

# MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE C

Thursday, 22 July 2021 at 7.30 pm

PRESENT: Councillors Olurotimi Ogunbadewa (Chair), Stephen Penfold (Vice-Chair), Mark Ingleby, Silvana Kelleher, Louise Krupski, Hilary Moore, John Paschoud and James Rathbone

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor Peter Bernards

Apologies for absence were received from

## 1. Declarations of Interests

Councillor Kelleher advised the Committee that she had attended a meeting in relation to Item 3. It was advised that as a result of the meeting, the Councillor had already made up her mind on the application. Councillor Kelleher recused herself from the consideration and voting of Item 3 on the meeting Agenda.

Councillor Rathbone advised the Committee that the application site to be considered at Item 4, on the meeting Agenda was in his Ward. The Councillor also advised that he had referred the application to Planning Committee.

Prior to the Planning Officers presentations, the Officer provided a brief supporting commentary. The Officer advised Members the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) had been updated on the 20 July 2021. It was advised that officers were satisfied that all applications to be heard at the meeting, remained consistent with the updated NPPF guidance.

## 2. Minutes

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning Committee C held on the 20 May 2021 and Planning Committee C (Council AGM), held on 26 May 2021 be agreed and signed as a correct record.

## 3. 36 SCAWEN ROAD, LONDON, SE8 5AE

The Planning Officer, gave an illustrative presentation recommending the grant of planning permission for the alterations, restoration and conversion of the existing house at 36 Scawen Road SE8 to provide:

- 2 houses with alterations to the roof to form a crown roof with side and rear dormers, together with the construction of 5, three and four storey houses, a children play area, allotments and a wildlife corridor around the site.

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

- Principle of Development

- Housing
- Urban Design
- Transport
- Impact on Adjoining Properties
- Sustainable Development
- Natural Environment

Following the Officers presentation, no questions were put to the Officer by Members.

The applicant addressed the Committee and described the application site. The application site was described as a 'special project' that would focus on food, cooking and food security. The applicant advised the Committee the development was their home. As a publican, they also wanted to provide their head chefs with accommodation. The applicant noted that the chefs ran 'field kitchens' to teach young people from the local community how to cook. Allotments would also be onsite, so members of the local community could learn how to grow produce. Members were advised that emphasis would be placed on ensuring sustainability. The applicant advised consideration would be given to how materials could be sourced and wastage disposed of in a sustainable manner. Members were assured that the development would use resources in 'clever, intelligent' ways. The applicant gave a historical account of the application site. The applicant described the various community based organisations, they would be involved in. They stated they were looking forward to doing 'amazing' things in the community.

Member's questions put to the applicant related to materials and design. The applicant provided a brief history of how materials were obtained from fallen buildings, during World War 2 and used to reconstruct the current building. The applicant noted the concern raised regarding the arched window. It was advised that the window could not be restored and it also did not form part of the original building.

During the Member's discussion, praise was given to the applicants plans for the proposed development.

The Committee considered the submissions made at the meeting, and

**RESOLVED – unanimously**

That it be noted that the Committee agreed to:

**GRANT** planning permission for the alterations, restoration and conversion of the existing house at 36 Scawen Road SE8 to provide:

- 2 houses with alterations to the roof to form a crown roof with side and rear dormers, together with the construction of 5, three and four storey houses, a children play area, allotments and a wildlife corridor around the site.

Subject to conditions and informatives outlined in the report.

#### 4. 34-40 EASTDOWN PARK, SE13

The Planning Officer, gave an illustrative presentation recommending the grant of planning permission for the demolition of existing buildings and construction of a part 4, part 5 storey building at 34/40 Eastdown Park SE13 to provide:

- 18 split level flats (Use Class C3), together with 3, two storey three bedroom houses (Use Class C3) and provision of shared communal garden, amenity space, associated hard and soft landscaping, cycle parking and bin storage.

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

- Principle of Development
- Housing
- Urban Design
- Impact on Adjoining Properties
- Transport
- Sustainable Development
- Natural Environment
- Planning Obligations

Afterwards, members' questions related to overheating, PTAL ratings, highways agreement, overlooking, financial viability, heating system, sunlight and daylight report, and density.

Members were assured by the Officer that an Overheating Assessment would be secured by a planning condition, which would require it to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. It was noted that the mitigation measures identified by the assessment report, would need to be installed before the first occupation of the development, following approval.

The Officer advised the Committee they would double check the PTAL rating for the proposal outlined in the Officer's report.

Members were advised by the Officer that with regard to healthy streets, the local authority's highways officers had conducted an assessment of the local pedestrian environment and identified required improvements. The Officer assured the Committee that the developer had agreed to comply with the recommended mitigation measures. The Officer confirmed that the mitigation measures identified from the assessment report could be secured by legal agreement.

The Committee were provided with further clarification, by the Officer via the Officer's presentation slides, that there would be no overlooking from the development onto the nearby Wisteria Road.

