

# MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE C

Thursday, 6 February 2020 at 7.30 pm

PRESENT: Councillors Olurotimi Ogunbadewa (Chair), Stephen Penfold (Vice-Chair), John Paschoud, Peter Bernards, James Rathbone, Louise Krupski, Hilary Moore, Lionel Openshaw, Paul Maslin and Liz Johnston-Franklin

ALSO PRESENT:

Apologies for absence were received from

## 1. Declarations of Interests

Councillor Bernards advised the Committee that, his children attended a school that was part of the Haberdashers' Aske's Federation.

The Chair announced a Variation of the Agenda, taking item 4 first and, advised Committee members, that the single objection received from the Telegraph Hill Society against item 4, had been withdrawn.

## 2. Minutes

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee A held on 31 October 2019 be agreed and signed as a correct record.

## 3. 2- 2a Morley Road (Inc Reflections & The Glasshouse) London, SE13 6DQ

The Planning Officer, gave an illustrative presentation recommending the grant of planning permission for the construction of an additional storey to the existing buildings at 1-8 The Glass House and 1-8 Reflections House, 2a Morley Road SE13 to provide 1 three bedroom self-contained unit, together with terrace area and new cycle and refuse stores.

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

- Principle of Development
- Standard of accommodation
- Urban Design
- Transport
- Impact on living conditions of neighbours
- Sustainable Development

Following members' enquiries relating to noise increase, availability to Members of officers' presentations, photographs, plans and, objections received prior to Committee meetings, the Officer advised that it was considered that the creation of

an additional storey for a flat would be complementary to the existing residential use in the building and as such, no additional increase in noise and disturbance beyond that expected for the buildings in residential use, was foreseen. The SGM advised the Committee that going forward, the planning department would make the officers' presentations, photographs, plans and objections received, available to the Committee members prior to meetings. It was confirmed that details of objections were published in officer reports, however due to data protection law, the exact locations of the objections could not be publicly provided. The agent, on behalf of the applicant, addressed the Committee reiterating the main points of the Officers report. The agent acknowledged the objections received in relation to damage to the flats below, increased noise and disturbance. It was noted that to minimise these issues, Officers recommended a condition to secure a Construction Management Plan. The agent informed the Committee that, the applicant would be happy to comply with the Officers recommendation and, any further conditions required to mitigate any other potential issues. A question was raised relating to the expected turnaround, for the application site construction works. The agent advised that this information would be outlined in the Construction Management Plan, to be submitted to the local planning authority for approval.

During the members' discussion, the potential of noise and disruption due to the site construction works was mentioned by a member and, it was suggested that a condition should be included in the permission to further restrict the construction deliveries and hours. The SMG advised that such a condition could be included in the permission, however this would serve to significantly increase the expected turnaround of the sites construction. The majority of Committee members agreed with the SMGs' view and proposed to give permission and, keep the current condition as outlined in the report.

Members voted on the recommendation in the report with a result of 8 in favour of the proposal and, 1 abstention.

The Committee

## **RESOLVED**

That planning permission be **GRANTED** for the construction of an additional storey to the existing buildings at 1-8 The Glass House and 1-8 Reflections House, 2a Morley Road SE13 to provide:

- 1 three bedroom self-contained unit, together with terrace area and new cycle and refuse stores.

Subject to Conditions and Informatives outlined in the report.

#### **4. Haberdashers Askes Hatcham College, Pepys Road, SE14 5SF**

There was no illustrative officers' presentation at the meeting, but Members received the report, and considered the proposal therein.

The Committee raised concerns regarding the BREEAM pre-assessment report score for the development, building structure and heat generation, solar panels, and cooling.

The Officer advised the Committee that when the applicant started the application, costs were assessed. It was conclude that schools receive the same amount of

funding. If a higher BREEAM score was required, the applicant may not have been able to secure the funding required.

It was advised that there were a number of plans related to the flat roof. The Officer stated that if members were minded, it would be possible to word an appropriate condition to see how many solar panels it would be possible to have fitted and the benefit they would have to the overall scheme. It was advised that officers considered the scheme would achieve appropriate sustainability and energy standards.

### **RESOLVED - unanimously**

That planning permission be **GRANTED** for the construction of single storey rear extension to EFAP block following demolition of the existing extension; refurbishment of the EFAP block including installation of new windows and door, provision of new rainwater goods, installation of barrier guarding on the roof and redevelopment of the shower block to create a:

- Specialist IT facility at a building at Haberdashers Aske's Hatcham College, Pepys Road SE14.

