

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE B

Thursday, 11 October 2018 at 7.30 pm

PRESENT: Councillors Suzannah Clarke (Chair), Tom Copley (Vice-Chair), Tauseef Anwar, Andre Bourne, Liz Johnston-Franklin, John Muldoon, John Paschoud and James Rathbone

ALSO PRESENT: Officers: Suzanne White – Planning Service, Vincent Murphy – Planning Service, David Syme – Planning Services, Kheng Chau - Legal Services, Alfie Williams - Planning Committee Co-ordinator.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Obajimi Adefiranye and Councillor Silvana Kelleher

1. Declarations of Interests

There were no declarations of interests.

2. Minutes

The Minutes of the Planning Committee (B) meeting held on 30 August 2018 were agreed by members.

3. ASHMEAD PRIMARY SCHOOL, ASHMEAD ROAD, LONDON, SE8 4DX

Planning Manager Suzanne White introduced the details of the application and noted that 36 objections and 9 letters of support were received in response to the consultation conducted by the Council. It was also noted that neither TfL nor the Council's Highways Department objected to the development. Suzanne White then explained that an Addendum Report had been produced detailing three further comments, two from local Ward Councillors and one from the Brockley Society. The comment from Councillor McGeevor proposed an amendment to Condition 11 strengthening the wording relating planting within the soft landscaping condition.

Councillor Paschoud asked for confirmation on whether the public space on Lewisham Way would be lost. Suzanne White confirmed that much of the existing space would be developed. Councillor Copley asked a question relating to the loss of playground space. Suzanne White responded by noting that the development would result in a better quality playground given the fragmented layout of the existing space, the provision of new all-weather facilities and the provision of a sandpit. Councillor Rathbone asked whether any new green space would be provided. Suzanne White stated that there would not be any new public green space. Councillor Clarke noted that there is a park in the vicinity of the school.

Councillor Anwar asked a question regarding highway safety. Suzanne White noted that the new entrance on Lewisham Way would be secondary to the existing entrance and that the school had proposed various safeguarding measures including limiting the time period the entrance would be in use and

requiring staff supervision of the entrance. Councillor Johnston-Franklin asked a question relating to air quality. Planning Officer Vincent Murphy stated that some areas of the site did not meet EU standards but that the impact is very slight. Councillor Johnston-Franklin stated that even a very slight impact is not good enough. Councillor Clarke asked if the mature tree on Lewisham Way could be retained. Suzanne White replied that the loss of the tree is regrettable but would be necessary to allow the construction works to take place.

The Committee then received a verbal presentation from Sean O'Flynn (Head Teacher), Kerry-Anne O'Neil (Architect) and Russell Edwards (Project Manager). Sean O'Flynn explained that the scheme would provide Ashmead with key benefits and meets the brief required by the school. Mr O'Flynn explained that the key objective was to keep as much playground space and trees as possible and stated that the height of the building was key to achieving this objective and retaining the forest school.

Kerry-Anne O'Neil explained that the proposal would allow a 3rd of pupils a more direct entrance to improve the accessibility of the school. It was then stated that the planting of trees within the site would help mitigate the loss of trees on Lewisham Way and would help improve air quality. Kerry-Anne O'Neil then commented that the soft landscaping and level changes at the Lewisham Way entrance provide positive urban design and highway safety. In addition, it was noted that the area on Lewisham Way would still be public space.

Councillor Rathbone asked whether there would be an impact on the existing school facilities. Sean O'Flynn stated that the proposal provides substantial benefits for pupils including an improved playground given that the existing space is not fully utilised. Councillor Clarke asked which age groups would use the Lewisham Way entrance. Sean O'Flynn replied that the entrance would be used by years 4, 5 and 6. Mr O'Flynn then explained that there would be a management programme rehearsing the use of the entrance in order to identify issues. It was also noted that the new forms would be introduced gradually and that the school would not be fully occupied until 2023 which would allow time to conduct risk assessments and suspend the use of the entrance if any issues are identified.

Councillor Clarke asked if railings had been considered for Lewisham Way. Vincent Murphy explained that the Road is managed by TfL and that TfL were opposed to railings. Planning Manager David Syme explained that a series of soft barriers had been used to enhance safety including level changes and planting. Russell Edwards confirmed that TfL were supportive of the design including the removal of fencing.

Members then received a presentation from Clare Cowen and Chris Johnson representing the Brockley Society. Yvonne Horsfall Turner (owner of Stone House), Shin Egashira (parent) and Douglas Jenkinson (parent) were also in attendance to answer questions from members. Clare Cowen stated that she had attended two meetings regarding the proposal and that there were extensive concerns within the local community including from parents, residents, the St John's Society and the Brockley Society. Clare Cowen acknowledged that improvement have been made to the design however, concerns remain regarding safety due to the proximity to the A2 and the impact on long views of the Grade II Listed Stone House. It was noted that the site is adjacent to Lewisham and Southward College which can cause mayhem with traffic during busy periods

Clare Cowen expressed concerns with air quality in the area and stated that the school had a duty of care to pupils given the effects on conditions such as asthma. It was highlighted that there had been a fatal collision recently further along the A2. Clare Cowen then stated that the entrance should be kept away from the main road and proposed that the building is either moved north or at an angle.

