

Committee	PLANNING COMMITTEE (B)	
Report Title	MINUTES	
Ward		
Contributors		
Class	PART 1	Date 25 April 2019

## MINUTES

To approve the minutes of the meeting of Planning Committee (B) held on the 10<sup>th</sup> January 2019 and 28<sup>th</sup> February 2019.

### LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

MINUTES of the meeting of the PLANNING COMMITTEE (B) held in ROOMS 1 & 2, CIVIC SUITE, LEWISHAM TOWN HALL, CATFORD, SE6 4RU on 10<sup>th</sup> January 2019 at 19:30.  
PRESENT: Councillors Suzannah Clarke (Chair), Tom Copley (Vice-Chair), Obajimi Adefiranye, Tauseef Anwar, Andre Bourne, Liz Johnston-Franklin, John Muldoon, John Paschoud and James Rathbone

OFFICERS: Mehdi Rezaie - Presenting Officer Planning Service, Jeremy Ward – Case Officer, Christopher Dale – Service Group Manager, Paula Young – Legal Services and Jesenka Ozdalga – Committee Co-ordinator

APOLOGIES: Cllr Silvana Kelleher, due to other Committee commitments would arrive later.

#### **1. Declaration of interests**

1.1 No declarations of interests.

#### **2. Minutes of the meeting held on 15 November 2018.**

2.1 *Cllr Copley* asked for minutes to be corrected under Section 1 Declaration of interests to read: The Campaign for Real Ale.

RESOLVED: That the minutes be approved subject to the above changes.

#### **3. 1 Waldram Park Road, SE23**

3.1 The Chair clarified that the application is in Perry Vale Ward and not Forest Hill as listed.

3.2 The presenting officer introduced the details of the application. The case officer then presented an addendum report and amendments to the application: Recommendation B was to give authority to the Head of planning, once legal agreements are in place, to grant permission subject to the conditions outlined in the original report. Amendments and additions to conditions were also included within the addendum. These related to hours of operation and road safety. The addendum also clarified that a Section 278 Agreement would be used to secure highways works.

3.3 In response to a question the case officer clarified that a Section 278 Agreement is an agreement between the developer and planning and highways authority regarding improvements to the highway.

- 3.4 In response to further questions the case officer clarified that the addendum report proposed to replace condition 13 of the original report relating to the hours of the operation and not condition 14 as stated. The reason for requiring the condition was unchanged.
- 3.5 The presenting officer introduced further details of the application and noted that, during the initial statutory consultation period, no objections had been raised by Highways or Environmental Health and Protection. Thames Water, The Metropolitan Police, London Fire and Emergency Services and Transport for London were also consulted and raised no objections. 12 objections were received by local residents and businesses regarding highways matters, air quality, loss of retail unit, scale, design and principle of development.
- 3.6 In response to a question, the case officer clarified that, despite reference having been made to Co-op, the proposal is for the premises to be used as Class A1 retail and the unit could potentially be occupied by any retail occupier.
- 3.7 Cllr Paschoud asked for his interest as a Labour and Co-operative Party member to be recorded. Cllr Muldoon and Cllr Copley asked for their interests as Labour and Co-operative Party members to be recorded as well.
- 3.8 In response to questions from members of the Committee officers clarified a number of points relating to bin collection, design of the lift plant space and landscaping. It was confirmed that footpath would be approximately 3m wide with a colonnade that creates an additional area.
- 3.9 The Committee received a verbal representation from the applicant who represented his family business which he advised was well established in the local area. The applicant confirmed that he had been involved in discussions with the Council, community and Forest Hill Society in relation to an appropriate land use and decided on a hotel scheme to provide a community meeting space, café, bar and casual dining. From the commercial perspective, the applicant confirmed they had spoken to a number of hotel providers including the IHG and Hilton Groups. As a family business they are committed to the area and chose an architect who has experience working in Lewisham. When choosing materials and style for the building they wanted something that would be an asset to the area so brick and re-constituted stone for detailing around windows was proposed. At the same time they wanted to add something modern which is reflected in the colonnade and glazed front at the ground floor. The scheme would also deliver wider benefits as it would add 170 sq. m to the public realm and double the number of jobs on the site.
- 3.10 *Cllr Muldoon* declared a personal interest as member of IHG and Hilton loyalty scheme.
- 3.11 Following concerns being raised with respect to traffic the applicant clarified that they had conducted a Parking survey which is in line with Lewisham Policy and which found parking provision to be sufficient. They considered an underground car park but hotel providers did not recommend it. In addition, a feasibility study was carried out which supported the location of the hotel and looked at the potential for Perry Vale car park behind the station to provide additional parking capacity if required.
- 3.12 In response to a question from a Councillor the applicant confirmed that they run this size of convenience store around the south east, it would be operated by them and there would be an equivalent offer including fresh food and ready meals and other provisions.
- 3.13 The applicant's architect advised that the Waldram Park Road pedestrian route would be 3m wide. The refuse storage would be located at the very northern part of the site to be out of the way but between the supermarket and the hotel is a 3.5m wide strip and bins would be brought out during servicing days.
- 3.14 The members received verbal representations from the objector, Mr. Peter Sullivan, a local resident, living on a Rockbourne Road with his house parking on Stanstead Road. The