Subject to Conditions and Informatives outlined in the report.

### **5. 41 Tressillian Road, London, SE4 1YG**

The Planning Officer, gave an illustrative presentation recommending the grant of planning permission for the installation of a front entrance door and construction of steps to the side addition, together with a new entrance door in the side elevation, installation of a rooflight in the front roof slopes and associated landscaping at 41 Tressillian Road SE4, in connection with the alteration and conversion to provide 4, two bedroom self-contained flats.

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

- Principle of Development
- Housing
- Urban Design and Conservation
- Transport Impact
- Impact on Adjoining Properties
- Natural Environment

Questions were raised relating to the status of the 1977 and 1980 applications, amenity space, entrance design, the rooflight and, breaches of conditions.

The Officer advised that in 1977 and 1980, planning permission was granted for both applications for the alteration and conversion of the property.

It was confirmed that none of the four proposed flats would benefit from private external amenity space. Instead, a communal space would be provided within the existing garden at the rear of the property, to be used by all four flats.

The Officer also advised that it would be possible to amend condition 3 to add a specific requirement for details of a path to the cycle store to be submitted and, approved in writing by the local planning authority (LPA), as part of the hard landscaping details.

It was suggested it would be possible for Condition 6 to be amended with regard to soft landscaping. It was also advised that within the same condition, details of the management and maintenance of the landscaping for a period of five years would be submitted to and, approved in writing by the LPA prior to the first occupation of the development.

The Officer confirmed that a condition was recommended to secure the detailed design specification and materials for the proposed development, which included the proposed front entrance door. It was advised that the rooflight would not be visible from public viewpoints due to the height of the building and, position relative to the larger gable roof.

The Legal Representative advised the Committee that conditions were enforceable, with the issue of a breach of condition notice. It would also be possible to serve a maintenance notice (section 215 notice) where the condition of land or buildings adversely affected the amenity of an area.

A representative from the Brockley Society addressed the Committee, advising that residents were opposed to the proposal because of concerns related to boundary treatment, impact on conservation area, and a loss of single family dwelling flats.

Following member's enquiries relating to boundary treatment, the representative advised Members that a good number of boundary walls were still in existence. The Officer informed the Committee that a timber fence on the side boundary would be replaced with hedges and, a low timber fence with a gate introduced to provide access to the rear garden. It was also advised that due to the proximity to the trees which lined the boundary, the proposed fencing and hedges were considered to be preferable to a brick wall and as such, no objection was raised. The Officer also advised the Committee that the Core Strategy policy did not allow the local authority to insist on a contribution to family housing, as only 4 units were being provided.

The SGM reiterated the Officers advice and emphasised the advice the officers had received from the tree officer had provided to Members with regard to boundary treatment by building a wall in close proximity to the mature trees. It was advised this would be detrimental, causing damage to the trees. The SGM advised Members if they were minded, an alternative condition would be possible. This would entail a condition that would require the applicant to submit an alternative boundary treatment, stipulated to be a hedge to the local authority for approval. The SGM confirmed the conditions would be worded so that the applicant would be required to be meet the specified obligations prior to the first occupation of the development.

During the discussion that followed, Members viewed a condition would be a good way to ensure the boundary treatment was in keeping with the conservation area. Another Member felt if a wall was built it should be conditioned that the materials used to build the wall would not have an impact on the trees. The SGM clarified the advice he had given Members related to providing a condition with regard to a hedge being built, as a wall went against the technical advice provided by officers to the Committee. The Legal Representative also advised Members, if a condition was worded to enable a wall to be built, the applicant would have the ability to appeal that condition.

The Committee considered the submissions made at the meeting, and

**RESOLVED - unanimously**

That planning permission be **GRANTED** for the installation of a front entrance door and construction of steps to the side addition, together with a new entrance door in the side elevation, installation of a rooflight in the front roof slopes and associated landscaping at 41 Tressillian Road SE4, in connection with the alteration and conversion to provide:

- 4, two bedroom self-contained flats.

Subject to Conditions and Informatives outlined in the report and,

A requirement that officers should:

- Amend condition 3 to add a specific requirement for details of a path to the cycle store to be submitted and approved in writing by the LPA as part of the hard landscaping details.
- Add a condition requiring the submission of details of a boundary hedge to be planted instead of the proposed timber fence indicated on the approved drawings, such details to be approved and implemented prior to first occupation of the development.

The meeting closed at 20.42 pm.