
- (b) The location and operation of plant and wheel washing facilities
- (c) Details of best practical measures to be employed to mitigate noise and vibration arising out of the construction process
- (d) Details of construction traffic movements including cumulative impacts which shall demonstrate the following:-
 - (i) Rationalise travel and traffic routes to and from the site.
 - (ii) Provide full details of the number and time of construction vehicle trips to the site with the intention and aim of reducing the impact of construction related activity.
 - (iii) Measures to deal with safe pedestrian movement.
- (e) Security Management (to minimise risks to unauthorised personnel).

- (f) Details of the training of site operatives to follow the Construction Management Plan requirements.

Reason: In order that the local planning authority may be satisfied that the demolition and construction process is carried out in a manner which will minimise possible noise, disturbance and pollution to neighbouring properties and to comply with Policy 5.3 Sustainable design and construction, Policy 6.3 Assessing effects of development on transport capacity and Policy 7.14 Improving air quality of the London Plan (2015).

4. (a) No development (including demolition of existing buildings and structures) shall commence until each of the following have been complied with:-
- (i) A desk top study and site assessment to survey and characterise the nature and extent of contamination and its effect (whether on or off-site) and a conceptual site model have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
 - (ii) A site investigation report to characterise and risk assess the site which shall include the gas, hydrological and contamination status, specifying rationale; and recommendations for treatment for contamination encountered (whether by remedial works or not) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council.
 - (iii) The required remediation scheme implemented in full.
- (b) If during any works on the site, contamination is encountered which has not previously been identified (“the new contamination”) the Council shall be notified immediately and the terms of paragraph (a), shall apply to the new contamination. No further works shall take place on that part of the site or adjacent areas affected, until the requirements of paragraph (a) have been complied with in relation to the new contamination.
- (c) The development shall not be occupied until a closure report has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council.

This shall include verification of all measures, or treatments as required in (Section (a) i & ii) and relevant correspondence (including other regulating authorities and stakeholders involved with the remediation works) to verify compliance requirements, necessary for the remediation of the site have been implemented in full.

The closure report shall include verification details of both the remediation and post-remediation sampling/works, carried out (including waste materials removed from the site); and before placement of any soil/materials is undertaken on site, all imported or reused soil material must conform to current soil quality requirements as agreed by the authority. Inherent to the above, is the provision of any required documentation, certification and monitoring, to facilitate condition requirements.

Reason: To ensure that the local planning authority may be satisfied that potential site contamination is identified and remedied in view of the historical use(s) of the site, which may have included industrial processes and to comply with DM Policy 28 Contaminated Land of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).

5. (a) The building hereby approved shall achieve a minimum BREEAM Rating of ‘Excellent’.
- (b) No development shall commence above ground level until a Design Stage Certificate for each building (prepared by a Building Research Establishment

qualified Assessor) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority to demonstrate compliance with part (a).

- (c) Within 3 months of occupation of any of the buildings, evidence shall be submitted in the form of a Post Construction Certificate (prepared by a Building Research Establishment qualified Assessor) to demonstrate full compliance with part (a) for that specific building.

Reason: To comply with Policies 5.1 Climate change and mitigation, 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions, 5.3 Sustainable design and construction, 5.7 Renewable energy, 5.15 Water use and supplies in the London Plan (2015) and Core Strategy Policy 7 Climate change and adapting to the effects, Core Strategy Policy 8 Sustainable design and construction and energy efficiency (2011).

- 6. (a) No development shall commence above ground level on site until a scheme for surface water management, including specifications of the surface treatments and sustainable urban drainage solutions, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
- (b) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme and thereafter the approved scheme is to be retained in accordance with the details approved therein.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding and to improve water quality in accordance with Policies 5.12 Flood risk management and 5.13 Sustainable drainage in the London Plan (July 2011) and Objective 6: Flood risk reduction and water management and Core Strategy Policy 10: Managing and reducing the risk of flooding (2011).

- 7. (a) No piling or any other foundation designs using penetrative methods shall take place, other than with the prior written approval of the local planning authority.
- (b) Details of any such operations must be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to commencement of development on site and shall be accompanied by details of the relevant penetrative methods.
- (c) Any such work shall be carried out only in accordance with the details approved under part (b).

Reason: To prevent pollution of controlled waters and to comply with Core Strategy (2011) Policy 11 River and waterways network and Development Management Local Plan (November 2014) DM Policy 28 Contaminated land.

- 8. No development shall commence above ground level on site until a detailed schedule and samples of all external materials and finishes/windows and external doors/roof coverings to be used on the building have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the local planning authority may be satisfied as to the external appearance of the building(s) and to comply with Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham of the Core Strategy (June 2011) and Development Management Local Plan (November 2014) DM Policy 30 Urban design and local character.

- 9. The refuse facilities shown on the approved plans listed under Condition 2 above shall be provided in full prior to occupation of the development and shall thereafter be

permanently retained and maintained.

Reason: In order that the local planning authority may be satisfied with the provisions for recycling facilities and refuse storage in the interest of safeguarding the amenities of neighbouring occupiers and the area in general, in compliance with Development Management Local Plan (November 2014) DM Policy 30 Urban design and local character and Core Strategy Policy 13 Addressing Lewisham waste management requirements (2011).

10. (a) A minimum of 4 secure and dry cycle parking spaces for staff and 6 visitor spaces shall be provided within the development as indicated on the plans hereby approved.
- (b) No development shall commence above ground level on site until the full details of the cycle parking facilities have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
- (c) All cycle parking spaces shall be provided and made available for use prior to occupation of the development and maintained thereafter.

Reason: In order to ensure adequate provision for cycle parking and to comply with Policy 14: Sustainable movement and transport of the Core Strategy (2011).

11. (a) No development shall commence above ground level on site until drawings showing hard landscaping of any part of the site not occupied by buildings (including details of the permeability of hard surfaces) have been submitted and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
- (b) All hard landscaping works which form part of the approved scheme under part (a) shall be completed prior to occupation of the development.

Reason: In order that the local planning authority may be satisfied as to the details of the proposal and to comply with Policies 5.12 Flood risk management and 5.13 Sustainable Drainage in the London Plan (2015), Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham of the Core Strategy (June 2011) and Development Management Local Plan (November 2014) Policy 25 Landscaping and trees, and DM Policy 30 Urban design and local character.

12. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the Tree Protection Plan (TPP) included as Appendix 4 of the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (Landscape Planning, 14.02.2017) and following the recommendations set out in BS 5837:2012 (Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction – Recommendations).

Reason: To safeguard the health and safety of trees during building operations and the visual amenities of the area generally and to comply with Policy 12 Open space and environmental assets of the Core Strategy (June 2011), and DM Policy 25 Landscaping and trees and DM Policy 30 Urban design and local character of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).

13. (a) A scheme of soft landscaping (including details of any trees or hedges to be retained and proposed plant numbers, species, location and size of trees and tree pits) and details of the management and maintenance of the landscaping for a period of five years shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to construction of the above ground works.
- (b) All planting, seeding or turfing shall be carried out in the first planting and

seeding seasons following the completion of the development, in accordance with the approved scheme under part (a). Any trees or plants which within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.

Reason: In order that the local planning authority may be satisfied as to the details of the proposal and to comply with Core Strategy Policy 12 Open space and environmental assets, Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham of the Core Strategy (June 2011), and DM Policy 25 Landscaping and trees and DM Policy 30 Urban design and local character of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).

14. (a) Details of the proposed boundary treatments including any gates, walls or fences shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to construction of the above ground works.
- (b) The approved boundary treatments shall be implemented prior to occupation of the buildings and retained in perpetuity.

