

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA 2

PLANNING COMMITTEE A

Date of Meeting: **THURSDAY, 27 AUGUST 2020 TIME 7.30 PM**

PLACE: **MICROSOFT TEAMS VIRTUAL MEETING**

Members of the Committee are summoned to attend this meeting:

Membership
Councillors:

James-J Walsh (Chair)
Sophie Davis (Vice-Chair)
Obajimi Adefiranye
Patrick Codd
Liam Curran
Carl Handley
Octavia Holland
Pauline Morrison
John Paschoud
Luke Sorba

The public are welcome to attend our committee meetings, however, occasionally committees may have to consider some business in private. Copies of reports can be made available in additional formats on request.

Kim Wright
Chief Executive
Lewisham Town Hall
London SE6 4RU
Date: Tuesday, 18 August 2020

For further information please contact:
Claudette Minott Committee Officer
2nd Floor Civic Suite
Catford Road SE6 4RU

Telephone No: 0208 314 3417
Email: committee@lewisham.gov.uk



SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA 2

	Order Of Business		
Item No	Title of Report	Ward	Page No.
3.	ADDENDUM - LAND AT SYDENHAM HILL ESTATE, LONDON, SE26 <ul style="list-style-type: none">This report has been prepared as additional representations have been received since publication of the agenda, as well as to include an additional condition and correct errors in the original report.	Forest Hill	1 - 6

Committee	STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE (ADDENDUM)
Report Title	Land at Sydenham Hill Estate, London, SE26
Ward	Forest Hill
Contributors	David Robinson

Reg. Nos.

DC/20/115160

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This report has been prepared as additional representations have been received since publication of the agenda, as well as to include an additional condition and correct errors in the original report.

2.0 SUMMARY OF ADDITIONAL RESPONSES

- 2.1 The additional responses have been summarised as follows

- The application includes step-free pedestrian paths with gradients steeper than 1 in 12. This proposal will disproportionately disadvantage residents who are wheelchairs users or mobility impaired
- Guide to Best Practice on Access to Pedestrian that comments “1 in 12” should be used as the absolute maximum gradient. Gradients of 1 in 10 can be managed by some wheelchair users (but not all) only as short ramps of up to 1m
- Overall, the applicant has not made sufficient 'reasonable adjustments' to satisfy disabled residents local needs.
- The applicant has not taken into consideration the special nature and use of many of the residential rooms in Castlebar as a care and nursing home. The proposed multi-story building will dominate many private residential rooms and will reduce their daylight access
- The applicant fails to recognise this use of Castlebar rooms by vulnerable. In the applicant’s latest daylight report addendum, many of the nursing home rooms are left labelled with room usage marked as “UNKNOWN”. Many non-habitable rooms (e.g ensuite bathrooms) are not made clear.
- It would be prudent for planners to the new development to check it does not infringe the right to light on Castlebar residents. Note. The assessment of loss of light in “rights of light” cases is different to the methods used by BRE guidance.
- The applicant is showing a poor approach to planning at this site by not properly assessing the individual room uses and impact and harm to the elderly, disabled and vulnerable residents, many with reduced eye sight function, who are living next door.
- There are many rooms on the main house Ground floor (and some on other floors) where the Proposed Vertical Sky Component % (Proposed VSC%) values have dropped considerably and by more than 10% from existing VSC % values.
- In relation to the proposed garden accommodation at Castlebar, 44 out 90 windows do not adhere to the BRE daylight Vertical Sky Component (VSC) guidelines, and where their uses of these rooms are for care/nursing home.