objector asked for a correction of distance of 50m between the hotel and the rail station. The Chair clarified that PTAL ratings are formally set for how close and easily accessible a site is to public transport. The objector, raised a question in relation to the number of disabled parking spaces in the hotel for employees and guests and raised concerns about a lack of parking in the area generally. He also queried if there is need for another bar and hotel in the area, especially as a similar establishment nearby had closed due to a lack of business.

- 3.15 Committee Members discussed the issue of parking for people with disabilities at some length and expressed sympathy with the concerns raised by the objector, noting that the hotel would contain 89 bedrooms. The presenting officer confirmed that, whilst there is no policy requirement to provide a disabled parking space, one is being provided here. To justify a refusal of planning permission without a policy justification is difficult for the Council to defend in an appeal. The Council's Highways department and Transport for London had been consulted and neither had raised any objection to the proposal on parking grounds.
- 3.16 A Member expressed concern that if a lorry arrives for delivery at the supermarket at the same time as somebody is dropped off at the hotel there is not going to be enough space. However, it was also noted that Rockbourne Road and Stanstead Road are borough roads and Waldram Park Road is a TfL road. If the Council can identify need for more parking bays for disabled users on those roads, creating appropriate marked bays, it is not necessarily something that would be connected to or influenced by this development. It was noted that, as the local plan is currently under review, maybe this issue could be looked at afresh.
- 3.17 Overall it was acknowledged that the proposal would be of benefit to the local economy, that there is a need for more hotel rooms across London and there did not appear to be any valid grounds for refusing planning permission for the application under planning law.
- 3.18 *Cllr Rathbone* moved a motion to approve officer's recommendation. This was seconded by Cllr Paschoud. Members voted as follows:
- For: Councillors Copley, Adefiranye, Clarke (Chair), Anwar, Bourne, Johnston-Franklin, Kelleher, Muldoon, Paschoud, Rathbone.  
Against: None  
The vote was unanimous.  
RESOLVED: Approve application DC/18/106467 subject to conditions from the officer's original and addendum reports.

#### **4. Rear of 110 Wood Vale, SE23**

- 4.1 The presenting officer introduced the details of the application and brought Members' attention to the addendum which clarified that the committee report should have made reference to DM Policy 33. This did not affect the officer recommendation. During the consultation period, no objections were raised from Highways (subject to conditions) or Environmental Health and Protection. The Forest Hill Society made no comments. Five objection letters were received from local residents raising concerns about overshadowing, overdevelopment, overlooking, parking, design and loss of employment. Officers considered the principle of development acceptable and commented that the design and architectural detailing were of a high quality and in context and the applicant had overcome previous reasons for refusal.
- 4.2 In response to concerns raised by Members, the presenting officer confirmed that Highways officers had carried out the appropriate assessments and did not raise any concerns with regard to the width of Moonlight Drive in terms of accommodating emergency vehicles. The officer estimated the width of the drive to be 5-6m which is wider than an average car.