Reason: To ensure that the boundary treatment is of adequate design in the interests of visual and residential amenity and to comply with Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham of the Core Strategy (June 2011) and DM Policy 30 Urban design and local character of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).

15. Details of the number and location of the bird and boxes to be provided as part of the development hereby approved shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to commencement of above ground works and shall be installed before occupation of the building and maintained in perpetuity.

Reason: To comply with Policy 7.19 Biodiversity and access to nature conservation in the London Plan (2015), Policy 12 Open space and environmental assets of the Core Strategy (June 2011), and DM Policy 24 Biodiversity, living roofs and artificial playing pitches and local character of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).

16. (a) The development shall be constructed with a biodiversity living roof laid out across the entire single storey flat roof of the building hereby approved.
- (b) Details of the living roof (including a roof plan to a scale of 1:50, cross-section to a scale of 1:20, specification and details of a substrate base and details of management) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of development above ground level.
- (c) The living roofs shall not be used as an amenity or sitting out space of any kind whatsoever and shall only be used in the case of essential maintenance or repair, or escape in case of emergency.
- (d) Evidence that the roof has been installed in accordance with (a) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved.

Reason: To comply with Policies 5.10 Urban greening, 5.11 Green roofs and development site environs, 5.12 Flood risk management, 5.13 Sustainable Drainage and 7.19 Biodiversity and access to nature conservation in the London Plan (2015) ,

Policy 10 managing and reducing flood risk and Policy 12 Open space and environmental assets of the Core Strategy (June 2011), and DM Policy 24 Biodiversity, living roofs and artificial playing pitches of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).

17. (a) Prior to occupation of the development a scheme for any external lighting that is to be installed at the site, including measures to prevent light spillage shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
- (b) Any such external lighting as approved under part (a) shall be installed in accordance with the approved drawings and such directional hoods shall be retained permanently.
- (c) The applicant should demonstrate that the proposed lighting is the minimum needed for security and working purposes and that the proposals minimise pollution from glare and spillage.

Reason: In order that the local planning authority may be satisfied that the lighting is installed and maintained in a manner which will minimise possible light pollution to the night sky and neighbouring properties and to comply with DM Policy 27 Lighting of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).

18. (a) No part of the development hereby approved shall be occupied until such time as a user's Travel Plan (for staff and visitors), in accordance with Transport for London's document 'Travel Planning for New Development in London' has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall operate in full accordance with all measures identified within the Travel Plan from first occupation.
- (b) The Travel Plan shall specify initiatives to be implemented by the development to encourage access to and from the site by a variety of non-car means, shall set targets and shall specify a monitoring and review mechanism to ensure compliance with the Travel Plan objectives.
- (c) Within the timeframe specified by (a) and (b), evidence shall be submitted to demonstrate compliance with the monitoring and review mechanisms agreed under parts (a) and (b).

Reason: In order that both the local planning authority may be satisfied as to the practicality, viability and sustainability of the Travel Plan for the site and to comply with Policy 14 Sustainable movement and transport of the Core Strategy (June 2011).

19. Prior to occupation of the development hereby approved, evidence that an application for a Secured by Design Award in respect of the approved scheme has been submitted to the relevant Crime Prevention Design Adviser shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the local planning authority may be satisfied as to the security arrangements of the building and to comply with Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham of the Core Strategy (June 2011) and Development Management Local Plan (November 2014) DM Policy 30 Urban design and local character.

20. Notwithstanding the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order), no plumbing or pipes, other than rainwater pipes, shall be fixed on the external faces of the building.

Reason: In order that the local planning authority may be satisfied with the details of the proposal and to accord with Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham of the Core Strategy (June 2011) and DM Policy 30 Urban design and local character of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).

21. Notwithstanding the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order), the new windows to be installed in the south elevation at second floor level of the building hereby approved shall be fitted as obscure glazed and retained in perpetuity.

Reason: To avoid the direct overlooking of adjoining properties and consequent loss of privacy thereto and to comply with DM Policy 31 Alterations and extensions to existing buildings including residential extensions, DM Policy 32 Housing design, layout and space standards, DM Policy 32 Housing design, layout and space standards of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).

22. Notwithstanding the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order), the use of the flat roofs on the building hereby approved shall be as set out in the application and no development or the formation of any door providing access to the roofs shall be carried out, nor shall the roof area be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area.

Reason: In order to prevent any unacceptable loss of privacy to adjoining properties and the area generally and to comply with Policy 15 High Quality design for Lewisham of the Core Strategy (June 2011), and DM Policy 31 Alterations and extensions to existing buildings including residential extensions, DM Policy 32 Housing design, layout and space standards of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).

23. The whole of the car parking accommodation shown on drawing nos. 1124 SP-02 PL8 hereby approved shall be provided and retained permanently for the accommodation of vehicles of the occupiers of the development (including employees using the building and persons calling at the building for the purposes of conducting business with the occupiers thereof) and the premises shall not be occupied until such car parking accommodation has been provided.

Reason: To ensure the permanent retention of the space(s) for parking purposes and to ensure that the use of the building does not increase on-street parking in the vicinity and to comply with Policy 14 Sustainable movement and transport of the Core Strategy (June 2011), DM Policy 29 Car parking of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014), and Table 6.2 of the London Plan (March 2016).

24. The premises shall only be open for customer business between the hours of 8.00 and 18.30 on Monday to Friday, 8.00 and 14.00 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays or Public Holidays.

Reason: In order to safeguard the amenities of adjoining occupants at unsociable periods and to comply with Paragraph 120 of the National Planning Policy Framework of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).

Informatives

- A **Positive and Proactive Statement:** The Council engages with all applicants in a positive and proactive way through specific pre-application enquiries and the detailed advice available on the Council's website. On this particular application, positive discussions took place which resulted in further information being submitted.

- B As you are aware the approved development is liable to pay the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) which will be payable on commencement of the development. An '**assumption of liability form**' must be completed and before development commences you must submit a '**CIL Commencement Notice form**' to the council. You should note that any claims for relief, where they apply, must be submitted and determined prior to commencement of the development. Failure to follow the CIL payment process may result in penalties. More information on CIL is available at: - <http://www.lewisham.gov.uk/myservices/planning/apply-for-planning-permission/application-process/Pages/Community-Infrastructure-Levy.aspx>
- C You are advised that all construction work should be undertaken in accordance with the "London Borough of Lewisham Code of Practice for Control of Pollution and Noise from Demolition and Construction Sites" available on the Lewisham web page.

This page is intentionally left blank



This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix A

Note of Local Meeting 54 Chinbrook Road, SE12

19th June 2017

This page is intentionally left blank

Note of Local Meeting

54 Chinbrook Road, Grove Park



7.30pm, 19th June 2017

Ringway Centre, 268 Baring Rd, Grove Park, London SE12 0DS

Application reference: DC/17/101268

Proposal: Demolition of existing dwellinghouse at 54 Chinbrook Road, SE12 and the construction of a four storey building to provide a new Medical Centre (Use Class D1) containing 8 clinical rooms (six GP consulting rooms and two treatment rooms) and ancillary clinical, administrative and meeting space, together with the provision of car and cycle parking and landscaping.

Attendance

Councillor Clarke (Chair)

Councillor Moore

Councillor Elliott

Suzanne White, Planning Officer (SW)

Dr Praideepan Velayuthan (Applicant)

David Carroll (Planning consultant)

Stephen Alexander (Architect)

Ashley O'Shaunessy (NHS Clinical Commissioning Group)

Heidi Alexander MP

Approximately 50 local residents attended (41 signed attendance sheet) as well as

Note of Meeting

Introduction

Councillor Clarke explained that the purpose of the meeting was to provide an opportunity for those attending to listen to a presentation by the applicant, ask questions and raise points of concern, all of which will be documented and taken into consideration in the determination of the application.

