

**LEWISHAM COUNCIL  
PLANNING COMMITTEE B  
THURSDAY, 17 SEPTEMBER 2020 AT 7.30 PM  
MINUTES**

**PRESENT:** Councillor Aisling Gallagher (Chair) Councillor Alan Smith (Vice-Chair)  
Councillors Tauseef Anwar, Liz Johnston-Franklin, Jim Mallory, Hilary Moore, John Muldoon, Lionel Openshaw and Sakina Sheikh.

**APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE** Councillor Leo Gibbons.

**OFFICERS:** Service Group Manager, (SGM) Planning Officers and Committee Officer.

**ALSO PRESENT:** Legal Representative.

**Item  
No.**

**1       Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Muldoon said that he had received an email from Mr Crombie who was making a representation with regard to item 5.

Councillor Smith said that he had also received emails from Mr Crombie but since he had not read them, he did not have a declaration of interest.

**2       Minutes**

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee B held on 15 and 16 July 2020 be considered at the next meeting.

**3       109 Honor Oak Park, SE23 3LB.**

The Planning Officer, gave an illustrative presentation recommending the grant of planning permission for the demolition of the existing house at 109 Honor Oak Park, SE23 and the construction of a three storey plus basement building consisting of 8 three bedroom self-contained flats, together with associated refuse storage, cycle storage and landscaping. She also said that an additional late representation had been received. The objection was with regard to the number and size of the flats proposed, parking stress issues and the house allowed to fall into disrepair.

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

- Principle of Development
- Housing
- Urban Design
- Impact on Adjoining Properties
- Transport

Following a question from a member, the planning officer advised that the current condition of the building could not have been controlled by planning officers, the owner had allowed it to fall into its current dilapidated condition.

The Agent made his presentation to the Committee. He said that in May 2018, the planning appeal inspector requested evidence to prove that it would not be economically viable to retain the property. In all other respects, the proposed development was acceptable. This application had been made to submit the detailed viability assessment for members' consideration. The question regarding the owners' responsibility for allowing the building to dilapidate was not relevant because the starting point of the property was that it was structurally unsound.

There was a question about how the gardens would be subdivided between flats 3 and 8. Members were advised that each garden will be independently accessed for each unit and each garden will be screened and landscaped to ensure privacy, and security for the residents.

Residents who had opposed the application did not attend the meeting.

Councillor Smith said that he agreed with the viability report. He moved that the officer recommendation be agreed, this was seconded by Councillor Muldoon.

Members voted on the recommendation in the report with a result of 7 in favour of the proposal and 2 abstentions.

The Committee

**RESOLVED** that planning permission be granted for the demolition of the existing house at 109 Honor Oak Park, SE23 and the construction of a three storey plus basement building consisting of 8 three bedroom self-contained flats, together with associated refuse storage, cycle storage and landscaping, subject to the conditions and informatives as outlined in the report.

#### **4 Lee Court, Lee High Road, SE13 5PE**

The Planning Officer, gave an illustrative presentation recommending the grant of planning permission for the construction of an additional storey at roof level to provide 2x 1b/2p and 4x 2b/3p flats and construction of 1x 1b/2p house to the side of Lee Court, Lee High Road, SE13, together with the associated landscaping, bin and cycle storage.

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

- Principle of Development
- Housing
- Urban Design and impact on locally listed building
- Transport
- Impact on living conditions of neighbours
- Sustainable Development

The agent, on behalf of the applicant, addressed the Committee. He said that research had been carried out into the history of Lee Court. Features which made both a positive and negative contributions to the Art Deco character had been identified.

Design work began from recognising the positive features of the building including the vertical emphasis created by stair cores and the horizontal emphasis created by the band coursing above and below windows.

The heritage value of the building was recognised: For example, the new roof top extension adopts vaulted roofs over stair cores to emphasize the existing stair core features, without overwhelming them. The extension as a whole is set back to provide a softer visual transition at the top of the building. The extension also incorporates strong elements of art deco design, including Crittall style windows and horizontal banding in the cladding. The proposed house hides the unsightly flank wall and is designed to be subservient to the host building.

