

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE A

Tuesday, 16 January 2018 at 7.30 pm

PRESENT: Councillors Abdeslam Amrani (Chair), Jacq Paschoud (Vice-Chair), Andre Bourne, Obajimi Adefiranye, Amanda De Ryk, Alan Till and James-J Walsh

ALSO PRESENT: OFFICERS: Michael Forrester – Planning Service, Paul Clough – Legal Services, Russell Brown – Planning Officer, Samuel James – Committee Co-ordinator

Apologies for absence were received from no one

1. **Declarations of Interests**

There were no declaration of interests.

2. **Minutes**

Members approved the minutes for Committee A, which was held on 8th December 2017

3. **54 AVONLEY ROAD, LONDON, SE14 5EW**

The presenting Planning Officer Michael Forrester explained the details the existing site which is in a backland location, fully enclosed by residential properties and is currently occupied by an MOT Centre which ceased operation in December 2016. He then outlined the proposal which is a change of use of the site from a vehicular repair and MOT centre (Use Class B2) to residential (Use Class C3). This would involve the demolition of all three buildings on site and the reprovision of two buildings in the form of nine residential units (4, four bed units, 3, three bed units and 2, two bed units).

Councillor Adefiranye took his seat at 19:35.

He went on to mention that there had been 9 letters of objection and 14 letters of support, and summarised the main concerns raised by objectors. He also outlined the involvement the Council's Highways team had with the application, and noted that their initial concerns had now been satisfied by additional information provided during the course of the application. He stated that officers raised no objections to the scheme and asked the committee to approve the proposal.

Questions by members followed relating to emergency vehicle access to the site, the access arrangements for Units 8 and 9, design of parking within the site and whether the swept path drawings had used a smaller than standard fire engine for their model. They also raised concerns over the Highways officer's initial comments.

The presenting officer reiterated that additional information had been submitted and was found to be acceptable by the highways officer, as outlined in the Planning Considerations section of the report.

Councillor Walsh raised concerns that the future residents and their visitors may mount the curbs, parking outside of the set parking spaces which could impede emergency vehicle access. The presenting officer stated that Condition 11 could be revised to provide details of curbing, should the proposal be accepted.

Councillor Kennedy took his seat at 19:45.

The committee received verbal representation from Johnny Horn, one of the Founders of the applicants Horn & Horne, who explained that they were trying to provide much needed family housing on a site which is more suited to residential than the existing usage, and would be less disruptive to the existing residents. He outlined the level of community engagement that has taken place and stated that the letters of support outnumbered those of objection. He assured members that disruption would be kept to a minimum during construction and explained how the current application has been altered and improved from the last following advice from officers.

Questions from members followed relating to increased traffic movement within and exiting/entering the site and whether an assessment had been carried out on this. The applicant stated that this had been done and reiterated that highways have agreed to the transport assessment which has been submitted.

Councillor Jeffrey questioned the predicted period of construction to which the applicant stated approximately 12 months.

Members asked whether emergency services had been consulted on the access to the site, or on the swept path drawings which were provided. The applicant stated that the documents had been produced by a professional transport consultant to the industry standard, but did not know if they had consulted the emergency services.

The committee then heard from Bill Randle an objector who lives on Edric Road who stated that they do not oppose any residential development on the site, but that the current proposal was an overdevelopment of it. He stated that the number of units had only been reduced by 1 bedroom since the previous refusal, and couldn't see how the current proposal had addressed the previous refusal reasons. He stated the main concerns relate to access; parking; noise, light and vehicle pollution; privacy and security.

Plan drawings were tabled and objector stated that the swept path drawings submitted by the applicant were factually incorrect and that a fire engine would not be able to access the site and that the access and parking arrangements would be generally unsafe for residents. He also stated that the swept path drawings assume no cars to be parked near or opposite the access on Avonley Road, which is rarely the case in reality.

He stated that the development goes against the Development Plan, and that a development of reduced height and less units would be supported.

