

# MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE A

Thursday, 16 August 2018 at 7.30 pm

PRESENT: Councillors Abdeslam Amrani (Chair), Octavia Holland (Vice-Chair), Juliet Campbell, Mark Ingleby, Jacq Paschoud and James-J Walsh

ALSO PRESENT: Officers: Michael Forrester – Planning Service, Kheng Chau - Legal Services, Alfie Williams - Planning Committee Co-ordinator.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Peter Bernards, Councillor Liam Curran, Councillor Paul Maslin and Councillor Luke Sorba

## 1. Declarations of Interests

The meeting began at 19:30.

Councillor Ingleby declared interest for the application at Home Park Housing Office, 129 Winchester Road (reference DC/18/106485) due to being a director for Lewisham Homes and did not participate in the determination of the application.

## 2. Minutes

The Minutes of the Planning Committee (A) meeting held on 5 July 2018 were agreed by members.

## 3. 154-158 SYDENHAM ROAD, LONDON, SE26 5JZ

Planning Manager Michael Forrester introduced the details of application and outlined the consultation undertaken that resulted in 9 letters of objection, including an objection from the Sydenham Society, and 5 letters of support. It was also noted that the proportion of affordable housing provided has been increased to 28% following the viability assessment.

Council Paschoud asked if the affordable units would be segregated. Michael Forrester responded that the applicant would be able to answer questions relating to plot allocation. Councillor Ingleby asked a question relating to the set back of the blocks from Sydenham Road. Michael Forrester demonstrated the distances from Sydenham Road on a site map. Councillor Holland asked whether all the blocks are the same size. Michael Forrester responded that the blocks are a mix of 2 and 3 stories. Councillor Amrani asked a question regarding the separation distance of the windows to the nearest residential buildings. Michael Forrester stated that all of the windows are more than 21m from the nearest buildings.

The committee then heard a verbal representation from the agent for the application Mr Tim Gaskell representing CMA Planning. Mr Gaskell explained that the site was originally a car yard and that a previous application for four storey building with houses to the rear had been refused and dismissed on

appeal due to the height and resulting impact on surrounding properties. Mr Gaskell then noted that the heights of the blocks has now been reduced and that the distances to surrounding properties are greater than 21m in accordance with Council guidance.

Tim Gaskell then explained that the scheme provides 14 car spaces, cycle spaces and a car club. Mr Gaskell also clarified for members that there would be a mixture of tenures within the buildings and that all of the residential units would be of the same quality. Councillor Paschoud asked whether the parking spaces are allocated. Mr Gaskell responded that parking spaces are provided for the houses and that disabled spaces would be individually allocated.

The Committee then received a verbal representation from Pearl Hind objecting to the proposal. Mrs Hind explained that she lives on a neighboring road and was concerned with a loss of light, loss of privacy and potential noise disturbances from the development. Mrs Hind stated that the buildings would be overbearing and that the amount of parking would be insufficient adding increased pressure in the surrounding area. Mrs Hind concluded by stating that trees should be used to provide screening.

Planning Manager Michael Forrester stated that the amount of parking provided is considered to be satisfactory within a site with a PTAL of 4 and also noted that the Highways Department had reviewed the scheme and raised no objection. Mr Forrester then commented that the scheme complied with Council guidelines on separation distances to surrounding houses and acknowledged that the outlook from those properties would change. However, the change to the outlook has been assessed and was considered reason to refuse the application.

Councillor Paschoud asked a question relating to the existing outlook. Michael Forrester explained that the existing outlook is buildings and open space. Councillor Campbell asked whether trees have been proposed as part of the landscaping scheme. Michael Forrester explained that the detailed of the landscaping scheme would be secured by condition but that the condition could be expanded to include the provision of trees. Councillor Amrani stated that he sympathized with neighbours but that the new homes were needed within Lewisham and noted that the scheme was much improved on the previous proposal.

Councillor Ingleby moved to approve the application with the amended landscaping condition. The motion was seconded by Councillor Paschoud.

Members voted as follows:

FOR APPROVAL: Councillors Amrani, Holland, Campbell, Ingleby and Paschoud

AGAINST: None

**Resolved:** That planning permission be approved in respect of application DC/17/104571 subject to the negotiation of the Section 106 Agreement.

#### **4. 62-72 DALMAIN ROAD, LONDON, SE23 1AT**

Planning Manager Michael Forrester introduced the details of the application and noted that there is an existing extension to the building. It was also noted that the

site is within the Malham Road Local Employment Location. Mr Forrester then explained that the consultation had resulted in 8 objections.

Councillor Ingleby asked a question relating to the cladding material. Michael Forrester explained that the extension would have stained timber cladding. Councillor Paschoud asked whether the extension would result in a loss of car parking facilities. Michael Forrester responded that the application is for the extension only.

The Committee then heard a verbal presentation from George Vadekys the architect of the scheme. Mr Vadekys stated that the site was designated as an employment location in which the Council are looking to intensify employment. The extension would potentially facilitate the provision of 22 new jobs, providing space for start ups. Mr Vadekys explained that the building would be no greater in height than the locality and would respect the residential form of the surrounding area. Mr Vadekys stated that the extension would be more than 30m from the nearest residential building and would have a lighter coloured cladding than the existing extension. It was noted that it would be possible to re-clad the existing extension.

