

## **APENDIX A – Local Meeting Minutes**

13 November 2013

### **PROPOSED REDEVELOPMENT AT 51-53 CANONBIE ROAD SE23 3AQ**

At 7:30pm on 13<sup>th</sup> November 2013, a local meeting was held at the Town Hall in Catford, regarding the submission of a planning application proposing the demolition of the existing dwellinghouse at 51-53 Canonbie Road SE23, and the construction of a 1, part single/part two storey, 6 bedroom house ( House 1 ) and 1, part two/part three storey with basement, 7 bedroom house (House 2) including a single - storey outbuilding at the end of the rear garden with covered side passageway, together with roof terraces and balconies, associated landscaping and the provision of 1 car parking space to the front of each house with access onto Canonbie Road.

21 individual letters have been received objecting to the proposal on the following grounds:

- Overdevelopment of the plot;
- Long rear addition being part of the proposal and height of side boundary wall;
- “Purpose” of covered walkway to the rear garden;
- Proposed houses not “traditional” in appearance nor “sympathetic” to the streetscene and “out of keeping” with the area;
- Existing house of historical interest and should be renovated and not be demolished;
- Replacement of the existing house with 2 dwellings is not “appropriate” for the site;
- The “majority” of houses in Canonbie and Netherby Roads are 1930s and not Post War;
- 6 and 7 bedroom dwellings not appropriate for Canonbie Road;
- Loss of outlook, sunlight and daylight to neighbouring properties;
- Loss of “views” from the rear of no.55;
- Overlooking from proposed balconies;
- The 2 storey “blank” wall visible from Canonbie Road;
- Disruption, mess and inconvenience caused to neighbouring properties;
- Increased road traffic activity and under-provision of car parking space;
- Increased noise and disturbance;
- Canonbie Road has sufficient housing provision;
- “Softer” coloured materials would be preferable;
- Use of Symons Court as access to the site;
- Proposed rear outbuilding could be a “precedent” for the area;
- Accuracy of drawings including depiction of building lines;
- Front elevation of no.49 does not show a flat roof;
- Cross section drawings needed to include site boundaries and proposed houses;
- Drawings should show internal conformity to London Housing Design Guide;
- Potential multi-occupancy of proposed dwellings;
- “Depth” of the building on the side of the hill and excavation causing instability to neighbouring properties;
- Impact on water an sewerage supplies;
- Not responsive to the “needs of the local borough”;

- “Harm” and “upheaval” caused by building work;
- Resident consultation took place after submission of plans.

The Tewkesbury Lodge Estate Residents’ Association objected to the proposal on the following grounds:

- “Potentially” misleading drawings and plans;
- Overdevelopment of the plot;
- Negative impact on the streetscape;
- Loss of amenity to 55 Canonbie Road.

The panel was comprised of :

Cllr Feakes (Chair) **(Cllr)**

Miheer Mehta (Planning Consultant) **(PC)**

Sean O’Sullivan (Planning officer) **(SO)**

22 local residents and representatives from the Tewkesbury Lodge Estate Residents’ Association were in attendance. **(R)**

### **Minutes of the Meeting**

Cllr Feakes opens the meeting by introducing the panel and proposal to the audience, and explains the procedures of a local meeting. He invites Mr Mehta to give an overview of the application.

Mr Mehta suggested that local residents referred to specially prepared “story boards”, which he had brought with him. Mr Mehta explained his role in the proceedings, and then gave a brief presentation of the proposal.

**(R)** The accuracy of the drawings is of concern. Without complete and adequately detailed plans and cross sections, an accurate assessment of the proposal cannot be made.

**(D)** Drawings will be revised where necessary and further detailed plans and cross sections will be submitted shortly.

**(Cllr)** Expressed concern regarding the accuracy and level of detail of the drawings submitted. Would re-consultation be necessary?

**(SO)** Possibly re-consultation would be necessary and the Council have a statutory duty to consult local residents. I shall pass concerns regarding the accuracy and level of detail of the drawings to the Case Officer.

**(R)** We are concerned about the loss of amenities to the neighbouring side facing kitchen window at 49 Canonbie Road, caused by the proposed development.

**(D)** There would be no significant loss of daylight/sunlight caused to the kitchen window or side of 49 Canonbie Road.

**(SO)** I shall ask the Case Officer to investigate any loss of amenities to this neighbouring property.

- (R) We are also concerned about the loss of amenities to the neighbouring property at 55 Canonbie Road, caused by the proposed development. In addition we are concerned about noise and disturbance during construction.
- (D) There would be no significant loss of amenities caused to 55 Canonbie Road, as a result of this development.
- (SO) I shall ask the Case Officer to investigate any loss of amenities to no.55. Construction noise is usually dealt with by other legislation for a development of this size.
- (R) We are concerned about the long rear addition being part of the proposal and the height of side boundary wall. What is the purpose of this and the covered walkway to the rear garden and can it be removed from the scheme? In addition, we are concerned about overlooking from the outbuilding into neighbouring properties down the hill. Could this outbuilding become a separate house?
- (D) The covered walkway would provide sheltered access to the proposed outbuilding to the rear. The height of the boundary wall would provide protection against subsidence from the neighbouring property. The outbuilding has similar dimensions to one that would be allowed in any back garden under permitted development rights.
- (SO) I shall ask the Case Officer to investigate any loss of privacy to neighbouring properties. For the outbuilding to be used as a separate dwelling to the main house, a planning application would be required.
- (R) The provision of parking spaces would be inadequate, and would be to the detriment of neighbouring occupiers.
- (SO) It is not possible to provide more parking spaces than the maximum policy requirement for parking provision. I shall ask the Case Officer to investigate with Highways.
- (R) The existing dwelling should be retained. Is demolition and replacement totally necessary and could it start an unhelpful precedent in the street?
- (D) The proposed development would enable the efficient use of the site and provide two good sized family dwellings.
- (SO) Stated that if the development were approved, then it would create some form of precedent. However, any proposed schemes in the future, would require individual planning applications. Therefore, each future scheme would be considered on a case by case basis and against Lewisham planning policies.

8.30pm

Cllr brings meeting to a close.