Councillor Paschoud asked whether the proposal was smaller than the existing building, to which the objector replied it was, but it would still be overbearing and impact on their privacy.

The presenting officer went on to clarify some of the conditions that have been suggested, and explained how these would alleviate the issues raised by the objector.

General questions from members followed:

Councillor De Ryk sought clarification on the security concerns during construction which were raised, as well as effectiveness of the louvre windows and the obscure glazing and whether future occupiers could simply remove these. The presenting officer stated that the new dwelling would not have PD rights so planning permission would be required to alter the windows and that there is a suggested condition for the applicant to submit a Construction Management Plan which would address the security issues.

Councillor Walsh had outstanding concerns over access, including for emergency vehicles, refuse trucks and the blocked sightlines of any drivers exiting the site. The presenting officer reiterated that Highways has approved the swept path and access details, and clarified that refuse would be brought to the bin store at the front of the site, meaning refuse trucks would not need access.

Councillor Walsh again queried whether the swept path drawings model had taken account of vehicles parked on Avonley Road and noted that if there was not 100% clarification on this then his concerns would stand. The officer noted that they did not have this information to hand.

Councillor Amrani looked up the size of a standard fire truck online and noted that there would only be 45cm leeway along the narrow access path which is concerning.

Councillor Walsh sought clarification on why the number of units had only reduced by 1 bedroom and queried if this was significant reduction in density. The presenting officer stated that the changes since the last refusal are outlined in the report, and that the proposed density conforms with and is at the lower end of the prescribed densities in the London Plan.

Deliberations over the safety of the access, and suitability for emergency vehicles continued, as well as concerns over the adequacy of the refuse storage and members wanted this examined further should the proposal be deferred. It was stated that the main issue is one of safety and access to the site.

Members discussed that should the proposal be deferred they would like further information on access to and parking within the site. They stated that they would also like to visit the site, would like further comments from highways on how the access could be improved (including controlled parking), as well as comments

from the fire brigade if possible. Councillor Walsh wanted more detail on the lighting levels within the site, and the suitability of these to ensure safety for drivers and pedestrians.

Following further deliberations Councillor De Ryk moved a motion to defer the decision to a later committee which was seconded by Councillor Walsh.

Councillors Adefiranye, and Kennedy were ineligible to vote as they took their seats once the case hearing had begun.

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Councillors Amrani (Chair), De Ryk (Vice-Chair), Paschoud, Bourne, Till and Walsh.

ABSTAINED: Councillor Jeffrey

RESOLVED: Defer the decision of application DC/17/103958 to a later committee date, following the submission of further details.

4. BASEMENT FLAT, 8 GRANVILLE PARK, LONDON, SE13 7EA

The presenting officer outlined the proposal for the construction of a single storey extension to the rear, together with the installation of a window in the side elevation. He stated there had been 7 objections, but officers consider the proposal to be a high quality design and recommended approval.

Councillor Amrani queried whether 5m deep extensions would usually be permitted and thought that the maximum allowable depth was 3m. The planning officer clarified that the 3m restriction relates to permitted development, and permission is required for anything greater, each case is assessed based upon its own merits.

Members then heard from Ade Fowler, the architect of the scheme. He explained the amendments that have been made since the previously withdrawn application and why he considered they are an improvement. He also explained that it was not the applicant's intent to harm any neighbours, and they are working to come up with an acceptable solution to boundary treatments, which are currently in a poor state.

Councillor De Ryk sought clarification on the existing and proposed boundary treatment and whether its installation would be permitted development. The agent explained how the proposed boundary treatment has been altered since the previous application, and stated it was not the applicants' intent to encroach onto anyone's property. The planning officer confirmed that boundary treatment up to 2m in height would be permitted development.

Councillor De Ryk questioned whether there would be light spill from, and overlooking into the proposed rooflight as well as whether the roof could withstand the load of workmen who may need to stand on it for maintenance in the future. The applicant confirmed that the roof could withstand workmen, and that there

would be some light spill from and overlooking into the rooflight, but this would be expected in an urban residential setting such as this.