- 4.3 In response to Members' concerns with respect to potential loss of privacy to neighbouring properties, the presenting officer advised that officers were satisfied with the distances in terms of privacy issues. There would be approximately 20m if not more to the end of the curtilage of the neighbour's site and then 15m or more from there onwards.
- 4.4 Some members expressed concerns in relation to the fact that 4 out of 7 units would not have a dual aspect and a number of bedrooms would be served by angled windows. The presenting officer clarified that there would also be skylights placed in the roof which would complement angled windows. In response to a further question it was confirmed that the dual aspect windows would only be included within dual aspect flats.
- 4.5 The Committee received verbal representations from the planning consultant who was the agent for the application. She explained this was the second application submitted for the residential redevelopment of this site. The first was refused in March 2018 and had a single reason for refusal relating to the impact of the additional height of the development and its consequent overbearing impact to 8 Langton Rise to the southwest. The current application did not include the projecting second floor element immediately behind 8 Langton Rise. Regarding the concerns raised by local residents on Wood Vale, the proposal was sensitively designed to ensure that no material adverse impacts would arise. The proposal would see change of use of a vacant industrial unit, following an unsuccessful two year marketing exercise. This is partly due to poor vehicular access and proximity to residential neighbours as well as the poor visibility from the road. The restoration of the existing industrial use would be more harmful to the neighbours in terms of noise and disturbance whilst the proposed land use would make a positive contribution to the borough's housing needs. The proposal would preserve and enhance the conservation area. The site has good access to public transport and sufficient parking on the street.
- 4.6 A member of the Committee raised concerns regarding land contamination as the site had previously been in industrial use. The agent clarified that there is a condition in the report regarding land contamination that requires relevant assessments to be done.
- 4.7 Following a query from a Committee Member the architect clarified that there is no need to provide a lift on the development of this scale and ground floor units are specifically designed to be wheelchair accessible.
- 4.8 The members received a verbal representation from the objector who lives immediately adjacent to the proposed development. He stated that local residents were disappointed to see that the developer did not take into consideration their objections. In the previous application the sunlight and daylight report is misleading and ignores impacts on the gardens of Wood Vale. The end of the objector's garden is used to grow vegetables and with the proposed development in place it would be completely shaded. The objector also raised concerns about the proposed balconies and windows potentially overlooking neighbouring gardens as well as noise impacts arising from people on the balconies.
- 4.9 Following a query on this issue the planning officer confirmed the planning guidelines were concerned with overlooking to windows rather than rear gardens.
- 4.10 The Chair pointed out paragraph 6.74 of the officer report which gives details in relation to sunlight and daylight Impacts.
- 4.11 Cllr Copley moved the motion to approve officer's recommendation. This was seconded by Cllr Muldoon. Members voted as follows:
- For: Councillors Copley, Adefiranye, Clarke (Chair), Anwar, Bourne, Johnston-Franklin, Kelleher, Muldoon, Paschoud, Rathbone.  
Against: None  
The vote was unanimous.

RESOLVED: Approve application DC/17/107209 subject to conditions from the officer's report.

**5. 59 Quentin Road, SE13**

- 5.1 The presenting officer introduced the details of the application. The application received 4 objection letters from local residents raising concerns on material planning issues including overshadowing and noise and disturbance and non-material issues including land ownership, access for maintenance personnel, trespass and loss of view. Paragraph 5.2 of the officer's report responds to these concerns.
- 5.2 A Member asked for a clarification on the issue of land ownership and the ability to build on someone else's land. The Chair pointed out that it is possible to apply for planning permission on someone else's land, but issues would arise when a scheme was built out and this was a Civil Matter.
- 5.3 In response to a question the presenting officer clarified that potential overlooking and overshadowing issues raised by objectors are valid objections. The legal officer further clarified that it is the number of objections that sends applications to the committee.
- 5.4 Cllr Adefiranye moved the motion to approve officer's recommendation. This was seconded by Cllr Johnston-Franklin. Members voted as follows:

For: Councillors Copley, Adefiranye, Clarke (Chair), Anwar, Bourne, Johnston-Franklin, Kelleher, Muldoon, Paschoud, Rathbone.

Against: None

The vote was unanimous.

RESOLVED: Approve application DC/18/107273 subject to conditions from the officer's report.

The meeting ended at 21.20.