Councillor Bourne asked whether the proposal to relocate the building had been put to the project team. Chris Johnson replied that the proposal had not been put to the applicant. Mr Johnson also commented that the Trees are visually important to the area and stated that on bin collection days the width of the remaining footpath would be further reduced. Councillor Clarke stated that moving the building would reduce the size of the playground. Chris Johnson replied that a green roof could be installed and used as a play space. Councillor Clarke responded that a roof space may present safety issues and reminded members and the objectors that they must discuss the present application.

Councillor Rathbone commented that the views of Stone House are not historic given that there was a row of terrace houses on the site until the 1970s. Chris Johnson gave an overview of the planning history of the site and then stated that the benefit of the long view and green space on Lewisham Way should not be lost. Councillor Johnston-Franklin asked whether the entrance on Lewisham Way would be retained in the alternative plan. Chris Johnson stated that it would not. Councillor Clarke reiterated that members must only discuss the scheme put before them and asked what concerns parents of pupils at the school had with the scheme. Shin Egashira replied that he had concerns regarding pedestrian safety, air pollution and the loss of trees.

Councillor Clarke asked Council Officers for more information regarding air pollution and asked if the siting of the building would help with dissipation. Vincent Murphy replied by providing an overview of the air quality reports submitted with the application. The first report commissioned into air quality at the site used existing monitoring. The existing monitoring showed that air pollution had been declining over a 5 year period. The second report monitored air pollution at locations within the site and found that air pollution at 6 receptors demonstrated that EU limits were exceeded. The maximum impact of any change in air pollution exposure was assessed to be 'slight'. Vincent Murphy concluded by noting that the air quality consultant for the applicant had stated that this equates to a miniscule impact.

Councillor Clarke commented that the existing trees on Lewisham Way are larger than the proposed trees and raised concerns that the new trees would not be as effective in screening air pollution. Vincent Murphy replied that the quality of mitigation provided by planting would be reviewed by an air quality expert which would be secured by condition. Suzanne White stated that it is not possible to ensure that the mature tree on Lewisham Way is retained but that a review can be secured by condition.

Councillor Paschoud noted that members do not know that the taller trees provide better air pollution mitigation and stated that there is sufficient information within the report to arrive at a conclusion. Councillor Paschoud then commented that the new building may provide a level of mitigation and noted that there is an existing school on the site. Vincent Murphy replied that the air quality consultants agree that the new building would provide a barrier.

Councillor Copley noted that Councillor McGeevor had withdrawn her objection due to the strengthened soft landscaping condition. Councillor Copley then moved to approve the application with the strengthen soft landscaping condition and a new condition securing further investigation for tree protection. The motion was seconded by Councillor Rathbone.

Members voted as follows:

FOR APPROVAL: Councillors Clarke, Copley, Anwar, Bourne, Johnston-Franklin, Paschoud, Muldoon & Rathbone

AGAINST: None

Resolved: That planning permission be approved in respect of application DC/17/104714 subject to conditions for soft landscaping and tree protection.

4. 77 SYDENHAM PARK ROAD, LONDON, SE26 4DH

Planning Manager Suzanne White introduced the details of the application to members and noted that that four objections had been received relating to the scale of the extension, overdevelopment, overlooking, loss of light, run-off and parking.

Members then heard a verbal representation from Chis De Souza the owner of the property. Mr De Souza explained that he had lived at the property for 12 years and that with a growing family they required extra space. Mr De Souza stated that they had taken all of the comments on board and had made amendments to the scheme. Mr De Souza noted that the extension is of a modest size similar to a neighbouring extension currently under construction. Mr De Souza concluded by explaining that the majority of the extension would be built on existing hardstanding so would not result in a loss of garden space and that the extension would not prevent parking on the drive.

The committee then received a verbal presentation from Jane McNamara objecting to the proposal. Ms McNamara explained that she was representing four households located on Chelsfield Gardens and stated that the extension was large and obtrusive. Ms McNamara stated that this type of extension would not be allowed in a Conservation Area and that although the property is not a Conservation Area, the area does benefit from a distinct character due to the contrasting line of red bricks. This characteristic would be lost and therefore the extension would not be in keeping with the appearance of the surrounding area. Ms McNamara also stated that the extension would reduce parking space at the property adding to parking pressures in the area and also raised concerns with increased run-off.

Councillor Clarke asked if the extension would be used for living space. Suzanne White confirmed that it would. Councillor Rathbone noted that No.81 has a similar extension. Following further deliberation Councillor Paschoud moved to approve the application. The motion was seconded by Councillor Bourne.

Members voted as follows:

FOR APPROVAL: Councillors Clarke, Copley, Anwar, Bourne, Johnston-Franklin, Paschoud, Muldoon & Rathbone.

AGAINST: None

Resolved: That planning permission be approved in respect of application DC/18/106425 subject to conditions.