Councillor Paschoud questioned whether the works would be PD if the property was not a flat, and whether the 5m depth is excessive. The applicant confirmed the works would not be PD, but that within the context of the long garden he thought it was acceptable.

Mr Benjamin Dodge of 8 Granville Park, the flat above the application property, then spoke against the proposal. He stated that he was also speaking on behalf of No.10 Granville Park, an adjoining property. He stated two main objections against the scheme, and four from No.10:

1. Concerned the relocation of a bedroom to below their living room would cause noise and disturbance complaints against them.
2. Concerned about disturbance cause by light spill from the rooflight, as well as the reflective roof material. He requested a condition to ensure the rooflight is opaque.
3. Loss of privacy caused by side elevation windows proposed, requested they be fixed shut and fully obscured.
4. Light pollution issues due to rooflight.
5. Raised concern over noise issues.
6. Style and scale not in keeping with conservation area or surrounding properties and would be overbearing in terms of height and depth.

Questions from members followed regarding the objectors perceived harmful impact of the light spill, to which he replied it would spoil their night time view of the garden. Councillor Amrani asked the planning officer what the depth of the garden was, which he stated approximately 17m, and clarified that the resulting garden would be comfortably greater than the 50% prescribed by Policy DM31.

Councillor De Ryk asked whether the applicants could install further side windows than those proposed, and the planning officer clarified that any new windows would require planning permission.

Councillor Walsh queried whether the rooflight was to be fixed shut, and if a condition could be added relating to this. He also queried whether there was an industry standard which limits noise transmission through glazing. The officer stated that there was no indication within the application that the rooflight would be openable, but a condition could be added to ensure it was fixed shut if felt necessary by members. He stated that noise from residential dwellings is not usually considered to be an amenity consideration.

Councillor Adefiranye raised concern over the potential of the proposal to damage underground services, but the planning officer stated that this was a building control rather than a planning consideration.

Councillor Walsh raised a motion to condition the rooflight to be obscure glazed which was seconded by Councillor De Ryk. This motion however, was not carried forward.

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Councillors De Ryk, Adefiranye, Walsh.

AGAINST: Councillors Amrani (Chair), Paschoud (Vice-Chair), Bourne, Jeffrey, Kennedy, Till

RESOLVE: Motion Defeated.

Councillor Walsh then raised a motion to accept Officer's recommendation and approve the application, subject to the roof light being fixed shut. Councillor Till seconded the motion.

FOR: Councillors Amrani (Chair), Councillor Paschoud (Vice-Chair), Bourne, Adefiranye, Jeffrey, Kennedy, Till, Walsh

AGAINST: Councillor De Ryk

RESOLVE: That planning permission be granted in respect of application No. DC/17/103717 subject to the conditions outlined in the report.

5. 108 MARSALA ROAD, LONDON, SE13 7AF

Councillor Kennedy excused himself from the meeting, as the application relates to a property which is owned by him.

The presenting officer explained that the proposal was for a Lawful Development Certificate (Proposed) in respect of the construction of a hip-to-gable roof extension and a rear dormer roof extension incorporating a Juliet balcony along with the replacement of the existing single storey rear extension to install bi-folding doors, together with the insertion of three rooflights to the front roof slope. He explained that officers had assessed it against the General Permitted Development Order and found it to be in compliance with the parameters and conditions set out. The only reason for the case to come to committee was because the Lewisham Constitution states that planning officers may not determine applications under delegated powers where the applicant is a member of the Council.

Councillor Jeffrey asked whether the room created in the loft could be used as a separate dwelling, and the planning officer confirmed it could not without gaining planning permission.

Councillor Walsh raised a motion to accept officers' recommendation and issue the Lawful Development Certificate, which was seconded by Councillor Till.

FOR: Councillors Amrani (Chair), Councillor Paschoud (Vice-Chair), De Ryk, Bourne, Adefiranye, Jeffrey, Till, Walsh

RESOLVE: That Lawful Development Certificate be issued in respect of application No. DC/17/104633.

The meeting ended at 21:10