

**LEWISHAM COUNCIL
PLANNING COMMITTEE A
THURSDAY, 4 NOVEMBER 2020 AT 7.35 PM
MINUTES**

PRESENT: Councillor James-J Walsh (Chair), Councillors: Obajimi Adefiranye, Patrick Codd, Carl Handley, Pauline Morrison, John Paschoud and Luke Sorba.

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Councillors: Liam Curran, Sophie Davis and Octavia Holland.

OFFICERS: Service Group Manager (SGM), Planning Officers (Officer), Committee Officer.

ALSO PRESENT: Legal Representative: Charles Merrett, Barrister from Francis Taylor Building on behalf of LBL.

**Item
No.**

1 Declarations of Interest

None received.

2 Minutes

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning Committee A meeting held on 27 August 2020 be agreed.

3 Hesper House, Wells Park Road, SE26 6RQ

The Planning Officer, gave an illustrative presentation recommending the grant of planning permission for the demolition of existing buildings on site and the construction of a 5-storey building (plus basement for parking) consisting of:

- 7x three bedroom and 3 x two bedroom self-contained dwellings at the site known as Hesper House, Wells Park Road, SE26, incorporating 10 off-street parking spaces, together with associated landscaping and refuse and cycle parking facilities.

The Committee noted the report and that the main issues were:

- Principle of Development
- Housing
- Urban Design
- Impact on Adjoining Properties
- Transport
- Sustainable Development
- Natural Environment
- Planning Obligations

Questions were raised by Members relating to: visuals of the scheme, disabled parking accessibility, mobility scooter movement on the adjacent pavement, viability, character and density.

The Officer referred to the presentation slides to convey the visuals of the scheme in context to its surrounding environment.

The Officer advised Members that detailed highways matters such as tactile paving, would be covered in a Section 278 Agreement with the Highway Authority. It was confirmed an informative would be added to any grant of planning permission, advising that any works affecting the public highway should not hinder the movement of mobility scooters. The Officer confirmed there would also be 1 disabled and 1 wheelchair accessible parking space.

The SGM clarified to Members that the viability of the scheme was unknown, as it could not be forecasted. It was confirmed that the scheme was running a deficit and it would not be possible to viably deliver affordable housing on the application site. The SGM advised the Committee that early and late stage review mechanisms would allow any un-forecasted additional profit, to be clawed back from the developer. It was noted that safeguards were built into the Section 106 Legal Agreement, to support the review stage mechanisms. It was advised that from experience, the mechanisms were effective.

The Officer advised Members that an Addendum to the report had been published, to address character and density concerns raised by the Chair, on behalf of a Member unable to attend the meeting.

The agent addressed the Committee. The agent described the development, covering areas such as: location, age, materials and the design approach. The agent advised Members that the intention to correct irregularities of the existing plot layout in relation to its context, would be an 'enrichment to the street'. The agent confirmed the development was not higher than the surrounding buildings. Members were advised by the agent that 'robust natural materials' were being used to build the development, such as handmade high quality bricks.

The agent stated the development was fully compliant with all regulatory standards. The development was also responsive to the Covid-19 pandemic, via the provision of sufficient homeworking spaces to accommodate lockdown measures imposed on workers. The agent informed the Committee that attention had also been given to the ecology relating to the application site. The agent concluded the address by advising Members that the London housing demands would be addressed by the development and, it would 'make a real contribution'.

Members asked questions relating to design and viability. The agent advised Members that their organisation was design driven and provided high quality schemes. The agent reiterated the advice provided by the SGM, with regard to the viability of the scheme and the review mechanisms in place.

A representative for the local residents addressed the Committee. The resident advised Members of resident's objections to the proposal due to: sunlight, outlook, site layout, height, amenities, privacy, character, enclosure, the street scene and site documentation.

There were no Member enquiries made to the representative.

Members made enquiries to the Officer, in regard to sunlight, windows and overlooking.

The Officer advised that the sunlight/daylight assessment conducted identified impacts to 6 windows which constituted harm. After the concern was addressed, a further investigation identified that 2 windows were still affected. It was also advised that 4 windows had reduced sunlight. The Officer advised that this outcome was deemed acceptable, when the benefits of the scheme were considered. It was confirmed the space behind the windows were not living spaces. The Committee were advised by the Officer that, although overlooking was significant, it was not considered harmful to neighbouring dwellings and, was deemed acceptable by Officers.

During discussion, several Members shared concerns regarding the lack of affordable housing and the viability appraisal which had been submitted. Members agreed however, that the proposed review mechanisms were satisfactory. Members agreed overall with the conditions to be imposed.

Earlier a Member lost their remote connection to the Committee meeting. The meeting was paused from 8.38pm to 8.39pm. The Member reconnected and advised they had heard everything that had been discussed prior to the pause of the meeting. The Member was advised they would be able to participate in the forthcoming vote on the planning application for item 3 on the Agenda.

The Committee considered the submissions made at the meeting, and

RESOLVED - unanimously

That it be noted that the Committee agreed to:

GRANT planning permission for the demolition of existing buildings on site and the construction of a 5-storey building (plus basement for parking) consisting of:

- 7x three bedroom and 3 x two bedroom self-contained dwellings at the site known as Hesper House, Wells Park Road, SE26, incorporating 10 off-street parking spaces, together with associated landscaping and refuse and cycle parking facilities.

Subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement to secure the planning obligations set out in the report and subject to the planning conditions and informatives outlined in the report with an additional informative advising the agent that any works affecting the public highway should not hinder the movement of mobility scooters.

The meeting closed at 9.00 pm.

Chair