Applicant's Presentation

PV provided the background to the scheme and meeting, stating that:

- This is a follow up to a previous meeting held in March, which was not required for planning but was well attended and the response to the proposals was good
- The ICO Health Group was formed in 2014 when otherwise the 4 surgeries would have closed
- There are current challenges with the buildings, some of which are dilapidated. The Group have sought to relocate for some time.
- The scheme is about delivering services to the community in a better way
- Want to clear up misconceptions about the scheme

- Many services have moved to Moorside which should be available more locally. This creates inconvenience for patients.
- The surgery is at a point where there is no other option, must make this scheme work. Risk there won't be services at Marvels Lane and Chinbrook Road.
- At the last meeting there were a lot of design comments, which the architect has taken away and digested.

SA provided an overview of the design. The main points made were:

- the design has changed since March and is now quite different. It was quite an angular 'sharp' building but this has been addressed through the curve at the front corner. It is also set back on upper floors
- we reviewed the number of GP consulting rooms, which have now been reduced to 6 on the ground floor plus two treatment rooms
- we looked at the materials that are prevalent in the area and are proposing to use brick with a recessive material to the top floor and rear
- the planning department were concerned with how the building would fit with the local character. This has been addressed through the landscaping.
- Cycle and car parking is provided
- We had a Secure by Design meeting. The officer confirmed that the scheme would meet the regulations

Q. What would the opening hours be?

A. 8-6.30pm Monday to Friday. The building would open at 8, with clinics from 8.30am.

Q. How many rooms would there be?

A. Six GP rooms, two consulting rooms and offices

PV provided further comments as follows:

- The proposal is for relocation only of GP surgeries. It is not intended to provide other services e.g. a Hub
- In Moorside, 6 rooms upstairs are required to run the surgery
- There is a need for rooms for GPs to decant into in order to free up consulting room space
- The pre-application discussions were focused on two main issues: transport and parking
- 34 objections have been received, which we have analysed as follows:
 - Traffic/highway safety x 23
 - Parking x 20
 - Building too big x 11
- Other sites were considered but this is the only one that has progressed to this stage

AO'S (CCG) provided an overview of the NHS Clinical Commissioning Group and their interest in the scheme:

- CCG has responsibility for funding GP services
- We want fit-for-purpose facilities
- In this case, the existing two sites are not fit-for-purpose
- The scheme has been through an internal approval process to make sure that it is the right size for the community

Comments and questions

Q: Consultation has been poor. There are traffic and parking concerns. Only one space for non-disabled drivers. There is a shortage of parking locally.

A: A Transport Statement and Travel Plan were submitted. The Travel Plan seeks to reduce the number of car borne journeys. Three pieces of work were completed: a parking survey for 2 days (Monday and Saturday); reference to a travel database for comparable developments; and a patient travel survey. This enables an estimate of traffic generation. It results in 13 additional trips during peak hours or 10 excluding the existing surgery i.e. 5 in and 5 out in the peak hour. This gives a maximum requirement of 13 parking spaces during the peak hour. Taking account of parking supply of 8, there would be an overspill of 5. There are 6 bays available. Officers suggested that 2 on-street bays were changed to disabled parking.

Comment: survey taken during half term

Comment: spaces often full

A: We were advised on the scope of assessment by the Council's Highways Officer. It was carried out by an independent consultant.

Comment: there are deep concerns about parking. The community feel the figures don't reflect their experience.

A: 8 spaces would be provided on site

Comment: near head-on collision witnessed at junction with Luffmann Road

Comment: there are references to consultation in application but I didn't know about it until letter today from ICO.

Comment: didn't get a letter, live next door.

Comment: parking problem is unsolvable. The Boy's Club on Marvel's Lane is the best site but Council won't sell it. Only 2 bus routes on this site.

Comment: concerned about traffic. At 8.30am there is a queue down to the site from Grove Park. Accidents on that junction. Amblecote is one way so vehicles will have to turnaround.

Comment: ICO has been looking for a site for years

SA: the existing surgery is in a similar location

Comment: agree with concern about highway safety, especially near park. Design looks good. Difficult to turn into Amblecote because cars park near junction.

Comment: it was definitely half term at time of parking survey. Moorside had 10 NHS spaces and it's been increased to 20+. Impossible to park for the pool. This only provides 5 spaces for staff. Will destroy parking in the area.

Comment: meeting fatally flawed. Some believe it will go through. Most see this as first consultation, should have been 6 months ago.

Comment: live on Luffmann Road, already people blocking drives. Would like opportunity to vote on parking restrictions.

Cllr Clarke: recommend speaking to local councillors. It is a long process but can be looked at.

Comment: main point is whether the surgery is needed, which it is. Most patients are over 60 and won't drive.

Cllr Clarke: good point. The people of Grove Park would like a GP centre like this, in the right place.

Comment: feel this is not the right place, it's difficult to cross the road.

Q. Why does CCG want this development? It will be redundant soon as services are integrated into the community.

A (PV): this is the 10th site we've looked at. Told the Youth Centre will take 5 years. Other sites have not worked. WG Grace didn't work.

Cllr Clarke: decisions by the Council are not necessarily taken by councillors. The ward councillors only found out about this scheme 3 weeks ago. The councillors are not onboard and glad the GPs are trying to find a solution, though concerned about this.

Comment: it's confusing how many surgeries are combining. Have the accident statistics been looked at? It will impact on Chinbrook Meadows. Buses are only single decker. New surgery will increase traffic. Local plan looks to maintain residential areas' character. Not well thought out.

A: this site will serve Marvel's Lane and Chinbrook patients only. Blood services will continue at Marvels Lane. Boundfield Road services won't move. We'll look at improving access to Moorside.

Comment: Marvel's Lane is closed half the week.

A: that is due to a list cleansing exercise following the merger.

Cllr Clarke: there is confusion over how many patients will use this site.

A: It's for local Grove Park patients currently inconvenienced using Moorside. Other surgeries in Lewisham have better services. The previous NHS plan was to close these four surgeries.

Comment: amazed to hear so many complaints about the GPs. Lived here 30 years. A 20mph speed limit has been introduced. Most people in Grove Park want a surgery here and it should be. Without it we will lose pharmacies and other businesses.

Q: will we lose all services without this scheme?

A(NHS): want local services in fit for purpose buildings, but if not could disperse the list or get a new operator, who would likely have the same issues. Have looked at 10 options with ICO.

Comment: I've been a patient for 50 years. Saved my life. Don't want to lose surgery. How much money spent by GPs and NHS to this point? Need to sort out parking problems.

Comment: concerned about child safety. Some play on Amblecote Road. Have impression it's a done deal. Why is the application so rushed?

A: we have been looking for a site since 2011. We found out last August that we had first refusal on this site. Then had negotiations with the CCG. An extension to the house was the first preference but the NHS require purpose built. The practice is funding all work on the project. We have not yet purchased the site. All previous options failed at first hurdle. This is furthest we've gone. It is a financial risk on the practice. Will take on board concerns.

Q. What did councillors know?

A: We didn't know until recently but conversations took place with the planning service and others. It's a point to raise.

Q. Can more parking be provided? How long will the build take?

A: If approved, there would be conditions on construction. Approx 12 month build.

Comment: I live in Paxton Court, a retirement community. Some residents have to get taxis to GP.

Q. What is the future of the Marvel's Lane Centre?

A: the PCT owned it. It then went to Lewisham and Greenwich Trust. There are issues with internal flooding, there is a leak in the roof, there are issues with the rooms and it is Grade II listed. Lewisham and Greenwich Trust want to retain it.