10 January 2019.

## LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

MINUTES of the meeting of the PLANNING COMMITTEE (B) held in ROOMS 1 & 2, CIVIC SUITE, LEWISHAM TOWN HALL, CATFORD, SE6 4RU on 28<sup>th</sup> February 2019 at 19:30.  
PRESENT: Councillors Suzannah Clarke (Chair), Tom Copley (Vice-Chair), Obajimi Adefiranye, Tauseef Anwar, Andre Bourne, Liz Johnston-Franklin, Silvana Kelleher, John Paschoud and James Rathbone

OFFICERS: Christopher Dale - Presenting Officer Planning Service, Vincent Murphy – Case Officer Planning Service, Paula Young – Legal Services and Jesenka Ozdalga – Committee Co-ordinator.

APOLOGIES FOR LATENESS: Cllr John Muldoon

### **1. Declaration of interests:**

- 1.1 Cllr Rathbone declared that the third application on the agenda (93 Effingham Road, SE12) is in his ward.
- 1.2 Cllr Adefiranye declared that his grandson attends St Dunstan's College (first application on the agenda).

### **2. Minutes of the last meeting:**

- 2.1 Three sets of minutes of the previous committee meetings held on 23 May 2018, 11 October 2018 and 15 November 2018 were agreed.
- 2.2 Minutes from the meeting held on 10 January 2019 were deferred for the next committee meeting.
- 2.3 The presenting officer clarified that the Government has published revised version of NPPF on 19th February 2019. Officers had reviewed the revised document and confirmed that none of the changes are considered material to the assessment of the any applications on the agenda of this meeting.

### **3. St Dunstan's College and Jubilee's sports ground, SE6**

- 3.1 The case officer presented the details of the application. The case was brought to the Committee for the reason of being in a prominent location and for the size of the proposal. The main school building is a locally listed building. The application related to two sites; the main school site and the Jubilee sports ground site.
- 3.2 The proposal was to construct a 2-4 storey building to the west of the school site to accommodate a new nursery and junior school, replace some facilities with modern ones and to include new landscaping.

19:50 Cllr Adefiranye left the room.

3.3 On the Jubilee site, 4 new courts with a hockey pitch would be provided. There would be no net loss of court facilities serving school and community as a result of the development.

3.4 The application had been through an extensive pre-application procedure, the proposal was supported by the Council's design and conservation officers. The proposal would result in minimal

intrusion to urban green space and would reduce exposure to the South Circular Road as the proposed building would be located further away from it.

3.5 There would be no harm to the Jubilee site or nearby residential buildings as a result of this proposal. There were no objections from Sport England subject to the conditions set out in the report and the community use agreement.

3.6 In conclusion, there were no material inconsistencies with planning policies and the proposal was supported on urban design, character and heritage grounds. The proposal would replace existing facilities and there would be no increase in staff numbers.

3.7 Members raised questions regarding:

- Implications for CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) of this development; (The case officer clarified that CIL would be payable);

- Location in terms of the nursery and junior school in terms of the closeness to the South Circular Road;

- Pollution issues and planting at the front and boundary of the sports fields with very few trees there at present. (The case officer explained that school is already very concerned about pollution, trees were planted in the last few months and further planting is secured by Condition 19)

- Construction vehicles access (The Presenting Officer explained that construction access would be sequenced and the condition for Construction Management Plan is in the report)

- The parking provision on the site (The Case Officer explained that cars would go through the main entrance around the school complex to the staff parking area. Officers were of the opinion that it would be slow moving traffic and a reason for refusal on safety issues would therefore not be justified).

3.8 The members received a representation from the applicant's representative Claire Wilkins. The applicant explained that they have worked with professionals and experts on this scheme for about 18 months. There has been a pressure from parents for the improvement of the junior school in regards to air pollution. The applicant had submitted a number of applications with no success mostly because of loss of urban green space. The proposed design has been improved thanks to input from Lewisham officers. The current school facilities are inadequate, modular buildings are unattractive with a lifespan of 10 years but are there for 50 years and the technology and science department is too small to accommodate new equipment. The proposed new buildings would provide a completely new junior school in a modern building that will sit well with the locally listed building. The number of classrooms would not increase and the junior school would have a playground. The applicant confirmed that they have consulted the local community and are not aware of any objections.

3.9 Members acknowledged and the applicant confirmed that the proposed location of the junior school and playground would move further away from the South Circular Road and therefore significantly reduce exposure to air pollution. The proposed design was based on the data collection.