5. 51 BARGERY ROAD, LONDON, SE6 2LJ

Planning Manager Suzanne White presented the details of the application to members and noted that the application site was within the Culverley Green Conservation Area. Suzanne White also explained that the planning history at the property includes an application for seven rooflights to be installed in the front and rear roof slopes that was refused and dismissed at appeal and enforcement action against the conversion of the property to a HMO. It was also noted that discussions with officers had resulted in a revision to the proposal to include a gable window in place of a rooflight.

Councillor Rathbone asked for clarification regarding permitted development rights relating to HMOs. Suzanne White explained that the conversion of a property to a HMO for 6 people or less would be permitted development. Councillor Paschoud asked whether the property was currently in use as a HMO. Suzanne White replied that she did not know if the property is currently a HMO but noted that the Council has not received any enforcement complaints. Councillor Rathbone asked whether members could require an inspection of the property as a condition. Councillor Clarke stated that members can only consider the application being presented. Suzanne White commented that the application must be decided on its merits. Councillor Rathbone stated that there is historic enforcement action at the property so this issue is pertinent. Planning Lawyer Kheng Chau stated that members can not consider the potential future use of the property.

Members then received a verbal presentation from Eric Kently representing the Culverley Green Residents Association. Mr Kently stated that he shared members concern regarding potential conversion to a HMO but explained that the proposed front gable window is also a concern. Mr Kently explained that he was not against loft conversions and conceded that rooflights are a necessary evil but stated that a window in the gable would be the worst option. Mr Kently observed that the properties on Bargery Road are symmetrical pairs and that introducing a window would destroy this symmetry and ruin the triangular apex that had been well preserved. Mr Kently also objected to the loss of historic brickwork that could never be reversed and concluded by questioning why the Council are encouraging gable windows.

Councillor Rathbone requested clarification of what was originally proposed. Suzanne White replied that a front rooflight was originally proposed and it was determined that a gable window would be a less harmful alteration. Councillor Paschoud questioned why a gable window is considered preferable. Eric Kently responded to confirm that the Culverley Green Resident's Association were not clear why the Council had taken this position. Councillor Clarke asked if the Culverley Green Resident's Association would have an objection to a rooflight. Eric Kently commented that a rooflight would be preferable given that they can be temporary. Suzanne White stated that the Council's position is that rooflight is a modern intrusion to the roofscape and commented that she did not agree that rooflights are temporary.

Councillor Paschoud commented that the applicant had been persuaded to revise the proposal to something more objectionable and asked whether it was possible to defer the application to get the revision reversed. Suzanne White confirmed that the committee could defer the application to allow the applicant to make amendments. Kheng Chau stated that members had the option to defer or refuse the application.

Councillor Paschoud moved a motion to defer the application. The motion was seconded by Councillor Muldoon.

FOR DEFERAL: Councillors Clarke, Copley, Anwar, Bourne, Johnston-Franklin, Paschoud, Muldoon & Rathbone.

AGAINST: None

Resolved: That application DC/18/105821 be deferred.

6. 2 MANOR MOUNT, LONDON, SE23 3PZ

Planning Manager Suzanne White introduced the details of the application and noted that the proposal was retrospective. Suzanne White then explained that three letters of objection were received to the application.

The committee then received a verbal representation from John Dalton the agent for the application. Mr Dalton explained that the works were necessary due to water ingress and commented that the planning process had been onerous as the application had originally been submitted in 2015. Mr Dalton stated that the Council had lost drawings and samples and commented that it had been difficult to contact Council Officers during the course of the application.

Councillor Paschoud asked Mr Dalton why he did not apply for planning permission prior to installing the replacement roof. Mr Dalton replied that the works were urgent and therefore this was not an option. Councillor Paschoud apologies to Mr Dalton for the poor quality service he had received. Councillor Paschoud then commented that he could see no material planning reasons for refusing the application and moved to recommend approval. The motion was seconded by Councillor Johnston-Franklin.

FOR APPROVAL: Councillors Clarke, Copley, Anwar, Bourne, Johnston-Franklin, Paschoud, Muldoon & Rathbone.

AGAINST: None

Resolved: That planning permission be approved in respect of application DC/17/99661 subject to conditions.

7. 9-19 RUSHEY GREEN, LONDON, SE6 4AZ

Planning Manager Suzanne White introduced the details of the application and explained that the application had previously been approved at a Planning Committee B held in April 2018. Suzanne White then explained that the site had subsequently changed ownership with a revised affordable housing offer increasing the affordable housing mix from 24% to 36% by habitable room. Suzanne White stated that the scheme was now eligible for the Mayor of

London's 'fast-track route' removing the requirement for a late-stage viability review.

Councillor Copley stated that the applicant had made a good offer that complied with policy and noted that there would be uncertainty with the late stage review given Brexit. Councillor Copley then moved a motion to approve the application. The motion was seconded by Councillor Paschoud.

FOR APPROVAL: Councillors Clarke, Copley, Anwar, Bourne, Johnston-Franklin, Paschoud, Muldoon & Rathbone.

AGAINST: None

Resolved: That planning permission be approved in respect of application DC/17/101909 subject to conditions and the negotiation of the Section 106 Agreement.