Q. Why are the Council and others not helping to facilitate other sites?

MP: I don't know the plans for the Marvel's Lane site. Dr Prad got in touch a couple of years ago. They looked at the Youth Centre to bring it back into use. There was a campaign to bring youth centre use back. Surgery didn't happen. I spoke to Council officers about the need for a new surgery. I advised GPs to consult the local community about their plans prior to submitting a planning application. Money has been invested in the scheme. Lewisham must make a decision on the planning application. Must look at what more could be done about parking and try to resolve.

Cllr Clarke: the doctors should have spoken to councillors early but they realise that now.

Comment: the aesthetics of the building are inappropriate in this context.

Comment: thanks to the doctors for their services. Numerous children and parents go to the park via Amblecote Road. The parking spaces are for people using the park.

Comment: Paxton Court residents are worried that, if the GP goes, the pharmacy may also go.

Q. will there be air conditioning? Concern about spread of legionnaires disease.

SA: will share detailed plans. Building must be very energy efficient.

Cllr Clarke: there will be noise from air conditioning units also.

SA: a condition could restrict that.

Comment: existing house is beautiful, solid and adds to the area. The owner didn't intend it to be demolished.

Comment: useful for further consideration of Youth Centre site. What are next steps?

Cllr Clarke: this application will go forward to a planning committee for a decision, probably Committee A or B. They will decide and can put conditions on. It will be a public meeting. Residents can speak for 5 minutes and councillors can speak under standing orders. Councillors will ask questions. Everyone at meeting will be notified. You can lobby councillors on this and the members of the committee and Chair.

Comment: we're all in favour of a new surgery but some concerned about location.

Cllr Clarke: think all are in favour of new surgery.

Comment: about WG Grace, some want to retain the building as it is. Opposed it because GP centre would be within a tower. Could revisit.

A (PV): we were never allowed to purchase that site, owner would only lease a shell. They need best return. Marvel's Lane not ideal as nearer boundary and not CCG's preference.

Cllr Clarke: have spoken to L&Q about plans for WG Grace and encouraged them to speak to councillors.

Q. how many floors proposed?

A: 4 storeys

Cllr Clarke closed the meeting at 9.50pm

Committee	PLANNING COMMITTEE B	
Report Title	36 Vicars Hill SE13	
Ward	Brockley	
Contributors	John Miller	
Class	PART 1	17 August 2017

<u>Reg. Nos.</u>	(A) DC/17/101595
<u>Application dated</u>	12.05.17
<u>Applicant</u>	Mapridge Design Studios on Behalf of Mr & Mrs Burnell
<u>Proposal</u>	The construction of a replacement garage to provide an ancillary studio on the rear elevation including the recreation of boundary walls and timber fencing together with alterations to the rear garden at 36 Vicars Hill SE13.
<u>Applicant's Plan Nos.</u>	01; 02; Design Access and Heritage Statement; 038-01; 1.01A; 1.02A; 1.03A; 1.04A; 1.05A received 01 Aug 2017
<u>Background Papers</u>	(1) Case File LE/108/36/TP (2) Local Development Framework Documents (3) The London Plan
<u>Designation</u>	None
<u>Screening</u>	N/A

2.0 Property/Site Description

- 2.1 The application site comprises a two-storey, semi-detached dwellinghouse on the eastern side of Vicars Hill, an entirely residential street predominantly comprising two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouses similar to the application property, with Hilly Fields Park on the western side of the road.
- 2.2 The site benefits from two road frontages, with the eastern boundary of its rear garden adjoining Ermine Road, another wholly residential street predominantly comprising two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouses. Nos. 30, 32, 34 and 38 Vicars Hill also benefit from the same two road frontages due to their location immediately to the north of the junction of Vicars Hill and Ermine Road.
- 2.3 The topography of the site and its surroundings slopes quite steeply downhill to the south-west, resulting in the rear gardens of the properties also being considerably lower than the floor level of the properties, and that difference in level increasing as one heads south-west.
- 2.4 This results in the existing garage being considerably lower than the dwellinghouse, and the garage is accessed through the rear garden by a series of several concrete steps.

The rear garden of the application site and neighbouring dwellinghouses are well vegetated and include numerous mature trees.

3.0 Planning History

- 3.1 An application was withdrawn in April 2014 for The demolition of the existing garage at the rear of 36 Vicars Hill SE13 and the construction of a two storey, 2 bedroom dwelling house with associated landscaping and boundary treatment.
- 3.2 Planning Permission was granted in May 2014 for the erection of a single storey extension to the rear of 36 Vicars Hill SE13, together with the construction of a new roof on the existing side extension.
- 3.3 Planning Permission was refused in September 2014 for the demolition of the existing garage at the rear of 36 Vicars Hill SE13 and the construction of a two storey, 2 bedroom detached dwelling house with associated landscaping and boundary treatment.
- 3.4 Planning Permission was refused in October 2015 for the demolition of an existing garage and construction of a single storey residential unit to create ancillary accommodation at 36 Vicars Hill, SE13, together with the construction of new replacement steps to the rear garden and timber fence fronting Ermine Road.

4.0 Current Planning Applications

The Proposals

- 4.1 Planning Permission is sought for the construction of a replacement garage to provide an ancillary studio on the rear elevation including the recreation of boundary walls and timber fencing fronting Ermine Road together with alterations to the rear garden at 36 Vicars Hill SE13.
- 4.2 The proposed replacement garage/studio would have a slightly larger footprint than the existing structure measuring 7.5m wide, 2.75m in height and 5.3m deep. It is setback 2m from the sidewalk.
- 4.3 The space would provide a studio and washroom.
- 4.4 The replacement timber fence/gate and boundary walls would have the same dimensions as the existing.
- 4.5 All materials to match existing
- 4.6 Landscape scheme incorporating raised beds along all boundaries including the roof of the replacement garage structure.

Supporting Documents

- 4.7 Design Access and Heritage Statements

5.0 Consultation

5.1 This section outlines the consultation carried out by Council following the submission of the application and summarises the responses received. The Council's consultation exceeded the minimum statutory requirements and those required by the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement.

5.2 Site notices were displayed and letters were sent to residents and business in the surrounding area and the relevant ward Councillors. The Brockley Society, Ladywell Society, and the Councils Conservation Department were also consulted.

Written Responses received from Local Residents

5.3 Objections were received from 9 local residents which are relevant to the assessment of the planning application:

- Replacement building not to be used as accommodation
- Concerns over the use of the replacement structures roof as an amenity space

5.4 Supporting comments were received from one neighbour

- Encouraging to see regeneration of this structure

Conservation Officer

5.5 Council's Conservation Officers have offered no objection to the proposed development

Written Responses received from the Brockley Society:

5.6 The Brockley Society welcomed the proposed changes.

Written Responses received from the Ladywell Society:

5.7 The Ladywell Society did not wish to comment on the application

6.0 Policy Context

Introduction

6.1 Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) sets out that in considering and determining applications for planning permission the local planning authority must have regard to:-

- (a) the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application,
- (b) any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application, and
- (c) any other material considerations.

A local finance consideration means:

- (a) a grant or other financial assistance that has been, or will or could be, provided to a relevant authority by a Minister of the Crown, or

(b) sums that a relevant authority has received, or will or could receive, in payment of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

6.2 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) makes it clear that ‘if regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise’. The development plan for Lewisham comprises the Core Strategy, the Development Management Local Plan, the Site Allocations Local Plan and the Lewisham Town Centre Local Plan, and the London Plan. The NPPF does not change the legal status of the development plan.