3.10 Members asked for clarification on whether the applicant envisaged any changes in community use of the facilities after the proposed development is completed. The applicant confirmed that most of the school facilities are open during and after school hours for community use and that use will remain after construction as well.

3.11 Members asked for more details on the planting proposal. The applicant confirmed that 14 trees are already planted on the perimeter of the fields with additional screening and they would protect parents and children during pick up and drop off.

3.12 The Members wanted to clarify why nursery and reception classrooms were located closest to the entrance area. The applicant clarified that parents of younger children come to classrooms more and interact with teachers. For that reason, as a safety measure to prevent parents walking around the

school, the nursery and reception classrooms were located close to the entrance area. However, the data shows that at that point the air quality is the same as further back on the site.

3.13 Members asked for more clarification on car movements on the site. The applicant explained that the school already have vehicles going through the site and that is something they are used to managing. Visitors are not allowed to come in and park on the site, that is also why there is a U-shaped drop-off path to prevent obstruction on South Circular Road. Parents are allowed to park for free at the Jubilee site. The applicant confirmed that vehicular access and arrangements would remain the same after construction. Furthermore, the applicant clarified that the majority of the construction vehicles would go through the existing gates.

3.14 It was acknowledged that the applicant informed owners of the houses located next to the school gate about the development and that no objections were raised.

3.15 The applicant wanted to add that they have information that education is excluded from the Community Infrastructure Levy.

3.16 The Members agreed that CIL would be resolved separately.

3.17 There were no objectors for this application.

3.18 The Committee received representations from Cllr Walsh under Standing Orders. Cllr Walsh is an alumni of St Dunstan's College and a member of The Dunstonian Association but also a local ward councillor. Cllr Walsh clarified that Headmasters house is actually a junior school that is very old and raises health and safety and air quality concerns and this proposal to push the junior school away from South Circular Road is something that should be supported.

3.19 Cllr Walsh explained the benefits of the proposal to Jubilee ground will help unlock some pitches for community use and that the soccer league play football there. Furthermore, new theatre space and bookable space for meetings would be available for community use. The transport management plan is important and is something that the school is very mindful of. Cllr Walsh considered this proposal an excellent piece of work that has been through a lot of pre-application meetings and change of design. The community involvement was outstanding and no concerns or objections were raised.

3.20 Cllr Paschoud moved a motion to approve this application according to the officer's recommendation. This was seconded by Cllr Bourne.

Members voted as follows:

For: Councillors Copley, Clarke (Chair), Anwar, Bourne, Johnston-Franklin, Kelleher, Paschoud, Rathbone.

Against: None

The vote was unanimous.

RESOLVED: Approve application DC/18/109716 subject to the conditions in the officer's report.

Cllr Adefiranye returned to the room at 20.30.

Cllr Muldoon arrived at 20.30.

#### **4. 109-111 Kirkdale, SE26**

4.1 The presenting officer presented the details of the application. The application proposed demolition of existing buildings and replacement by part three part four storey buildings to provide two retail units at the ground floor level and four flats above. Previous applications submitted for this location were, among other reasons, refused by reason of excessive height and bulk in relation to adjacent buildings. The currently proposed building would match the height of the existing building with front elevation flush to the adjacent buildings. The height of the proposed building would step down to the rear and would incorporate green roofs. There had been some minor revisions to the current proposal, mostly internal modifications, removal of front lightwells and access re-arrangement.



4.2 As a result of these changes, The Sydenham Society had withdrawn their objection. There was one remaining objection from a local resident. Overall, officers considered that the design, massing and scale of the proposed scheme were appropriate for the context with good quality accommodation and met the requirements of policies.

4.3 On a Member's request, the presenting officer confirmed that drawings published for this application are to scale and any deviation from the approved drawings could be subject to enforcement action.

4.4 A Members asked for clarification on the location of the bin storage and it was confirmed by the planning officer that it was part of the amendments and bin and cycle storage are now located to the rear of the proposed building.

4.5 In response to questions from Members, the presenting officer confirmed that The Sydenham Society's objection was withdrawn on the morning of the Committee meeting, that the means of fire escape is not a planning issue and that the proposed building can be accessed from the front and the rear.