Mr Vadekys concluded by highlighting that a parking study has been undertaken that indicated that the extension would have an acceptable impact on parking stress within the surrounding area. Councillor Paschoud stated that parking stress in the area is caused by the local school and asked whether the study was undertaken at peak school times. Mr Vadekys replied that the applicant was asked to conduct the study during evening hours.

Members then received a representation from Anna Saunders, a local resident, objecting to the application. Ms Saunders explained that she had lived in the area for 11 years and had seen a lot of changes and claimed that the first extension to the building had caused the greatest amount of disruption she had experienced in the area. Ms Saunders stated that the cladding and scale of the existing extension was domineering and out of keeping with surrounding buildings. Ms Saunders then explained that the building is used for uses such as yoga classes, not just offices, which add to parking stress in the surrounding residential area and that the extension would further exacerbate this stress.

Ms Saunders stated that an increase in car numbers would have a negative impact on highway safety concerns given that there is a school in the vicinity and also raised a concern with air pollution. Finally, Ms Saunders stated that the 7am – 10pm opening hours are unneighbourly and would contribute to the loss of the residential character of the area. Councillor Ingleby asked if re-cladding the existing extension would be beneficial to the area. Anna Saunders replied that it would be an improvement but would not fully address the concerns of local residents.

Michael Forrester explained that the purpose of the designation as a Local Employment Location was to increase the employment base within Lewisham, which at present is low. Mr Forrester also informed members that the application has been reviewed by the Highways Department and that the transport impact was considered to be acceptable. Councillor Campbell asked whether a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) could be imposed. Mr Forrester replied that a CPZ would need to be proposed by the Highways Department and would be subject to consultation. Councillor Holland asked for clarification of visitor

numbers to the site. Mr Forrester responded that the travel plan condition could be expanded to promote sustainable travel.

Councillor Amrani asked if the operating hours could be restricted. Michael Forrester explained that onerous operating hours would not be consistent with the sites designation as a Local Employment Location. Councillor Amrani stated that employment locations are needed within the borough and noted that it was unusual to get an application for an office building at committee. Councillor Amrani then stated that conditions for re-cladding and sustainable travel should be added. Michael Forrester clarified that Condition 4 for the travel plan could be expanded to include sustainable travel for staff and visitors.

Councillor Holland moved a motion to approve the application with the amended conditions. The motion was seconded by Councillor Ingleby.

Members voted as follows:

FOR APPROVAL: Councillors Amrani, Holland, Ingleby and Paschoud

AGAINST: Councillor Campbell

**Resolved:** That planning permission be approved in respect of application DC/17/104928

## **5. HOME PARK HOUSING OFFICE, 129 WINCHFIELD ROAD, LONDON, SE26 5TH**

Planning Manager Michael Forrester introduced the details of the application and explained to members that the application was submitted by Lewisham Homes on behalf of Lewisham Council. Michael Forrester then explained that 100% of the residential units would be for social rent with a commercial space provided at ground floor level. It was noted that daylight and sunlight study has been conducted and concluded that the impact of the development would not be unacceptable to neighbouring buildings. Mr Forrester then stated that on-site parking provision would be restricted to disabled residents and that consultation had resulted in four objections.

Councillor Paschoud asked a question regarding the allocation of the disabled parking spaces. Michael Forrester replied that the applicant would be better placed to answer questions relating to parking allocation.

The committee then heard a verbal presentation from Emma Gittus representing Lewisham Homes and James Scruce the architect for the scheme. Emma Gittus explained that the application would form a key part of meeting the Mayoral target of providing 500 new council homes and stated that Lewisham Homes had held several consultation events prior to the submission of the proposal. Emma Gittus then informed members that the ground floor unit would have a flexible use so could potentially provide a community space subject to consultation.

James Scruce then gave an overview of the design considerations for the scheme. Mr Scruce stated that the existing building is detrimental to the townscape and is the site of anti-social behaviour. Mr Scruce then explained that the standard of accommodation exceeds the requirements of the London Plan and would seek to redevelop Home Park by increasing the level of community and residential activity locally. Mr Scruce concluded by stating that the massing,

colours and materials would reflect the locality and urban grain and noted that the design and massing had been reviewed by the Design Review Panel prior to submission.

Councillor Paschoud requested an answer to her previous question regarding disabled parking. Emma Gittus replied that issues relating to disabled parking allocation would be referred back to the Housing Department. Councillor Paschoud then asked whether there would be open plan kitchen/living space as this is crucial for some disabled residents. Emma Gittus responded that there would be an opportunity to amend internal layouts.

The committee then received verbal representations from three local residents Mr R Bailey, Tim Graham and Julia Webb. Tim Graham spoke first and stated to members that the development did not proposed enough parking and that the colour scheme is not in keeping with the 1960s buildings. Mr Graham also stated that the building would overlook nearby properties and highlighted that no children's play area had been provided which raised concerns as Home Park is not a safe place for children. Mr Bailey noted that a parking survey had been undertaken which raised concerns given that cars are often double/treble parked. Mr Bailey also objected to the loss of storage sheds and stated that too many flats has been provided on the site.