National Planning Policy Framework

6.3 The NPPF was published on 27 March 2012 and is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. It contains at paragraph 14, a ‘presumption in favour of sustainable development’. Annex 1 of the NPPF provides guidance on implementation of the NPPF. In summary, this states in paragraph 211, that policies in the development plan should not be considered out of date just because they were adopted prior to the publication of the NPPF. At paragraphs 214 and 215 guidance is given on the weight to be given to policies in the development plan. As the NPPF is now more than 12 months old paragraph 215 comes into effect. This states in part that ‘...due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with this framework (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given)’.

6.4 Officers have reviewed the Core Strategy for consistency with the NPPF and consider there is no issue of significant conflict. As such, full weight can be given to these policies in the decision making process in accordance with paragraphs 211, and 215 of the NPPF.

London Plan (July 2011)

6.5 The London Plan policies relevant to this application are:

Policy 5.3 Sustainable design and construction

Policy 5.11 Green roofs and development site environs

Policy 5.13 Sustainable drainage

Policy 5.18 Construction, excavation and demolition waste

Policy 7.4 Local character

Policy 7.6 Architecture

Policy 7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology

London Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG)

6.6 The London Plan SPG’s relevant to this application are: **[delete irrelevant documents]**

Housing (2012)

Sustainable Design and Construction (2006)

Core Strategy

- 6.7 The Core Strategy was adopted by the Council at its meeting on 29 June 2011. The Core Strategy, together with the Site Allocations, the Lewisham Town Centre Local Plan, the Development Management Local Plan and the London Plan is the borough's statutory development plan. The following lists the relevant strategic objectives, spatial policies and cross cutting policies from the Lewisham Core Strategy as they relate to this application:

Spatial Policy 1 Lewisham Spatial Strategy

Core Strategy Policy 8 Sustainable design and construction and energy efficiency

Core Strategy Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham

Core Strategy Policy 16 Conservation areas, heritage assets and the historic environment

Development Management Local Plan

- 6.8 The Development Management Local Plan was adopted by the Council at its meeting on 26 November 2014. The Development Management Local Plan, together with the Site Allocations, the Lewisham Town Centre Local Plan, the Core Strategy and the London Plan is the borough's statutory development plan. The following lists the relevant strategic objectives, spatial policies and cross cutting policies from the Development Management Local Plan as they relate to this application:

- 6.9 The following policies are considered to be relevant to this application:

DM Policy 1	Presumption in favour of sustainable development
DM Policy 30	Urban design and local character
DM Policy 31	Alterations/extensions to existing buildings
DM Policy 32	Housing design, layout and space standards
DM Policy 33	Development on infill sites, backland sites, back gardens and amenity areas
DM Policy 36	New development, changes of use and alterations affecting designated heritage assets and their setting: conservation areas, listed buildings, schedule of ancient monuments and registered parks and gardens

Residential Standards Supplementary Planning Document (August 2006)

- 6.10 This document sets out guidance and standards relating to design, sustainable development, renewable energy, flood risk, sustainable drainage, dwelling mix, density, layout, neighbour amenity, the amenities of the future occupants of developments, safety and security, refuse, affordable housing, self containment, noise and room positioning, room and dwelling sizes, storage, recycling facilities and bin storage, noise insulation, parking, cycle parking and storage, gardens and amenity space, landscaping, play space, Lifetime Homes and accessibility, and materials.

Brockley Conservation Area Supplementary Planning Document (December 2005)

- 6.11 This document advises on the content of planning applications, and gives advice on external alterations to properties. It lays out advice on repairs and maintenance and specifically advises on windows, roof extensions, satellite dishes, chimneystacks, doors, porches, canopies, walls, front gardens, development in rear gardens, shop fronts and

architectural and other details. It also sets out detailed guidance on the limited development that will be accepted within Brockley Mews - mainly within Harefield Mews.

7.0 Planning Considerations

7.1 The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:

- a) Principle of Development
- b) Design
- g) Impact on Adjoining Properties
- i) Ecology and Landscaping

Principle of Development

7.2 The application site is covered by an Article 4 Direction, which means planning permission needs to be obtained for any improvement, enlargement or alteration to the property, but does not preclude development. The Council assesses each application on its merits.

7.3 National, regional and local policies have identified a need to promote adequate standards of living accommodation and meet the needs of the housing market. This application relates to an extension to a residential property in a residential area and as such the principle of development is supported, subject to design considerations, the impact on adjoining properties and the conservation area and highways issues.

7.4 Design and Impact on the Conservation Area

7.5 London Plan Policy 7.6 Architecture, requires development to positively contribute to the surrounding environment, using the highest quality materials and design. Policy 7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology outlines that development should identify, value, conserve, restore, re-use and incorporate heritage assets where appropriate and should conserve their significance by being sympathetic to their scale, form and architectural detail.

7.6 Core Strategy Policy 16 Conservation areas, heritage assets and the historic environment states that new development should be of high quality design and should preserve the historic environment and sense of place. Development Management Policy 36 New Development, changes of use and alterations affecting designated heritage asset and their setting advises that planning permission will not be granted if the proposed development is deemed incompatible with the special characteristics of the area, its buildings, spaces, settings and plot coverage, scale, form and materials.

7.7 The proposed replacement garage would provide a new useable studio space ancillary to the use of the main dwelling.

7.8 The design is a considerable improvement over the previous submissions, which have been refused based on the provision of additional accommodation. The latest refusal incorporated a bedroom, kitchen, bathroom, dining and living room into a single storey studio dwelling. The current application does not intend to provide additional accommodation and intends to install raised planters along all sides of the roof.

7.9 As the proposal has a similar footprint to the existing structure, it would be proportionate to its scale and the size of the garden. Furthermore the materials proposed are considered to be appropriate and an example of high quality design and would complement the host property.

7.10 The proposed landscape scheme raises no objection and improves on the existing garden layout. The re-constructed boundary walls, replacement timber fencing and gate are also considered acceptable as they are to match the existing in both materials and design.

7.11 **Impact on Adjoining Properties**

7.12 DM Policy 31 states that residential extensions adjacent to dwellings should result in no significant loss of privacy and amenity including loss of sunlight and daylight to adjoining properties and their back gardens

7.13 Officers are mindful of objections raised regarding the use of the space as accommodation and the use of the roof as a terrace.

7.14 The proposal would not have any impacts on the neighbouring properties as it is of a similar scope of what is existing. Furthermore, it is located in the rear garden of the property fronting Ermine road and would not be built close to any existing dwelling. If the proposal were to be used an amenity space it would only overlook the front houses along Ermine Road but not any neighbouring properties. Proposed screening as seen in the landscape scheme is intended to reduce any further outlook and alleviate concerns of overlooking.

7.15 Adverse effects such as utilising the space as accommodation and an amenity area can be addressed through recommended conditions therefore no significant effects on neighbouring properties are anticipated.

8.0 **Equalities Considerations**

8.1 The Council has considered the public sector equality duty under section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010 and in the exercise of its functions to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct which is prohibited under this Act and to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

8.2 As with the case with the original separate duties, the new duty continues to be a “have regard duty” and the weight to attach to it is a matter of judgement bearing in mind relevance and proportionality. It is not an absolute requirement to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity or foster good relations.

9.0 **Conclusion**

9.1 This application has been considered in the light of policies set out in the development plan and other material considerations.

9.2 Officers consider the proposed development to be of no significant harm to the character of the area or to residential amenity and is therefore considered acceptable

10.0 **RECOMMENDATION**

GRANT PERMISSION subject to the following conditions:-

1. The development to which the permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years, beginning with the date on which the permission is granted.

Reason: As required by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

2. The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the application plans, drawings and documents hereby approved and as detailed below:

038-01; 01; 1.01; 1.02; 1.03; 1.04; 1.05; 02

Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved documents, plans and drawings submitted with the application and is acceptable to the local planning authority.

