

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE B

Thursday, 19 July 2018 at 7.30 pm

PRESENT: Councillors Suzannah Clarke (Chair), Obajimi Adefiranye, Tauseef Anwar, Liz Johnston-Franklin, Silvana Kelleher, John Muldoon, John Paschoud and James Rathbone

ALSO PRESENT: OFFICERS: Suzanne White – Planning Service, Kheng Chau – Legal Services, Samuel James – Committee Co-ordinator

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Tom Copley and Councillor Andre Bourne

1. Declarations of Interests

No declarations of interest

2. Minutes

Members approved the minutes for Committee B held on 26th April.

Members approved minutes for Committee B held on subject 7th June to some minor amendments.

3. MAYFIELDS HOSTEL, 47 BURNT ASH HILL, LONDON, SE12 0AE

The presenting Planning Officer Suzanne White (SW) explained the details of the existing site which is currently a 2/3 storey building in Council ownership, used as a hostel for emergency accommodation for homeless families.

SW outlined the details of the proposal would comprise the demolition of the existing building, and the construction of a five/six storey building comprising 24x two bedroom, 16x three bedroomed self-contained flats, a two storey commercial space (flexible use classes A1 / A2 / A3 / B1(a) / D1 (crèche, education, museum, art gallery) and 7x two storey houses at Mayfields 47 Burnt Ash Hill.

The scheme would result in 47 self-contained, 100% socially rented residential units. 66 new trees would be planted, and photo voltaic panels would be installed on the roof.

SW went on to mention that the Council had received 18 letters of objection and 4 letters in support of the proposal. A local meeting was held on 13th December 2017. The Council's housing team are in support of the proposal.

The proposal was recommended for approval, subject to 26 conditions.

Questions from Councillors followed:

Councillor Rathbone (CR) noted that Lewisham Homes were not yet present, and stated that he would save some of his questioning for them.

Councillor Kelleher (CK) sought clarification on the number of trees to be planted, to which SW replied it would be 66.

Councillor Johnston-Franklin (CJF) asked whether the ground floor would be in commercial, community or flexible usage. SW clarified that it would be mixed or flexible usage, which could change over time.

CJF expressed interest in conditioning the use to be for community only, and stated that since the applicant was Lewisham Homes this should be possible. SW stated that there were no policies in place to allow a preference of one use over another in this location.

CR noted that Lewisham Homes had previously said that the ground floor use would be community usage, and this appears to have changed, a question for Lewisham Homes.

Chair Councillor Clarke (CC) noted that 10m² of playspace per child had been calculated as being provided, and queried whether this space included the bin storage and parking spaces that could not be used for play in reality.

SW clarified that 690m² of playspace would be provided in total over 2 areas. The London Plan SPG (*Providing for Children and Young People's Play*) sets guidelines which would require 700m² to be provided. The figure of 690m² did not include parking spaces, landscaping or bin storage areas. However it was noted that this did include a hard landscaped area, which would occasionally be used by vehicles accessing or leaving the disabled parking spaces.

CC asked about the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ), and whether the Council had any control over it. SW stated that a condition could be added requiring consultation with local residents regarding the CPZ, but this would be difficult to enforce. It was noted that there was sufficient funding for this in the scheme's costing.

CC asked what rooms the windows facing Swallow Court would serve. SW stated that officers had sought to confirm this through the planning records but no plans were available, but added that they would likely serve as secondary windows.

Councillor Anwar (CA) asked how many commercial units were proposed and SW clarified 1 with a floor space of approximately 260m². CA asked whether the unit could in theory be occupied by whoever successfully applied to use it, and SW confirmed this was true.

CJF stated that the CPZ appeared to be committed to, but noted that in reality we cannot promise it, so it should be removed from the proposal.

The applicant (Lewisham Homes Representative) and their architect were then invited to speak in support of their scheme.

The Architect started by stating 500 new Council homes are required to be built in 2018. He stated the existing building is in a poor condition, but the site has excellent transport links and then went on to discuss the merits of the application.

He stated that it was an innovative design and that modern construction methods would be used – 90% of the construction works to be completed off-site.

Kevin Barker (KB) of Lewisham Homes (LH) stated that the proposal is key to delivering the Mayors housing targets, it complies with all space standards policies, and that local residents have been engaged, and will continue to be informed of progress.

Questions from Councillors followed.

CR welcomed the design of the proposal and stated that he was happy with the way LH engaged with the community. He then expressed disappointment that the ground floor unit would no longer be solely for community usage and questioned why.

KB stated that he wasn't aware this had changed as the development team are not involved in that, rather the communications team were. He stated that maybe it was down to concerns that a suitable user for the space would be difficult to find if the use class was restricted.

CR stated that there had been previous communications between councillors and LH regarding the community usage, and asked again why the use hadn't been limited to community uses, CA shared these concerns.

Councillor Paschoud (CP) asked who would manage the freehold of the commercial unit. KB stated that this was not known at this stage and Councillor Rathbone stated that this was in a pre-negotiation stage between the charity and LH and that nothing had yet been agreed.