4.6 The Committee received representations from the applicant, Sajaid Shaukat and architect, David Mansoor.

4.7 This application was submitted after a pre-application meeting and plans were amended with officers' input. The proposed flats would be for rent. The parade itself needs more investing and improvement. This proposal would provide 2 commercial units and employ local people and there is already some interest for them. The proposal would provide a green roof for wildlife and would be in keeping with the area and the parade.

4.8 The Committee received representations from a local resident, Jamie Davis living opposite the proposed building on the second floor and objecting to the application. The objector clarified that he is not against development in principle as this site has not been looked after for many years. However, he raised concerns in terms of direct overlooking, increased parking demand in the area and the viability of the proposed shops.

4.9 Following a query from a Member of the Committee, the objector clarified that he objected to the introduction of two sets of French doors directly overlooking his lounge and in principle, had no objection to the development.

4.10 Cllr Copley pointed out that the area has been neglected, the proposed building itself is an improvement, high quality retail space may revitalize the parade and moved the motion to approve this application.

4.11 This was seconded by Cllr Paschoud.

Members voted as follows:

For: Councillors Copley, Clarke (Chair), Anwar, Bourne, Johnston-Franklin, Kelleher, Paschoud, Rathbone, Muldoon and Adefiranye

Against: None

The vote was unanimous.

RESOLVED: Approve application DC/18/106154 subject to the conditions in the officer's report.

21:00 Cllr Johnston-Franklin left the meeting.

## **5. 93 Effingham road, SE12**

5.1 The presenting officer presented the details of the application. The application was in The Lee Manor Conservation Area and proposed construction of two dormer windows with a mansard link on the rear roof slope and insertion of two rooflights to the front roof slope and replacement of the existing roof tiles with natural slate. The application followed a previous refusal from June 2018. Two neighbouring

properties on either side feature two rooflights on the front roofslope. The adjacent property at no.95 has an existing rear dormer granted in 2005. Planning permission was granted in January 2019 for a similar scheme at no.90.

5.2 A further objection had been received by The Lee Manor Society after publication of the committee agenda. Officers considered that the proposal had overcome the previous reason for refusal as the massing had been reduced and the mansard link had been pulled in further away from the eaves. The proposed new natural slate roof covering was considered an enhancement and therefore, the officer's recommendation was to approve this application subject to the conditions in the report.

5.3 On a Member's request, the presenting officer clarified that bulk and scale of this application and the approved application at no.90 were similar with differences in windows and cladding details.

5.4 The members received representations from the applicant, John Camp. The main reason for the roof extension was his growing family and commitment to the area. There are at least 15 loft conversions on Effingham Road and this application intends to enhance the area and maintain the Victorian character of the property. The initial application was refused, even though it replicated the extension of the neighbour at no.90 approved by the Planning Committee. The proposal would not be visible from the public realm and particular care was taken to reduce the scale as much as practicable.

5.5 The Committee received representations from Charles Batchelor, on behalf of The Lee Manor Society objecting to this application. While the improvements of the scheme were appreciated, the Society objected to the precedent that was being set by approving these roof extensions. The Council's policies state that two separate dormers should be proposed but recently applications were coming with a link which was considered to form a big block on the house, the connecting element slopes back and it still appears to start at the face of the dormer. The emerging Alterations and Extensions SPD that has been on consultation for 6 months doesn't allow this extension in conservation areas.

5.6 On a Member's request, the presenting officer clarified that Alterations and Extensions SPD carries only limited weight at this stage. The character of the area, what has been allowed in the area and recent planning decisions are important planning considerations.

5.7 Following another question from a Member, the presenting officer clarified that the roof plan showed how far the dormers would project and it is a wide linking section. Officers did not consider it was significantly different to another scheme approved recently.

5.8 The legal representative clarified that the SPD carries little weight and it is for the Members of the Committee to decide whether the proposal would enhance or harm the Conservation Area.

5.9 Cllr Bourne considered that the roof extensions would be enhancements to the Conservation Area and, considering other applications for similar proposal have been approved, moved the motion to approve this application.

This was seconded by Cllr Kelleher.

Members voted as follows:

For: Councillors Copley, Clarke (Chair), Anwar, Bourne, Kelleher, Paschoud, Rathbone, Muldoon and Adefiranye

Against: None

The vote was unanimous.

RESOLVED: Approve application DC/18/107882 subject to the conditions in the officer's report.

Meeting ended at 21:27.