3. Notwithstanding the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order), the residential accommodation hereby approved shall only be used for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwellinghouse known as **36 Vicars Hill SE13** and shall not be occupied as any form of self contained residential accommodation without prior the benefit of planning permission.

Reason: The application has been assessed only in terms of this restricted use and any other use may have an adverse effect on the character and amenity of the area and amenity for future occupiers contrary to relevant Policies in the London Plan (2015), Core Strategy (2011) and Development Management Local Plan (2014).

4. Notwithstanding the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order), the use of the flat roofed extension hereby approved shall be as set out in the application and no development or the formation of any door providing access to the roof shall be carried out, nor shall the roof area be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area.

Reason: In order to prevent any unacceptable loss of privacy to adjoining properties and the area generally and to comply with Policy 15 High Quality design for Lewisham of the Core Strategy (June 2011), and DM Policy 31 Alterations and extensions to existing buildings including residential extensions, DM Policy 32 Housing design, layout and space standards, and DM Policy 33 Development on infill sites, backland sites, back gardens and amenity areas **[delete irrelevant policies]** of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).

INFORMATIVES

- (1) **Positive and Proactive Statement:** The Council engages with all applicants in a positive and proactive way through specific pre-application enquiries and the detailed advice available on the Council's website. On this particular application, positive discussions took place which resulted in further information being submitted.



Existing Site plan + location



site location
1:1250

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee	PLANNING COMMITTEE B	
Report Title	50 St German's Road, London, SE23 1RX	
Ward	Crofton Park	
Contributors	Joe Roberts	
Class	PART 1	Date: 17th August 2017

Reg. Nos. DC/17/100842

Application dated 17.03.2017

Applicant Sterling Rose Development

Proposal The demolition of the existing house at 50 St Germans Road SE23 and the construction of a 4 storey plus basement level building to provide 2 one bedroom, 2 two bedroom and 1 three bedroom self-contained flats, together with the provision of 2 car parking and 7 cycle spaces and private amenity space.

Applicant's Plan Nos. Site Location Plan, P9/002, P9/003; P9/004; P9/005; P9/006; P9/007; P9/008; received 24 March 2017 P9/001; REVG,P9/009 REVG;P9/010 REVG ; P9/011 REVG; P9/012 REVG; P9/013 REVG; P9/014 REVG; P9/015 REVG; P9/016 REVG; received 4 July 2017.

Background Papers Case File LE/652/50/TP (1)

Designation PTAL 2
Not a Listed Building nor situated within the vicinity of a Listed Building

1.0 Property/Site Description

- 1.1 This application relates to a part two storey plus basement detached family dwelling house located on the southern side of German's Road. The existing property is double fronted with a substantial front and rear gardens and an off-street parking space. The majority of the front garden has been covered in hardstanding.
- 1.2 There are steep gradients within the application site and the immediate vicinity running downwardly from east to west and from north to south, resulting in the

existing property being viewed as two stories from the front and three stories at the rear.

- 1.3 The adjoining property to the east is a four storey flatted development and to the west is a two storey double fronted property that is in use as a nursery.
- 1.4 Other than the adjoining nursery, the surrounding area is predominately residential in nature.

2.0 Planning History

- 2.1 No relevant planning history.

3.0 Current Planning Application

- 3.1 The application proposes the demolition of the existing house at 50 St Germans Road SE23 and the construction of a 4 storey plus basement level building to provide, 2 one bedroom, 2 two bedroom and 1 three bedroom self-contained flats, together with the provision of 2 car parking and 7 cycle spaces and private amenity space.
- 3.2 The application was subsequently revised to reduce the quantum of development and the studio unit was removed from the application; the 3 bedroom family unit which was initially completely on the lower ground floor has been revised to be a maisonette over the lower ground and part ground floors.

Internally, the three bedroom unit would be located on the lower ground and ground floor, also a one bedroom unit would be split over the ground and lower ground floors. There would also be 2, two bedroom units on the first and second floors and a further a one bedroom unit within the top floor.

- 3.3 Externally, due to the topography of the site the building would be viewed as four stories from the front (the fourth floor is proposed as set back from the edges) and five to the rear. The building is designed with a flat roof and the elevational treatment would be stock brick with aluminium windows. Two front lightwells would also be constructed.
- 3.4 The garden to the rear has been revised to be solely for the use of the 3 bedroom family unit. Rear terraces would be provided for the other units.

4.0 Consultation

- 4.1 This section outlines the consultation carried out by the Council following the submission of the application and summarises the responses received. The Council's consultation exceeded the minimum statutory requirements and those required by the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement.

4.2 Site notices were displayed and letters were sent to residents in the surrounding area and the relevant ward councillors. The Council's Conservations officer was also consulted.

4.3 Five objection letters were received from neighbouring residents.

Written responses received from local residents

4.4 Objections were received from 5 local residents citing the following issues which are relevant to the assessment of the planning application:

- Traffic- increased volume and parking problems.
- Loss of natural sunlight and daylight
- Impact on existing trees that form privacy screen between the properties
- Loss of privacy
- Addition of 11 extra vehicles and the adjoining nursery would be too much of an impact on the road and parking pressure.

Highway and Transportation

4.5 Council's Highways Officers have offered no objection to the proposed development subject to details being secured on cycle parking and a condition relating to a parking management strategy which allowed the family sized unit to retain the parking spaces.

4.6 The council's urban design officer supports the scheme following its revision from an initial render façade treatment to stock brickwork and other elevational detailing.

4.7 The application has been significantly revised following officers assessment to reduce the number of units from 6 to 5, elevational treatment and internal reconfiguration, and as such it was felt necessary to re-consult on the application given the general nature of the objections to the development as a whole.

5.0 Policy Context

Introduction

5.1 Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) sets out that in considering and determining applications for planning permission the local planning authority must have regard to:

- (a) the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application,
- (b) any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application, and

- (c) any other material considerations.

A local finance consideration means—

- (a) a grant or other financial assistance that has been, or will or could be, provided to a relevant authority by a Minister of the Crown, or
- (b) sums that a relevant authority has received, or will or could receive, in payment of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

5.2 Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) makes it clear that any determination under the planning acts must be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

5.3 The Development Plan for Lewisham comprises the Core Strategy, the Development Management Local Plan (adopted in June 2011), the Site Allocations Local Plan and the London Plan (July 2011). The National Planning Policy Framework does not change the legal status of the development plan.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

5.4 The NPPF was published on 27 March 2012 and is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. It contains at paragraph 14, a 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'. Annex 1 of the NPPF provides guidance on implementation of the NPPF. In summary, this states in paragraph 211, that policies in the development plan should not be considered out of date just because they were adopted prior to the publication of the NPPF. At paragraphs 214 and 215 guidance is given on the weight to be given to policies in the development plan. As the NPPF is now more than 12 months old paragraph 215 comes into effect. This states in part that '...due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with this framework (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given)'.

5.5 Officers have reviewed the Core Strategy for consistency with the NPPF and consider there is no issue of significant conflict. As such, full weight can be given to these policies in the decision making process in accordance with paragraphs 211, and 215 of the NPPF.