3.0 CONSIDERATIONS

Additional Public Representations

Accessibility and Gradients

- 3.1 The site is an established residential estate and the proposals replaces existing residential accommodation at Mais House which is beyond its useful life and does not meet current Building Regulation standards for accessibility and does not provide any designated disabled parking. There is a significant improvement and benefit in the proposed provision of facilities for disabled residents in the new buildings particularly when compared to existing.
- 3.2 The existing gradients across the application site do not meet the recommended maximums for wheelchair user access. The majority of new routes proposed through the site will provide gradients which improve upon the 1 in 12 recommended maximum. At Otto Close there are instances where the relocated existing right of way would not meet the recommendations with the gradients between 1 in 8.1 and 1 in 10.0 – the existing right of way in this location does not meet the recommendations achieving gradients of 1 in 7.9 to 1 in 11.0 respectively.
- 3.3 Whilst not desirable that any relocated path gradient exceed the recommended maximum, the current right of way through the site does not meet the recommended maximum. The layout and topography of the site, as well as existing residential units and vegetation means that it is not possible to redesign or relocate the existing paths through the site to meet the maximum recommendations.
- 3.4 Providing compliant access across the Sydenham Hill estate, from the new residential block on Sydenham Hill to the Kirkdale entrance with Otto Close has not proved possible to deliver due to the extreme nature of the existing site topography across the estate. Options for extensive ramp solutions and external lifts to assist have been considered, but the site topography is such that an engineered ramp at recommended gradients would be so extensive it would require loss of many trees and a large portion of the existing communal gardens.
- 3.5 It is however noted that the proposed wheelchair accessible dwellings (11 no.) would be located within the Sydenham Hill block where access is provided in accordance with the recommended maximums – these would have compliant access to wheelchair accessible parking spaces (6no. subject to future review should demand increase) and Sydenham Hill where bus routes operate. The location of the units and parking spaces would be secured as part of the S106 agreement.
- 3.6 The Applicant's design team have made every effort to comply with the above guidance. The key issue in preventing the recommended gradients being met is the existing site topography. The existing road and path network across the estate do not currently meet the minimum standards and it has been demonstrated that is not possible reprofile these and to provide access that fully meets these recommendations.
- 3.7 The Applicant has made the creation of a welcoming, accessible and inclusive community a high priority. To help establish this, the design of the main block focuses on creating a sense of shared community by providing generous well-connected communal facilities and amenity spaces, accessible to all (including disabled and wheelchair users). The communal spaces, lobby, resident's room, resident's garden, playspace and open lawn are all designed for access by all. Step free access is

provided between the public street, bus stop, parking and designated disabled parking bays, wheelchair units and all other homes.

- 3.8 In response to concerns raised in relation to the relocated right of way, the long profile of Otto Close, as it passes the new terrace houses, would be adjusted slightly to allow for an area of level landing at the midpoint and toward the bottom of the street. It is acknowledged that the footways of Otto Close exceed the recommended maximum gradients, and the addition of narrow landings does not fully resolve this issue. However, the introduction of narrow landings will provide some relief for users. Taken together, the adjustments to finished levels locally would allow for resting points at the bottom, mid-point and top of the incline. It is noted that Otto Close is an existing route and public right of way that is determined by site terrain and existing topography, meaning options to further regrade the slope to more gentle gradients are very limited. The detailed design of the level landings along Otto Close would be included in drawings relating to condition 5 (hard landscaping).