Julia Webb highlighted the development at Our Lady & Saint Phillip Neri School and stated that conditions for the scheme had not been implemented which had created concern amongst residents that something similar would happen with the present proposal. Julia Webb then stated that the development was cramped and was likely to upset long term elderly residents. Mr Graham stated that the scheme would put further strain on refuse collection which is a significant issue on the estate. Mr Bailey also noted that the bins are often left out in the open.

Council Holland asked what the sheds are used for. Mr Bailey responded that the sheds are used for storage for local residents. Councillor Holland then asked for clarification of the concerns raised by elderly residents. Tim Graham replied that the concerns relate to overlooking into first floor bedrooms. Julia Webb commented that there is a perception that they would not be listened to and that many people had given up fighting having been worn out by the Saint Phillip Neri School development. Mr Graham added that there were many more than 4 objectors given that the consultation events often had more than 30 people attending.

Michael Forrester explained to members that all adjoining properties has been consulted and that the Council had received only four responses objecting to the application. Mr Forrester then highlighted that the Highways Department had not objected to the application and that there was a condition for a travel plan and car club. In addition, a number of highways improvements are proposed including new crossings and dropped kerbs. Mr Forrester then stated that the building was a minimum of 21m from the nearest residential property in accordance with guidance. Mr Forrester also noted that many of the concerns raised by residents relate to existing site management and would be raised with Lewisham Homes.

Councillor Paschoud stated that she had attended a consultation event and that there is clearly an issue with refuse and fly tipping and there is an ongoing concern with the Saint Phillip Neri School development. Michael Forrester responded that a refuse management condition would be added. Councillor Holland asked a question relating to the loss of the storage sheds. Michael

Forrester replied that this would be a matter for Lewisham Homes however, it was noted that the Highways Department did not object to the loss of the sheds.

Councillor Amrani stated that an informative should be added directing the Housing Department and Lewisham Homes to address the estate management issues. Council Campbell stated that the Saint Phillip Neri School development and Home Park should be added to the list of concerns. Councillor Paschoud moved to approve the application with the addition of the informative and refuse management condition. The motion was seconded by Councillor Holland.

Members voted as follows:

FOR APPROVAL: Councillors Amrani, Holland, Campbell and Paschoud

AGAINST: None

**Resolved:** That planning permission be approved in respect of application DC/18/106485.

## **6. 294A BROCKLEY ROAD, LONDON, SE4 2RA**

Councillor Walsh arrived and participated in the determination of the application.

Planning Manager Michael Forrester introduced the details of the application and noted that the development had been implemented prior to the submission of the application. Michael Forrester also highlighted that previous application to provide two one bedroom flats had been refused and dismissed at appeal as the proposed flats were undersized. Mr Forrester concluded by explaining to members that the consultation had resulted in an objection from the Brockley Society.

Councillor Walsh asked for clarification of the floor to ceiling height as they appeared to be low in the site photographs. Michael Forrester replied that the floor to ceiling heights meet the required standard. Mr Forrester then explained to members that the issue with the previous application was poor surveying that did not accurately measure the size of the units as the stairs and storage were not included within the area of the flats in accordance with the London Plan. It was also noted that the flats are dual aspect and a site inspection confirmed that the standard of finish was acceptable.

Councillor Paschoud asked whether the loss of the previous dwelling was policy compliant. Michael Forrester explained that DM Policy 3 protects single family housing but as the property was a maisonette the policy did not apply and therefore the principle of development was considered acceptable. Councillor Amrani asked why the application was retrospective given that the previous development had been refused. Michael Forrester noted that it is not illegal to submit a retrospective application and was carried out at the developers own risk. Councillor Amrani stated that the Committee are against retrospective application and that applications should be submitted on time.

The committee then received a verbal representation from Tim Cropper from Mialex, the agent for the application. Mr Cropper stated that the application had been lodged to correct inaccurate advice previously given to the applicant that had under calculated the internal area of the flats. Mr Cropper highlighted that

one flat exceeds the National Technical Standards and noted that although the second flat had been determined to be slightly under size it provides a good standard of accommodation.

Councillor Ingleby asked why the application had been submitted after the development had taken place. Mr Cropper stated that it was not his decision but that it is not a criminal offence and that the flats have been determined to provide a good standard of accommodation. Councillor Paschoud asked whether it is possible for the Council to question how flat size is determined. Michael Forrester responded that it was not possible in policy terms. Councillor Holland asked what makes the undersized unit acceptable. Michael Forrester replied that the flat is dual aspect and that the fit out had been taken into account.

Councillor Walsh criticised the approach taken by the developer but could not see any legal grounds to refuse the application so moved to approve the application. The motion was seconded by Councillor Campbell.

Members voted as follows:

FOR APPROVAL: Councillors Amrani, Holland, Campbell, Ingleby, Paschoud and Walsh

AGAINST: None

**Resolved:** That planning permission be approved in respect of application DC/18/106122

**Meeting ended at 21:15**