London Plan (2016) (as amended)

The London Plan policies relevant to this application are:

Policy 3.3 Increasing housing supply

Policy 3.4 Optimising housing potential

Policy 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments

Policy 3.6 Children and young people's play and informal recreation facilities

Policy 3.8 Housing choice

- Policy 3.9 Mixed and balanced communities
- Policy 5.1 Climate change mitigation
- Policy 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
- Policy 5.3 Sustainable design and construction
- Policy 5.7 Renewable energy
- Policy 6.9 Cycling (including table 6.3)
- Policy 6.11 Smoothing traffic flow and tackling congestion
- Policy 6.13 Parking
- Policy 7.4 Local character
- Policy 7.5 Public realm
- Policy 7.6 Architecture

London Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG)

The London Plan SPG's relevant to this application are:

The Housing SPG (GLA, March 2016)

Core Strategy (2011)

- 5.6 The Core Strategy, together with the London Plan and the Development Management Local Plan, is the borough's statutory development plan. The following lists the relevant strategic objectives, spatial policies and cross cutting policies from the Lewisham Core Strategy as they relate to this application:

Spatial Policy 1 Lewisham Spatial Strategy

Core Strategy Policy 1 Housing provision, mix and affordability

Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham

Policy 16 Conservation areas, heritage assets and the historic environment.

Development Management Local Plan (2014)

- 5.7 The Development Management Local Plan was adopted by the Council at its meeting on 26 November 2014. The Development Management Local Plan, together with the Site Allocations, the Lewisham Town Centre Local Plan, the Core Strategy and the London Plan is the borough's statutory development plan. The following lists the relevant strategic objectives, spatial policies and cross cutting policies from the Development Management Local Plan as they relate to this application:

The following policies are considered to be relevant to this application:

- | | |
|-------------|--|
| DM Policy 1 | Presumption in favour of sustainable development |
| DM Policy 2 | Prevention of loss of existing housing |

DM Policy 22	Sustainable design and construction
DM Policy 29	Car parking
DM Policy 30	Urban design and local character
DM Policy 32	Housing design, layout and space standards

Residential Standards Supplementary Planning Document (as updated 2012)

This development sets out guidance and standards relating to design, sustainable development, renewable energy, flood risk, sustainable drainage, dwelling mix, density, layout, neighbour amenity, the amenities of the future occupants of developments, safety and security, refuse, affordable housing, self-containment, noise and room positioning, room and dwelling sizes, amenity space and materials

6.0 Planning Considerations:

- 6.1 The main issues to consider in regard to this application concerns the principle of development, the scale and appearance of the proposed building including its basement, the impact on the adjacent Conservation Area; and the level of impact the development would have upon the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

Principle of Development

- 6.2 The subject property comprises an existing family dwelling. Although a 2 storey property, it is much smaller in height than the adjoining properties, and presents a somewhat 'squat' appearance in the street scene. The adjoining dwelling houses at No. 48 (and its matching pair at 46) has a much higher eaves and its proportions are further increased in relation to No. 50 by it having a gable end wall. The remainder of the street is of a highly mixed character of property ages and styles, but in the main, are buildings of significantly greater height and mass than No. 50. Given its incongruity, together with the lack of townscape consistency in the composition of the street scene, there are no objections to its loss. Moreover, in support of the principle of development, the proposal would result in net housing gain to the borough and as such is compliant with policy DM2 1a, which supports the loss of housing by demolition, redevelopment or change of use where the proposed redevelopment would result in housing gain.
- 6.3 The principle of development however is not just simply a matter of replacing the existing building and housing gain, but also securing a form of development appropriate to its context. Particular regard must be paid to the quality of the materials and detailing of the proposed development. A high quality design which relates successfully to the neighbouring properties is crucial. It must also be demonstrated that the proposal would result in no significant harm to neighbouring residential amenity.

Design and Scale

- 6.4 Policy 3.4 of the London Plan 2016 states that boroughs should take into account local context and character, the design principles and public transport capacity; but that development should also optimise housing output for different types of location within the relevant density range.
- 6.5 DM Policy 30 requires all development proposals to attain a high standard of design. Further to this, applications must demonstrate the required site specific design response in relation to the creation of a positive relationship to the existing townscape, natural landscape, open spaces and topography to preserve and/or create an urban form which contributes to local distinctiveness. Proposals should demonstrate the quality and durability of building materials and their sensitive use in relation to the context of the development. The policy also states the materials should be of a high quality and the reasons for their choice justified.
- 6.6 Officers consider the scale and massing of the proposed development to be in keeping with the general character of the area. In design terms, it steps down from the substantive adjoining building at number 52 in line with the sloping topography of the site. The proposal would leave sufficient space between adjoining properties to retain the detached nature of the property and maintain the rhythm within the street.
- 6.7 It should be noted that although there is no requirement for new development to replicate existing architectural styles, provision is made in DM Policies 30 and 33 for development to attain a high standard of design and be appropriate in its context. As such the proposed development was revised to change the proposed material from render to brick, to match the rest of the street and to add more architectural detail to the front elevation. This increase of detailing to the front would soften the scale of the proposed building and help create more visual interest. The replacement of render, which is not considered to be a high quality or durable material, is considered to be a vast improvement from the original scheme and detailing of the front elevation.
- 6.8 Overall the proposed materials are considered to be of a high quality to ensure the proposed buildings would be in keeping with the existing development and provide visual interest.
- 6.9 Details were listed on the plans, however a sample panel was not provided. Therefore a condition is proposed for the submission of samples to be submitted before the commencement of development to secure the high quality of the design
- 6.10 The original proposal would have a roof element that is sited further towards the boundary with number 52 leaving a gap on the other side, giving the element an asymmetrical look. This has been revised to give a centralised roof element that is set back from all sides. This set back allows the roof element to be subordinate to the main property. Further to this there are various examples within the street of flat roofs and flat roof extensions, as such its introduction would not be incongruous within the streetscene. Due to

tis subordination officers consider the design of the roof element to be acceptable.

- 6.11 In light of the above, officers consider the design of the proposed development to be of an acceptable design and would comply with the relevant design policies with the development plan. .

Residential Amenity

- 6.12 Officer DM Policy 32 'Housing design, layout and space standards' and Policy 3.5 'Quality and design of housing developments' of the London Plan requires housing development to be of the highest quality internally, externally and in relation to their context. These policies set out the requirements with regards to housing design, seeking to ensure the long term sustainability of the new housing provision. Informed by the NPPF, the Mayors Housing SPG provides guidance on how to implement the housing policies in the London Plan. In particular, it provides detail on how to carry forward the Mayor's view that "providing good homes for Londoners is not just about numbers. The quality and design of homes, and the facilities provided for those living in them, are vital to ensuring good liveable environments neighbourhoods".
- 6.13 London Plan Policy 3.5 sets out the minimum floor space standards for new houses relative to the number of occupants. However, in 2015, the 'Technical housing standards – nationally described space standards' were introduced. The alterations to the London Housing SPG adopted these standards. The technical housing standards will therefore be applied in this instance. The proposed units would exceed the policy requirement with regards to overall floor space and room sizes. However, floorspace standards are not the only indicator of the quality of accommodation provided.
- 6.14 DM policy 32 also requires proposals to provide accommodation of a good size, a good outlook, with acceptable shape and layout of rooms, with main habitable rooms receiving direct sunlight and daylight. There is also a presumption that residential units provided should be dual aspect.
- 6.15 The application has been revised so that all the units provided would have dual aspect with good levels of outlook from the main habitable rooms. One bedroom within the family sized unit would have a slightly poor outlook but as the two other bedrooms are provided with good levels of outlook this is not considered to detrimentally impact on the standards of accommodation for the future occupiers.
- 6.16 All units would be provided with adequate sized amenity areas and the family sized units would have a very larger rear garden suitable for a family.
- 6.17 In light of the above officers consider the proposal would provide a good standard accommodation and comply with DM Policy 32 and the council's residential standards SPD.