KB stated that he would take the councillors concerns regarding community usage back to the LH office.

Councillors queried the details of the Photo-Voltaic panels, it was concluded that discussions are still ongoing regarding the specifics, but that they would result in a reduction in energy bills for the building.

CC expressed concern that some of the play spaces could result in anti-social behaviour on site, would also be used by vehicles, and that the 4m deep amenity areas are too small for children's play. The architect replied that the only parking would be for disabled users, so vehicle movements would be limited. He stated that anti-social behaviour had been considered at the formal design stage.

CC asked whether the units would eventually be available as Right to Buy homes, and KB stated that this was currently the case because there was no alternative. CC raised concern over the long-term provision of temporary accommodation, as the existing hostel would be lost. KB stated that the Edward Street Hostel provides 50% more than the existing Mayfields Hostel.

Mr Kirk, the objector and representative of the Pitfold Resident's association was then invited to speak against the proposal.

He stated that he supports the need for social housing but not this scheme in particular. His concerns include the lack of parking and insufficient play space for a large volume of families with children; the design of the proposal being too high and massive – dwarfing the neighbouring church; loss of a large number of mature trees; lack of servicing/social infrastructure in local area including schools and hospitals; stated the proposal only meets half of the policy requirements for new homes in Lewisham.

CR thanked Mr Kirk and stated that Cllr Mallory had been working with LH and had negotiated for less trees to be lost and more replaced, as well as for the overall build height to be reduced. He stated that due to the semi-judicial nature of planning committee decisions, the proposal could only be assessed against relevant legal requirements and material planning considerations, including policies.

Deliberations followed regarding the suitability of the children's play space, the parking issues and suitability of CPZ proposal.

CR stated that this was clearly a contentious case and could go either way. Considering the context, and the issues raised it would be unreasonable to refuse the application on the marginal 10m² failure on provision of playspace, where 47 high quality socially rented homes would replace the existing poor quality accommodation where there is a clear need.

Councillor Rathbone then raised a motion to accept the officers' recommendation, on the condition that Lewisham Homes are held to account on the issues raised, and grant planning permission, this was seconded by Councillor Paschoud.

Members voted as follows:

FOR RECOMMENDATION: Councillors Clarke (Chair), Anwar, Franklin, Kelleher, Muldoon, Paschoud and Rathbone.

AGAINST RECOMMENDATION: None

ABSTAINED: None

RESOLVED: Unanimously accept officer's recommendation and grant planning permission

4. 159A UPPER BROCKLEY ROAD, LONDON, SE4 1TF

SW outlined the facts of the case as the demolition of the existing buildings and the construction of a 3-storey plus basement development comprising 4x two bedroom, 2x one bedroom and 1 studio self-contained flats/maisonettes. The site is located within the Brockley Conservation Area, and subject to an Article 4 direction.

Over 3 separate consultations 20 objections were received, and 6 letters in support of the proposal. Subsequently the application has been revised considerably following a local meeting. The Brockley Society withdrew their objections to the scheme following these revisions.

It was acknowledged by SW that there is a loss of employment space in the form of an existing MOT garage, however this is vacant, in poor quality, and located in a residential area. She stated that the scheme has been recommended for approval by officers, subject to 18 conditions. Questions from Councillors followed:

CJF raised concern over the pavement width along Geoffrey Road that would be left as a result of the proposal as well as concerns over the amount of traffic. She also queried the proposed cycle path, and how this would be paid for.

SW stated that the pavement width would be acceptable, and that the developer is committed to delivering the cycle lane as well as removing the redundant vehicle crossover with a £6000 payment.

The applicant, Steven Seiver (SS) was then invited to speak in support of his proposal. He stated that following refusal and dismissal at appeal of the previous scheme they had responded to the issues raised, including removing provision of office space, relocating refuse and cycle storage and submission of daylight/sunlight report. He also stated that the Brockley Society are in support of the scheme.

CK asked why there was no longer provision of 3 bedroom units, to which SS responded the reduction in footprint of the proposal had resulted in less floorspace, and the 2 bedroom units now proposed were more financially viable.

CC asked about the proposed materiality, specifically why London stock brick was not proposed. SS stated that this material had been negotiated, but if required could be amended.

The local objector Ali Williams (AW) was next invited to speak against the scheme. She raised concerns over the loss of employment space; the design of the proposal (and its impact on the Conservation Area); impact on neighbouring properties; traffic issues; the specific use of S106 funds and the limited number of trees proposed. Questions from councillors followed:

CP stated that he did understand some of the concerns raised, however that lots of the objections relate to the proposal before substantial revisions were made. He stated that the proposal would look better than the existing garage buildings.

AW stated that in her opinion the building would be overbearing, would overlook neighbours at a distance of less than 20m, is too close to the pavement especially considering the amount of station footfall that uses the street.

CP asked SW what the pavement width would be, she measured it from the plan and replied it would be just less than 2m wide, which is greater than the minimum 1.2m usually sought by Highways and therefore acceptable.

Deliberations between members followed, and CP started to raise a motion but CC asked SW whether the materials condition could be strengthened. SW stated that an informative could be added and stated that the wording of the construction management plan condition would need to be amended to require the developer to develop in accordance with the plan.