Sunlight and Daylight

- 3.9 In response to public representations made in relation to daylight and sunlight, with particular regard to the impact on Castlebar, the applicant has provided an additional daylight and sunlight report to respond to this specific matter. It is noted that Right to Light is not a planning consideration as it is governed by separate legislation.
- 3.10 In relation to the main house, only the closest half of Castlebar has been tested, as based upon these results, the half of Castlebar furthest away from the proposed development would be BRE compliant and testing is not considered necessary.
- 3.11 For Vertical Sky Component (VSC), the main house has 76 windows which have been tested, and 73 (96%) adhere to the guidelines. Three windows to room R5 at ground floor show some transgression of the BRE guidelines. However, this room is also lit by a larger window which faces west away from the Sydenham Hill Estate site and this window therefore remains unaffected by the change in massing.
- 3.12 For Daylight Distribution, the main house has 26 rooms that have been tested and all rooms adhere to the guidelines. All rooms retain daylight to over 90% of their room areas or receive no loss of daylight at all.
- 3.13 Whilst the use of all rooms is not known, the applicant has been able to demonstrate a very good degree of compliance with the BRE guidelines with only windows serving one dual aspect room transgressing the recommendations – this room is served by another window which would remain BRE compliant
- 3.14 A recent planning application has been approved at Castlebar to extend the building (at the flank furthest from the proposed development) as well as provision of 6 semi-independent living care suites.
- 3.15 For VSC, the new garden accommodation has 90 windows that have been tested. The unusually high number of windows is due to the panelled glass design for the windows to these new units to maximise outlook. 46 of the windows adhere to the guidelines, whilst the remaining windows all fall just below the target guidelines. The VSC is a measure of the angle of sky, and these new units have a projecting roof that over hangs these windows, which means that for some of these windows, they do not receive high VSC levels in the existing condition. This means even small changes to the VSC, then materialise into large percentage reductions. It is also necessary to consider the Daylight Distribution (DD) results as well as VSC given the

two daylight tests should be considered together. The DD results show that all rooms adhere to the DD test. The test shows that all rooms retain 0.9 times their existing daylight levels, therefore well within the 0.8 BRE guideline, and therefore the change is unlikely to be noticeable to future occupants.

- 3.16 For sunlight, two assessments have been undertaken: Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH) for the accommodation, and the 2-hour Sun on Ground test for the garden amenity area.
- 3.17 For both the main house and the new garden accommodation, all windows assessed adhere to the BRE guidelines for APSH analysis. All rooms retain very high sunlight levels, and/or receive no reduction.
- 3.18 The amenity area has been re-tested with the new garden massing proposed. 96% of the amenity area receives 2 hours of direct sunlight on 21st March in the existing condition. 92% of the amenity area will receive 2 hours of direct sunlight on 21st March in the proposed condition. The BRE guidelines advise for 50% of amenity areas to receive 2 hours of direct sunlight on 21st March or again, no more than a 20% reduction. The Castlebar garden receives well over the 50% guideline and shows only a 4% reduction in the existing sunlight level.
- 3.19 The revised results show that for both the main house and the new garden accommodation, daylight and sunlight levels will remain very good. Despite some transgressions to the VSC levels at the window plane, all rooms adhere to the daylight analysis within the rooms. Additionally, all rooms tested within the Care Home adhere to and exceed the sunlight guidelines. Furthermore, the garden amenity area adheres and exceeds the sunlight test as set out by the BRE guidelines.

Additional Condition

- 3.20 An additional condition is included as part of the officer's recommendation as follows:
- 3.21 **Ball Court Management and Refurbishment**
- 3.22 No works shall commence in relation to the refurbishment of the ball court until full details of the refurbishment and management (including access arrangements) of the ball court are submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority
- 3.23 **Reason:** To ensure a high quality area of amenity space and to protect the amenity of existing occupants of adjoining properties

Amendments to Original Report

- 3.24 Page 1 – The applicant is now “Stantec” on behalf of City of London Corporation. Peter Brett Associates have been subject to an acquisition by Stantec during the application process.
- 3.25 Para 18 – Additional Information – The 1B1P/ studio units are intended to provide for the City Corporation's Sons and Daughters housing policy which offers studio properties to sons and daughters of existing City Corporation residents. There is a high demand for these units and all studio units will be allocated to City Corporation within the nomination agreement with LB Lewisham.
- 3.26 Para 562 - should read 45 replacement trees not 48

- 3.27 Para 579 - should read 'replacement trees has increased from 42 to 45'
- 3.28 Para 589 – References an incorrect report – this should refer to a Phase 1 grounds conditions assessment prepared by Stantec and Ground Conditions Factual Report (including site investigations) prepared by CC Ground Investigations Ltd.

4.0 CONCLUSION

- 4.1 The additional comments received have been reviewed and are not considered to change the assessment undertaken or the conclusion and recommendation of the officer report to committee.

This page is intentionally left blank