

|              |                        |                       |
|--------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
| Committee    | PLANNING COMMITTEE (B) |                       |
| Report Title | MINUTES                |                       |
| Ward         |                        |                       |
| Contributors |                        |                       |
| Class        | PART 1                 | Date 01 December 2016 |

## MINUTES

To approve the minutes of the meeting of Planning Committee (B) held on the 20 October 2016.

### LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

MINUTES of the meeting of the PLANNING COMMITTEE (B) held in COMMITTEE ROOMS 1&2, LEWISHAM TOWN HALL, CATFORD SE6 on 20<sup>th</sup> October 2016 at 7:30PM.

PRESENT: Councillors: Reid (Chair), Ogunbadewa (Vice-Chair), Mallory, Moore, Muldoon, Paschoud, Dacres, Best.

OFFICERS: Suzanne White - Planning Service, Kevin Chadd - Legal Services, Andrew Harris - Committee Co-ordinator.

#### 1. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Councillors Muldoon and Mallory declared personal non-prejudicial interests, Councillor Muldoon as a member of the Co-Operative Group (item 2 on the agenda), and Councillor Mallory as living near Lampmead Road (item 5 on the agenda).

#### 2. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of Planning Committee (B) held on 8<sup>th</sup> September 2016 were agreed by Members to be a true and accurate record.

#### 3. 197 NEW CROSS ROAD, LONDON, SE14 5DQ

The Planning Officer Suzanne White outlined the details of the case and informed Members that a further petition had been received, further to the one outlined in the Officer's Report.

The committee then received verbal representation from Ms Altine Elias (Agent), who presented the scheme and responded to Members questions. Ms Elias reiterated to Members that the scheme would result in the relocation of an existing betting shop rather than provide a new unit. She also stated that the scheme complied with both national and local policies, and would not result in any harm to local amenities.

Councillor Reid (Chair) queried whether there were any assurances that would ensure the old premises would close if permission was granted. Ms Elias confirmed that this was a condition of the licence.

The committee then received verbal representation from an objector, Ms Shereener Brown. Ms Brown outlined concerns regarding the prominent position of the building, the high concentration of betting shops in the area, the negative impacts on local vulnerable populations and the resulting anti-social impacts. She also argued that there had been strong local opposition to the scheme, with one of the two submitted petitions receiving over 700 signatures.

Ms Brown also objected that insufficient site notices were displayed on site. Councillor Mallory requested for comments about this, to which Councillor Reid (Chair) stated that there was evidence that all the consultation had been sufficiently in line with Council policies.

The committee then heard from Councillor Dacres, who was speaking against the proposal under standing orders. She also stated that she was also representing Councillors from Telegraph Hill and New Cross.

Councillor Dacres went on to highlight concerns regarding the social implications of the scheme such as increases in antisocial behaviour and crime. She also highlighted that there was already a high density of such shops within the area and that there was strong local community opposition to the scheme, which had been seen in the submitted petitions. Councillor Dacres then stated that scheme would cause harm to historic and iconic building, which was highly prominent when entering the borough from Southwark.

Councillor Mallory stated that although there had been some consultation with police, this had been insufficient and that he had concern for the proliferation of such shops. He then requested that the applicant should seek a report from the Metropolitan Police on the scheme. Councillor Muldoon also agreed that there should be further consultation with the police. Kevin Chadd (Legal Services) advised that while it was possible to request this from the police, they would not be obligated to respond. He also outlined that the planning application was a separate process to the licencing process, which the police would be consulted on.

Councillor Ogunbadewa (Vice-Chair) agreed with Councillors Mallory and Muldoon, and suggested that the decision be deferred to a future committee until the police had been consulted. Councillor Reid (Chair) agreed and Councillor Mallory moved a motion to defer the application. It was seconded by Councillor Muldoon.

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Reid (Chair), Ogunbadewa (Vice-Chair), Moore, Muldoon, Mallory.

That in respect of the planning application No. DC/16/096758, the decision be deferred to allow time for the Metropolitan Police to be consulted.

#### 4. ST CYPRIANS HALL, BROCKLEY ROAD, LONDON, SE4 2RA

The Planning Officer Suzanne White outlined the details of the case.

Councillor Reid (Chair) noted that the Highways Officer had requested several conditions should the application be granted, and questioned whether the scheme was acceptable because of this.

The Planning Officer Suzanne White stated that the site had a public transport access level 4, was within walking distance from two stations and had parking on the opposite side of the road. She outlined that the site was on a residential street, but that there could be conditions which would control noise generated from operations such as deliveries.

Councillor Muldoon enquired about the nature of deliveries and what would happen if two deliveries arrived at once. The Planning Officer Suzanne White stated that the applicant could clarify this, but that there could be conditions which would restrict and reduce the amount of deliveries which would take place.

The committee then received verbal representation from Mr Henry Courtier (Agent). Mr Courtier outlined to Members the benefits of the scheme to the local community, such as the creation of 20-25 new jobs. He also stated that the scheme would also provide services and products which were not currently readily available in the area such as free cash withdrawals and a source of fresh fruit and vegetables. Mr Courtier went on to state that the scheme was in line with Council policies and received positive feedback from local residents. He added that the applicant was also happy for conditions to be attached which would safeguard residential amenities.

Councillor Reid (Chair) asked Mr Courtier to address concerns about the potential impact on parking. Mr Courtier stated that the shop would be designed for 'top-up' shopping, rather than as a place to do weekly shopping. He also stated that most business would be from people on foot, rather than by car. Mr Courtier went on to state that there would be between 4-6 deliveries per day, but that the company's delivery vans had been shown not to impact on local road congestion.