The applicant then outlined the technical matters with regard to the structural assessment of the existing building, the proposed structure that will float above the existing roof, and two entirely separate means of escape to be located at the front and rear of the building.

Members were advised that access for construction would be clarified at the planning condition stage in the construction method report and a detailed report would be produced during the technical design to ensure that service provision to the building is adequate and supplemented if necessary.

The Chair invited members to ask questions. The key points were as follows:

The energy efficiency of the building will exceed building regulations. The question of whether the building would overheat in summer had been given consideration. It was proposed that mass would be built into the structure using plasterboard with a higher latent heat capacity. In addition windows could be fitted with a solar reflective finish.

Access from the fourth to the fifth floor would be via one flight of stairs. These stairs are currently used to access the roof.

Cycle storage would be at the rear of the building for new residents. This was due to the limitation of space as location of bins would also have to be considered at the rear. There would be storage for between 13-15 cycles; this was more than recommended in the conditions. However, it was agreed that the following be added to the conditions. 'Notwithstanding what is shown on the approved plans, revised details of cycle storage shall be submitted and approved in writing by the local authority'. Officers could then consider whether the maximum cycle provision on site had been achieved.

The Chair of Lee Court leaseholders association addressed the Committee on behalf of leaseholders and residents of Lee Court and made the following key points.

- The proposed design of the additional storey was accepted.
- Residents had concerns about additional people accessing the communal areas. Some of the central stairwells are poorly maintained and there were concerns that the space would not be big enough for the extra numbers of people using this area.
- There are plans within the planning conditions to improve the external communal area. However the proposal to provide cycle storage for residents in the new flats only could be a barrier to equity. Storage should be extended so that all residents have access to this storage.
- There were concerns about the cladding material at the top of the building, how fire safety would be ensured and whether it would cause a fire hazard.
- A void is proposed between the roof and the new building. Squirrels and other animals were already in this void and residents had concerns that this could create long term problems for residents and long term damage to the building.
- Although residents appreciated the proposed upgrades to internal and external parts of the building, they had concerns that maintenance fees could increase.

The Chair asked the agent to address residents' concerns. He said that with regard to the void below the proposed structure, the intension was to hover above the existing roof. This had been recommended by a structural engineer and would ensure that the void was ventilated.

The agent said that a fire consultant would be employed. The type of cladding would not be composite. It would be standalone, aluminium, powder coated, rain screen cladding. With regard to fire spread and separation, part B of the Building Regulations had changed massively to ensure that the building is protected and this would be taken into account. Members had sympathy with the concerns that residents' had, but most of their concerns were for the landlord to address; they were not planning concerns. The Chair recommended that the residents should speak to their local ward councillors for advice.

The Committee considered the submissions made at the meeting, and

**RESOLVED unanimously** that planning permission be granted for the construction of an additional storey at roof level to provide 2x 1b/2p and 4x 2b/3p flats and construction of 1x 1b/2p house to the side of Lee Court, Lee High Road, SE13, together with the associated landscaping, bin and cycle storage subject to the conditions and informatives outlined in the report and the following additional condition

Notwithstanding what is shown on the approved plans, revised details of cycle parking provision for the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior first occupation of the development hereby permitted.

At 8.37 there was a short break in the meeting which reconvened at 8.45

## **5 Greyladies Gardens, Wat Tyler Road, London, SE10 8AU**

The Planning Officer, gave an illustrative presentation recommending the grant of planning permission for retrospective planning application for the installation of rooftop safety railings to both the Northern and Southern Blocks of Greyladies Gardens, Wat Tyler Road SE10 (as amended on 24/2/2020).

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

- Principle of development
- Urban design impacts, including heritage impacts
- Impacts on occupiers of adjoining properties

Following a question regarding procedure, the service group manager explained that the planning application had been referred to the planning committee by officers in accordance with the Council's Scheme of Delegation.