The Committee were assured that a periodic financial viability review of the application would be conducted. It would be agreed with the developer that if the development generated a higher surplus profit than anticipated, it would be redirected towards building affordable housing.

Members were advised by the Officer that Sustainability Officers had accepted the proposed energy strategy, as connection to a heat network was not possible. It was noted that this was not a reasonable ground for refusing the application.

Members were advised that the daylight and sunlight report submitted, found there was a reduction in light with regard to small areas of the neighbouring gardens, exceeding BRE standards for overshadowing of amenity spaces

The Officer informed the Committee there was no reduction in density. Members were advised that an increase in height was not considered appropriate. The Committee were advised that officers were satisfied that it was an appropriate density.

The Officer confirmed to Members that it was not possible for the developer to insert another floor onto the proposed development.

Members were advised by the Officer, to consider the application before them. As there was no alternative proposal to what was put before them for consideration.

The applicant addressed the Committee, describing the proposal. Members were advised of the developer's 18 year experience in the building industry. The applicant emphasised that the developer cared about the properties they built. In particular the importance of light and space contributing to well-being was noted. The Committee were also advised that consultation had been conducted within the local community. The proposal was described by the applicant as a most 'important project' and noted it was 'challenging' due to the current pandemic and its effects on property values. The applicant assured Members that 'robust' materials would be utilised. Also that energy pumps and panels would as sustainable as possible. Members were informed of the communal garden and the importance of shared amenity space for communities. The applicant advised community space would be ensured, if the application were approved.

The following questions from members related to heating, tenure, materials and green space management.

The applicant advised the Committee the development entailed 18 apartments. There was not enough space for air source heat pumps to service them all. Therefore, it was more appropriate to use panels instead.

Members were informed by the applicant that the development would be built for sale. However, the developer would be open to the development of rental opportunities, available to 'wider occupiers'.

The applicant reassured the Committee that a landscape architect would be appointed to manage the green space. The developer would spend time finding the right company. The applicant provided assurance to Members that the right strategies would be put in place.

No representatives with objections, were present at the meeting.

During the Members discussion, concern was raised with regard to heating. It was felt that the materials used attributed to deforestation and was not sustainable. There was also the view that the developer could have used pumps, but had chosen not to. A Member of the Committee felt 'inclined' to refuse approval of the proposal.

The applicant noted the concern and advised the Committee of materials that would reduce CO2 emissions, noting 'efficient' concrete that keep the development cool in the summer and at stable temperature in the winter. The applicant advised that the materials were efficient, as they were factory made. Another Member felt the use of heat pumps would have been more consistent and efficient. It was not felt the proposed electrical heating would be appropriate for the

development and should be viewed as a 'last resort'. The opinion was that the choice to use panels was cost related.

The applicant stated that heat pumps had been used in previous projects, the developer worked on. But it was felt pumps were less appropriate for the apartments due to their size. Therefore, the use of heat pumps had been redirected to larger schemes. The applicant felt the agreed energy strategy was appropriate for the proposed development.

Members voted on the recommendation in the report with a result of 5 in favour of the proposal and 3 against. It was

## **RESOLVED**

That it be noted that the Committee agreed to:

**GRANT** planning permission for the demolition of existing buildings and construction of a part 4, part 5 storey building at 34/40 Eastdown Park SE13 to provide:

- 18 split level flats (Use Class C3), together with 3, two storey three bedroom houses (Use Class C3) and provision of shared communal garden, amenity space, associated hard and soft landscaping, cycle parking and bin storage.

Subject to conditions and informatives outlined in the report.

## **RESOLVED**

That it be noted that the Committee agreed to:

**GRANT** planning permission for the demolition of existing buildings and construction of a part 4, part 5 storey building at 34/40 Eastdown Park SE13 to provide:

- 18 split level flats (Use Class C3), together with 3, two storey three bedroom houses (Use Class C3) and provision of shared communal garden, amenity space, associated hard and soft landscaping, cycle parking and bin storage.

Subject to conditions and informatives outlined in the report.

## **5. 21 WISTERIA ROAD, LONDON, SE13 5HW - THIS ITEM HAS BEEN REMOVED FROM THE AGENDA**

The item was removed from the Agenda.

## **6. 16 REYNARD CLOSE, LONDON, SE4 2DF**

The Planning Officer, gave an illustrative presentation recommending the grant of planning permission for the construction of a single storey rear extension at 16 Reynard Close, SE4, and all other associated works.

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

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

The following members' question related to scale, light and elevation limits. The Officer provided clarification to Members with regard to scale, light and elevation limitations, as outlined in the Officer's report. The Officer confirmed that officers felt the measurements clarified, were acceptable.

The applicant was in attendance at the meeting, but did not address the Committee.

No representatives with objections, were present at the meeting.

Members agreed the Officer's recommendation. It was

### **RESOLVED**

That it be noted that the Committee agreed to:

**GRANT** planning permission for the construction of a single storey rear extension at 16 Reynard Close, SE4, and all other associated works.

Subject to conditions and informatives outlined in the report.

The meeting closed at 9.13 pm