Neighbouring Amenity

- 6.18 Core Strategy Policy 15 'High quality design for Lewisham' seeks to ensure that proposed development is sensitive to the local context. Officers therefore expect proposed developments to be designed in a way that will not give rise to significant impacts upon the amenities of existing neighbours and future occupiers. Development Management Policy 33 'Development of infill sites, backland sites, back gardens and amenity areas' therefore seeks to ensure that infill development would result in no significant overshadowing or overlooking, and no loss of security or amenity.
- 6.19 Objections have been received in relation to the impact of the proposed development with regards to loss of light and compromised privacy. Although the development would impact on the outlook of the side window at a flat located at Number 52, officers consider this to be a secondary window and not the main source of light into the property. Without more evidence officers cannot consider this to be a reason for refusal.
- 6.20 The proposed development would not extend beyond the rear building lines of the two adjoining properties and therefore officers consider there to be no overbearing impact in terms of its height and scale.
- 6.21 The upper floor windows would be overlooking into the adjoining rear gardens, however there was already some levels of overlooking as existing and it is well acknowledged that this is a common feature of urban living within street terraces. Further to this the garden to number 52 is communal and all of the flats in that building already overlook it and the garden to number 48 is used as a nursery. Any privacy issues are also lessened with the introduction of privacy screen on the roof terraces.
- 6.22 Objection has also been raised regarding the loss of trees. Officers consider that the trees in the rear garden do provide good natural privacy screens and if all else was acceptable a condition requiring their retention would be appropriate.
- 6.23 As such, officers consider there not to be a detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents.

Highways

- 6.24 The NPPF recognises that transport policies have an important role to play in facilitating sustainable development but also in contributing to wider sustainability and health objectives. Plans and decisions should take account of whether the opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site. Safe and suitable access to the site should be achieved for all people. The NPPF clearly states that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.
- 6.25 Core Strategy Policy 14 'Sustainable movement and transport' supports this policy approach and promotes more sustainable transport choices through

walking, cycling and public transport. It adopts a restricted approach on parking to aid the promotion of sustainable transport and ensuring all new and existing developments of a certain size have travel plans. Core Strategy Policy 7 'Climate change and adapting to the effects' and Core Strategy Policy 9 'Improving local air quality' further promote sustainable transport.

- 6.26 The site has a PTAL of which is considered poor accessibility to public transport. Two off street parking space are being proposed. The councils highways officer raise no objections to the car free nature of some of the units even with the poor PTAL rating, on the proviso that a parking management strategy be provided allowing the larger units sole access to their parking spaces. Officers consider a suitably worded condition would capture this and allow the family sized unit sole access to the parking spaces.
- 6.27 To increase sustainability, cycle parking has been provided to the rear, with boundary treatments to protect the privacy of the lower ground floor unit. .
- 6.28 Although there is a nursery adjoining that would increase traffic at peak time this unlikely add to the parking stress within the area as the increased traffic would be for drop off and pick up only.
- 6.29 It is felt that the proposed development would give rise to an increase in parking in the surrounding streets, nevertheless, the increase is not considered significant enough to warrant a refusal.
- 6.30 On balance, the proposed development is acceptable with regards to parking.
- 6.31 Details regarding refuse and recycling should be secured by way of a condition.

7.0 Equalities Implications

- 7.1 The Council has considered the public sector equality duty under section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010 and in the exercise of its functions to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation and any other conduct which is prohibited under this Act and to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.
- 7.2 As with the case with the original separate duties, the new duty continues to be a "have regard duty" and the weight to attach to it is a matter of judgement bearing in mind relevance and proportionality. It is not an absolute requirement to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity, or foster good relations.

8.0 Conclusion

- 8.1 This application has been considered in the light of policies set out in the development plan and other material considerations.

8.2 The proposed development is considered to be acceptable and of no significant harm to residential amenity or the character of the area.

9.0 **RECOMMENDATION GRANT PERMISSION** subject to the following conditions:

1. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years, beginning with the date on which the permission is granted.

Reason: As required by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the application plans, drawings and documents hereby approved and as detailed below:

P9/002, P9/003; P9/004; P9/005; P9/006; P9/007; P9/008; received 24 March 2017
P9/001; REVG,P9/009 REVG;P9/010 REVG ; P9/011 REVG; P9/012 REVG; P9/013 REVG; P9/014 REVG; P9/015 REVG; P9/016 REVG; received 4 July 2017.

Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved documents, plans and drawings submitted with the application and is acceptable to the local planning authority.

3. No Deliveries in connection with construction works shall be taken at or despatched from the site other than between the hours of 8am and 6pm on Mondays to Fridays and 8am and 1pm on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays or Public Holidays.

No work shall take place on the site other than between the hours of 8am and 6pm on Mondays to Fridays and 8am and 1pm on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays or Public Holidays.

Reason: In order to safeguard the amenities of adjoining occupants at unsociable periods and to comply with Paragraph 120 of the National Planning Policy Framework and DM Policy 26 Noise and Vibration, DM Policy 32 Housing design, layout and space standards of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).

4. No development shall commence on site until a detailed schedule and specification/samples of all external materials, finishes, windows, external doors and roof coverings to be used on the building(s) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

5. **Reason:** To ensure that the local planning authority may be satisfied as to the external appearance of the building(s) and to comply with Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham of the Core Strategy (June 2011) and Development Management Local Plan (November 2014) DM Policy 30 Urban design and local character.

6. No development shall commence on site until a scheme for the storage and collection of refuse and recycling facilities for each residential unit hereby approved, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

The facilities as approved under part (a) shall be provided in full prior to occupation of the development and shall thereafter be permanently retained and maintained.

7. **Reason:** In order that the local planning authority may be satisfied with the provisions for recycling facilities and refuse storage in the interest of safeguarding the amenities of neighbouring occupiers and the area in general, in compliance with Development Management Local Plan (November 2014) DM Policy 30 Urban design and local character and Core Strategy Policy 13 Addressing Lewisham waste management requirements (2011).

8. Notwithstanding the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order), the use of the flat roof on the building(s) hereby approved shall be as set out in the application and no development or the formation of any door providing access to the roof shall be carried out, nor shall the roof area be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area.

Reason: In order to prevent any unacceptable loss of privacy to adjoining properties and the area generally and to comply with Policy 15 High Quality design for Lewisham of the Core Strategy (June 2011), and DM Policy 31 Alterations and extensions to existing buildings including residential extensions, DM Policy 32 Housing design, layout and space standards, and DM Policy 33 Development on infill sites, backland sites, back gardens and amenity areas of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).

9. No development shall commence on site until a Construction Logistics Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The plan shall demonstrate the following:-

(a) Rationalise travel and traffic routes to and from the site.

(b) Provide full details of the number and time of construction vehicle trips to the site with the intention and aim of reducing the impact of construction vehicle activity.

- (c) Measures to deal with safe pedestrian movement.

The measures specified in the approved details shall be implemented prior to commencement of development and shall be adhered to during the period of construction.

Reason: In order to ensure satisfactory vehicle management and to comply with Policy 14 Sustainable movement and transport of the Core Strategy (June 2011), and Policy 5.3 Sustainable design and construction, Policy 6.3 Assessing effects of development on transport capacity and Policy 7.14 Improving air quality of the London Plan (2015).

10. A minimum of **4** secure and dry cycle parking spaces shall be provided within the development as indicated on the plans hereby approved.

No development shall commence on site until the full details of the cycle parking facilities have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

All cycle parking spaces shall be provided and made available for use prior to occupation of the development and maintained thereafter.

Reason: In order to ensure adequate provision for cycle parking and to comply with Policy 14: Sustainable movement and transport of the Core Strategy (2011).

Informative

Positive and Proactive Statement: The Council engages with all applicants in a positive and proactive way through specific pre-application enquiries and the detailed advice available on the Council's website. On this particular application, positive discussions took place which resulted in further information being submitted.

This page is intentionally left blank



This page is intentionally left blank