Councillor Paschoud raised a motion to accept the officers' recommendation and grant planning permission, this was seconded by Councillor Muldoon.

Members voted as follows:

FOR RECOMMENDATION: Councillors Clarke (Chair), Anwar, Franklin, Kelleher, Muldoon, Paschoud and Rathbone.

AGAINST RECOMMENDATION: None

ABSTAINED: None

RESOLVED: Unanimously accept officer's recommendation and grant planning permission.

Councillor Paschoud left the meeting at 21:20

5. THE GLASSHOUSE, 2A MORLEY ROAD, LONDON, SE13 6DQ

SW outlined the facts of the case as the construction of an additional storey roof extension to The Glasshouse, 2A Morley Road, SE13, to provide a two bedroom self-contained flat, together with provision of bin and bicycle storage. She stated that the application has been revised to remove a balcony, and the scheme was now considered acceptable, and is therefore recommended for approval by officers.

CK noted that the extension would make the building taller than No.4, one of the adjoining properties and also queried the overlooking impact on that property. SW stated that this was true but that the impact would be acceptable, as there are no windows affected at that property, regarding the overlooking issue, the windows to that side would be high level and serve a kitchen/diner.

CR queried how planning policy has changed since 1996 when the original building was granted permission. SW replied that there is a new context of policies and built form now, with a greater emphasis on the delivery of new homes so if an additional residential unit can be achieved within a new storey that is well designed, then it would be supported in principle.

CJF raised safety concerns regarding fire escape from the new flat, and queried whether there would still only be 1 escape route with an additional storey being added. SW replied that fire safety is a building control matter so not a material planning consideration, and that yes, there would still only be 1 means of escape.

CC asked whether hours of construction could be conditioned, and SW stated that they could should the application be approved.

The architect of the scheme, Richard Hodgekinson and the developer Barry McKevey were then invited to speak in support of the scheme. They stated that they had strived to improve the proposal based upon previous refusal reasons. They claimed there would be no overlooking and that they wanted to work with existing residents, whilst ensuring there is no cost to them.

CR asked the applicants to clarify how the previous refusal reasons had been addressed, they answered that the revised scheme is more in keeping, steps back, has smaller balconies – concluded that it is a very different scheme this time.

Michael Park, the owner of the existing top floor flat and the tenants of the flat were then invited to speak. He stated that the consultation had been flawed and biased, giving just 3 weeks to comment on the proposal. He stated that his property would be the most impacted during construction works and by the addition of a new flat above his, ruining the general enjoyment of the flat. Also that the flat would not be suitable for a family.

He stated that the previous refusal reason had not been overcome, and that it was unfair that he would suffer the brunt of the impacts for a development of which the sole purpose is to make money for a private developer.

CR queried whether the applicants could come back for questions, CC stated that would be irregular.

CR stated that only material planning considerations could be considered when making a decision, and asked which conditions could ease the construction period for the applicants.

The objector expressed concern at the planning process, stated that they do not understand the process, but the planning department and developers do, making it unfair. CC replied that unfortunately that is how the planning process works nationally.

The objector stated that the impact on neighbours had not been considered, i.e. additional noise and disturbance from having people live above, and during construction.

Councillors deliberated over the controls that could be put in place by the construction management plan, and how this could manage the impacts during construction although noted they could not consider the impacts during construction when coming to a decision.

CC noted that standing orders had been suspended at 21:50. The applicants were called back to answer some questions on the construction management plan, and how they would mitigate impacts on other residents of the building.

The applicant stated that the construction management plan could detail everything down to specific time-scales. They noted that as it is not a planning issue, they hadn't worked out specific construction timings yet, but can add as much details as required prior to starting construction. The architect added that they have a good track record, but was cut off by CC who stated that only the current application is to be discussed.

CC asked what the disruption of taking the roof off would be. The applicant stated that the roof would not be open, there would be weather proofing in place, and they would be very careful, as they do not want unhappy neighbours.

CC then asked about soundproofing and the applicant confirmed it would be installed.

Further deliberations between members followed, where they noted that there didn't appear to be any material considerations to refuse the proposal on, although it would surely be disruptive and expressed their sympathy.

Members stated that they would leave the construction management plan in the hands of officers, but that they wanted to require the developer to engage existing residents at every stage. SW stated that the condition could be strengthened to require the developer to notify residents prior to commencement of the works and to provide a programme of works.

CR stated that the strongest possible conditions were required, and CC stated that members would entrust this to officers.

Councillor Rathbone moved to accept the officers' recommendation, which was seconded by Councillor Johnston-Franklin.

Members voted as follows:

FOR RECOMMENDATION: Councillors Clarke (Chair), Anwar, Franklin, Kelleher, Muldoon, Paschoud and Rathbone.

AGAINST RECOMMENDATION: None

ABSTAINED: None

RESOLVED: Unanimously accept officer's recommendation and grant planning permission.

6. 1 TYRWHITT ROAD, LONDON, SE4 1QD

Meeting Closed at 21:25