Applicant

The agent outlined the history of the application. He said that the access hatches and the steps themselves had been granted planning permission. The railings were a normal part of the safety product. Since planning permission had been granted, there had been significant discussions with planning officers. Part of the proposals had been to paint the steps anthracite grey, which the applicant was willing to do if necessary. The railings were installed because it is the safest way of accessing the roof. Alternate systems had been considered for the railings, including the anchor and hook system but none were considered to be as safe as the current railings.

The agent said that with regard to harming visual amenity, the railings have a negligible impact

In conclusion, the conservation officer and the planning officer agreed that there is not harm to the conservation area nor does it have any heritage impact. The railings are a necessary part of maintaining the building.

Representation

A resident addressed the Committee He said that he was speaking on behalf of eight residents in Dartmouth House and the board of Dartmouth House and all 18 freeholders of the property. He said that this planning application is of concern to residents' because it affects their lives every

day. The fixtures obstruct their view of the heath. The scale of the impact from their gardens and windows is greater than the photographs in the planning report. He requested that members consider alternative low profile safety systems instead of the current fixtures. Contrary to the claims of the agent, it was his belief that there are other viable alternatives which are readily and easily available, including the rope and tether system. Details of alternative safety systems had been given to planning officers.

It was the understanding of the resident, that the conservation officer also wrote to the planning officer regarding their concerns about 'the negative cumulative impact of the fixtures and recommended the rope and tether system. It was also his understanding that the conservation design officer shared residents' view that a low profile solution would be a more appropriate design. He recommended that the application be refused and recommend a low profile alternative to replace all steps and railings including around the hatches.

A question was raised regarding the necessity for hand rails which a member considered to be an important safety feature of the building. The resident claimed that if an anchor, bolt and tether system was used, steps would not be necessary. He further claimed that the wrong plans were referred to in assessing whether the additional railings around the hatches enjoyed prior planning permission.

A member asked why the comments made by the conservation officers, and outlined by the objector, had not been included in the report. The Service Group Manager said that the conservation team had been contacted with regard to the application. They had asked for investigations to be made into alternative solutions to the railings and steps. A former Lewisham planning officer met with the applicant, but the discussion did not lead to any alternative system. The comments of the conservation officers had been included in the report but were not verbatim and he explained how officers formulate recommendations.

The agent outlined the different alternatives that were looked into. A roof top tether system was considered but a decision was made that it was not safe enough because of difficulties trans-versing various levels on the roof while extending the anchors to every level and hatch. This was the only alternative that was low profile. The agent explained in detail why he did not consider the previous rope and anchor system to be safe enough. Whilst on the roof, un-anchoring took place where there is a dip in the building and was not safe when accessing the different hatches or going over the various levels.

The Service Group Manager shared some photographs of the railings sent in by the resident. The photographs were shown to all those present. The Chair said that several of the railings were not part of the application.

The resident said that the comments made by the conservation officers were made after the original application. He also claimed that the wrong plans were used and all the railings in the photograph he supplied should

be included in the application. The legal officer clarified that the application was only for the four sets of railings, two on each building. Members could only consider, therefore, the impact of the four railings.

In conclusion, the objector said that an alternative solution could be put in place and he asked that they be considered and constructively dismissed.

A member said that the railings constitute a safe way for people to work on the roof and this over rides the consideration of the visual impact for residents.

The Committee considered the submissions made at the meeting, and Members voted on the recommendation in the report with a result of 7 in favour of the proposal and 2 against.

**RESOLVED** that retrospective planning application be approved for the installation of rooftop safety railings to both the Northern and Southern Blocks of Greyladies Gardens, Wat Tyler Road SE10 (as amended on 24/2/2020) subject to the condition and informative outlined in the report and an additional condition requiring the railings to be painted grey.

The meeting closed at 20.42 pm.

Chair

---