

# MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE A

Tuesday, 26 October 2021 at 7.30 pm

PRESENT: Councillors James-J Walsh (Chair), James Royston (Vice-Chair) and Sophie Davis

ALSO PRESENT:

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Obajimi Adefiranye, Councillor Liam Curran, Councillor Carl Handley, Councillor Octavia Holland, Councillor Jonathan Slater and Councillor Luke Sorba

## 1. Declarations of Interests

The Chair advised the Committee:

- There would be a variation in the order of the meeting's agenda.

## 2. Minutes

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meetings Planning Committee A held on the 10 June 2021 and Planning Committee A (Council AGM), held on 26 May 2021 be agreed.

## 3. 34 Sydenham Hill, London, SE26 6LS - DC/20/118980

The Planning Officer gave an illustrative presentation, recommending the grant of planning permission for the proposal, as outlined in the Officer's report. The Committee noted the report and that the main issues were:

Principle of Development o Housing o Urban Design and Heritage Impacts o Impact on Adjoining Properties o Transport o Sustainable Development o Natural Environment.

Following the Officers presentation, Members questions related to the coach house.

The Officer confirmed the details of the coach house would be recorded for historical purposes, before it was demolished. The Committee were assured the local authority's conservation officer recommended and supported this action. The Officer also confirmed the features of the development that would be retained and treated sensitively, as outlined in the Officer's report, such as the staircase and lightwells. This would ensure the development retained its character.

The applicant addressed the Committee and described the application site. The applicant discussed: consultation, conservation, trees and the public benefit of the development against the loss of the coach house.

Questions were put to the applicant by the Committee members related to: the coach house.

The applicant advised Members the coach house was in a poor state of repair. In addition, its layout did not provide suitable family living. The applicant also advised

the Committee of the viability of the development, stating the value of the development with the conversion had increased. Members were told the development with the coach house would not be viable.

A representative with objections addressed the Committee. The representative discussed: Scale, heritage of existing development, design, the impact on the local area, ecological concerns, accommodation and infrastructure. The representative requested conditions, to mitigate concerns raised and residents to be included in consultation.

No questions were put to the representative by the Committee.

The following member's questions put to the Officer related to: design review panels, the difference between major and minor considerations, site and heritage, accommodation, conservation,

The Officer advised Members that design review panels were helpful, but did not replace professional judgement.

The Officer provided clarification to Members with regard to the difference between major and minor considerations. The Officer advised the Committee that many of the concerns raised were already conditioned with the applicant, such as materials to be used. It was confirmed that officers were satisfied with the conditions placed upon the applicant.

The Officer advised the local authority's conservation officer had assessed the development closely over the past few years. The conservation officer supported the proposal for the demolition of the coach houses.

During the Members discussion, concerns were raised with regard to parking, highway safety and bin storage.

The Officer advised that the development was not in a CPZ and permits could not be introduced.

The Officer advised that an informative could be added to request the developer consulted with the local authority's highways officer on the matter of highway safety.

The Committee considered the submissions made at the meeting, and

## **RESOLVED**

That it be noted that the Committee agreed to:

**GRANT** planning permission for the alteration, conversion and change of use of Cedars at 34 Sydenham Hill SE26 and the construction of a part single/part two storey extension at the rear, terraces at lower ground level and the provision of associated car parking spaces and bicycle storage to provide:

11 self-contained flats, together with the demolition of the existing Coach House and the construction of 8 two bedroom cottages and associated landscaping and parking area.

Subject to conditions and informatives outlined in the report and,

A requirement that officers should:

Add an informative requiring the developer to engage with the local authority's highway officer, with regard to highway safety.

Add wording to the refuse condition to ensure additional capacity is added to the bin store.

#### **4. Garages adjacent to 7 & 9 Ewelme Road and to the rear of 30-38 Woodcombe Crescent, SE23 - DC/20/117886**

The Planning Officer gave an illustrative presentation, recommending the grant of planning permission for the proposal as outlined in the Officer's report.

The Committee noted the report and that the main issues were: Principle of Development o Housing o Urban Design o Impact on Adjoining Properties o Transport o Sustainable Development o Natural Environment.

Following the Officers' presentation, Member's questions related to: accessibility and waste disposal.

The Officer advised there were no issues regarding accessibility. The local authority's highways officer had raised no concerns.

The Officer used their presentation slides to clarify bin access on the development.