Councillor Moore stated that she had concerns regarding multiple deliveries and questioned how this would impact local amenities. Councillor Ogunbadewa (Vice-Chair) also asked what the times the deliveries would be. Mr Courtier responded stating that the deliveries would be between 7am to 7pm and that a delivery service plan would be used to manage the impact of the deliveries.

No Members of the public opposing the scheme were present at the meeting.

Councillor Reid (Chair) asked the committee if they felt the scheme had been sufficiently justified. Members agreed that it had and Councillor Moore moved a motion to accept the Officer's recommendation, subject to conditions. It was seconded by Councillor Muldoon.

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Reid (Chair), Ogunbadewa (Vice-Chair), Moore, Muldoon, Mallory.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted in respect of application No. DC/16/096995 subject to the conditions outlined in the report.

5. 10 LAWRIE PARK AVENUE, LONDON, SE26 6HJ

The Planning Officer Suzanne White outlined the details of the case.

No representatives from either the applicant or any objectors were present at the meeting.

Councillor Moore asked whether the development incorporated built in storage. The Planning Officer Suzanne White stated that the scheme complied with all required housing standards.

Following deliberation by Members, Councillor Moore 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: Reid (Chair), Ogunbadewa (Vice-Chair), Moore, Muldoon, Mallory.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted in respect of application No. DC/16/097415 subject to the conditions outlined in the report.

6. 278-280 KIRKDALE, LONDON, SE26 4RS

The Planning Officer Suzanne White outlined the details of the case.

The Committee then received verbal representation from Mr Joe Alderman (Agent) acting on behalf of the applicant, who further detailed the application and stated that the site had been advertised for its existing use, but there had been no interest in it as A1/A3 use. He also stated that the current application would bring use to a vacant property.

Councillor Paschoud arrived at the meeting at 20:35.

Councillor Reid (Chair) then asked what assurances there were that the other unit would close. She also enquired as to the level of advertising which had taken place on for the unit under the current use. Mr Alderman responded that the existing unit would be closed as it was not viable to run two offices within Sydenham. He also informed Members that the unit had been marketed since the first application in 2010/11, but there had been little interest in the unit for A1 use.

Councillor Reid (Chair) asked the Planning Officer Suzanne White if advertising had taken place. The Planning Officer Suzanne White responded stating that, as the site is in a secondary retail area, there were no policies which required further evidence to be submitted, though the applicant had submitted some evidence.

No Members of the public opposing the scheme were present at the meeting.

The committee then received verbal representation from Councillor Best, who was speaking against the proposal under standing orders. Councillor Best informed Members that she was speaking on behalf of the Sydenham Society.

Councillor Best went on to highlight concerns regarding the density of such uses within the area and that there was local opposition to the proposed change of use. She stated that there had been interest in the use of the premises as an A1 use, but that there had been concerns over the advertised price. However she argues that the current use was viable due to the high footfall from the Overground line and newly renovated Greyhound Pub. Councillor Best followed this by outlining her concern that the previous unit would be left as an A2 use.

The Planning Officer Suzanne White stated that the applicant's planning statement stated that the site had been advertised since 2014 and had had 7 viewings, with no parties showing further interest. Councillor Reid (Chair) asked if more information had been

requested, to which the Planning Officer Suzanne White replied that there were no policies which required this.

Further questions from Members regarding the advertisement of the unit followed. The applicant responded stating that evidence had been supplied and that the physical restrictions of the unit was also responsible for the lack of interest.

Following further deliberation by Members, 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: Reid (Chair), Ogunbadewa (Vice-Chair), Moore, Mallory

ABSTAINED: Muldoon

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted in respect of application No. DC/16/097653 subject to the conditions outlined in the report.

#### 7. 30 LAMPMEAD ROAD, LONDON, SE12 8QL

The Planning Officer Suzanne White outlined the details of the case.

Councillor Reid (Chair) stated that the materials were of a good quality, but that she had concerns regard the size of the dormer. The Planning Officer Suzanne White confirmed that the dormer complied with Council specifications.

Councillor Paschoud also raised concerns that the development could be seen as out of character with the area. The Planning Officer Suzanne White responded that it was on the edge of the Lee Manor Conservation Area and that some innovation was acceptable. She added that other properties within the terrace also had large dormers.

Councillor Mallory followed by outlining concerns regarding the quality of work which had resulted in the initial collapse of the building, the fact that other more modest applications in the area had previously been refused and that the examples in the Officer's report referenced structures which had been built prior to the expansion of the Conservation Area. Councillor Muldoon asked if conditions could be added which would ensure the quality of the work, to which Councillor Reid (Chair) indicated would be a matter for Building Control. Kevin Chadd (Legal Services) reiterated this to Members.

The Committee then received verbal representation from Mr Robert Williams (Applicant) and Mr Peter Lancaric (Agent). Mr Williams (Applicant) outlined to Members that the intention of the proposal was to complement the main house, while making it compatible with the requirements of modern living. They went on to highlight that pre-application advice and consultation with neighbours had been undertaken, and that other similar development in the area had been approved.

Councillor Reid (Chair) followed by asking Mr Lancaric (Agent) to respond to the concerns regarding the size of the dormer, to which Mr Lancaric replied that the dormer looked much larger on the digital drawings and would look significantly smaller and less dominant in real life.

Councillor Muldoon then enquired about how the initial collapse had occurred. Mr Williams (Applicant) responded stating that it had been the result of an error, coupled with pre-existing damage from wood rot which had caused the collapse. He then advised Members that new structural engineers had been appointed and that there had been two visits from Building Control, who had approved the subsequent works.

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

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Reid (Chair), Ogunbadewa (Vice-Chair), Moore, Mallory

ABSTAINED: Muldoon

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted in respect of application No. DC/16/097144 subject to the conditions outlined in the report.