The applicant addressed the Committee and described the application site. The applicant discussed: accommodation, high quality design, working relationship with the local authority, waste management, accessibility and the low impact of the development on its neighbours. Afterwards, questions were put to the applicant by the Committee in relation to: accessibility, lighting and waste management.

The applicant advised members the proposed ramp alongside steps design (ramp/steps) met building regulations. The applicant agreed that the design could be conditioned by officers.

The Committee were assured by the applicant, that low level lighting would be installed around the ramp/steps design.

The applicant also agreed to have a condition added to their proposed waste management plan for the development.

A representative with objections addressed the Committee. The representative discussed: fire safety, accessibility for services, the impact on neighbouring properties, design and waste management. Standing Orders were suspended at 9.31pm.

After the representative addressed the Committee, Members asked questions that related to: accessibility and traffic.

The representative expressed concerns regarding accessibility for emergency and delivery services.

The representative also advised Members of their concern for school children using the road near the development. They felt the design of the access to the development would pose a hazard to the children. Throughout the consideration of the application, Members raised concerns regarding the fire safety, the ramp/steps design, highway safety and waste management. Officers agreed that with the exception of highway safety, each issue raised could be conditioned, with wording allocated to Officers and agreed with the Chair.

The Committee considered the submissions made at the meeting, and **RESOLVED**

That it be noted that the Committee agreed to:

**GRANT** planning permission for the demolition of the garages adjacent to 7 & 9 Ewelme Road and to the rear of 30-38 Woodcombe Crescent, SE23, and the construction of a:

5 x 3-bedroom dwellinghouses and associated landscaping, refuse storage and cycle parking

Subject to conditions and informatives outlined in the report and, A requirement that officers should:

Add a condition requiring a Fire Strategy

Add a condition requiring further details of the ramp/steps design to increase the width of the ramp

Add a condition requiring further details of the arrangements for the management company necessary to handle waste/management provision.

**5. 107 Jerningham Road, SE14 5NH - DC/21/121739**

The Planning Officer gave an illustrative presentation, recommending the grant of planning permission for the proposal as outlined in the Officer's report. The Committee noted the report and that the main issues were:

Principle of Development o Urban Design and Heritage Impact.

The applicant addressed the Committee and described the application site.

No questions were put to the applicant by the Committee members.

A representative with objections addressed the Committee. The representative discussed: design, conservation and character

The following member's question put to the representative related to: design.

The representative advised the Committee it was not felt the proposal was an upgrade to the existing development.

During the Members discussion concern was raised regarding the impact of the design on the conservation area.

The Officer advised the design was sympathetic to the conservation area, as outlined in the Officer's report. The Officer also used their presentation slides to provide further clarification.

The Committee considered the submissions made at the meeting, and **RESOLVED**

That it be noted that the Committee agreed to:

**GRANT** planning permission for the demolition and re-building of the front boundary brick wall and piers at 107 Jerningham Road, SE14, together with the retention and modification of stone paving and planting layout in the front garden.

Subject to conditions and informatives outlined in the report.

**6. Blitbolt Ltd The Workshop, 101 Ashby Mews, London, SE4 1TB - DC/21/121526**

Application was not considered.

The meeting was adjourned at 10.15pm. The meeting reconvened at 10.20pm.

**7. 324 Brockley Road, London, SE4 2BT - DC/21/121564**

The Planning Officer gave an illustrative presentation, recommending the grant of planning permission for the proposal, as outlined in the Officer's report.

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

Principle of Development o Urban Design o Impact on Adjoining Properties.

Following the Officer's presentation, Members asked questions in relation to: proximity.

The Officer provided clarification regarding measurements in relation to the proposal and neighbouring properties, as outlined in the Officer's report.

The applicant was not present at the meeting.

A representative with objections addressed the Committee. Concern was raised with regard to the information provided by the Officer and printed images which were circulated by the objector at the meeting

The Officer requested a recess at 10.35pm for legal advice.

The meeting reconvened at 10.40pm. The Officer advised there were concerns regarding the printed images circulated.

The legal representative advised due to the concerns raised, the application should be deferred, to allow further investigation into the matter

The Committee considered the submissions made at the meeting, and

**RESOLVED**

Application would be **DEFERRED**, to allow investigation with regard to information supplied by objectors at the meeting.

**8. 11 Wells Park Road, SE26 6JQ - DC/21/120114**

Application was not considered.

**9. Nelsons Archway, Brigade Street, London, SE3 0TW - DC/21/121093**

Application was not considered.