

# MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE A

Monday, 24 January 2022 at 7.30 pm

PRESENT: Councillors James-J Walsh (Chair), James Royston (Vice-Chair), Obajimi Adefiranye and Luke Sorba

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor Sophie Davis

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Liam Curran, Carl Handley and Jonathan Slater

## 1. Declarations of Interests

None

## 2. Minutes

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning Committee A meeting held on the 26 October 2021 be agreed.

## 3. 433 New Cross Road, London, SE14 6TD - DC/21/123142

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 • Housing • Urban Design • Impact on Adjoining Properties • Transport • Sustainable Development • Natural Environment • Planning Obligations

Following the Officers presentation, Members questions related to space.

The Officer advised officers were confident with the measurements provided in the plan, by the development's architect. It was felt there would be enough space.

The agent addressed the Committee and described the application site. The applicant discussed: collaboration process and engagement with the local authority, design issues and the visual enhancement to the area.

Questions were put to the agent by the Committee members related to: viability, accessibility, daylight/sunlight,

The agent advised Members that the creation of 8 units on the development, instead of the proposed 9, would have a negative effect on financial viability of the development. The agent acknowledged the

need for affordable housing and advised Members the applicant was disappointed, that they would not be able to provide 10 or more units, due to the negative effect on the developments' viability.

The Officer provided clarification with regard to accessibility, as outlined in the Officer's report.

A representative with objections addressed the Committee. The representative discussed: light, privacy, balcony, and design.

No questions were put to the representative by the Committee.

The following member's questions put to the Officer related to: height, overlooking, design, materials, parking, cycle storage security and space.

The Officer advised the Committee that the developer was limited to 9 units due to space constraints and it was not possible to build a taller scheme. The maximum allowance for the development, had been reached.

Members were advised by the Officer that, the already existing overlooking to gardens, was not considered harmful by officers. The Committee were also advised the balcony was not built higher, as that would be intrusive. The screening instead, created no harm. The Committee were informed all design measures taken, were in keeping with planning policy.

The Officer confirmed London stock brick would be used, to match the existing brickwork in the vicinity. There would also be the use of zinc on the top floor, to provide visual interest and to provide vertical differentiation between the top, middle and bottom of the development. Assurance was given by the Officer that materials, were of good quality.

Members were informed by the Officer that there were existing short stay parking to the front of 445 New Cross Road. The Committee were assured that Transport for London (TfL), were satisfied that the existing five spaces on site, would accommodate the parking requirement for the development.

The Committee were advised that although the cycle store would open directly onto the public realm, increased passive surveillance provided by the new residential accommodation, would help mitigate security concerns. It was also advised that details of other security measures would be agreed, with the applicant.

Members were advised that the majority of the proposed units would feature private external amenity space that either met or exceeded the space standard set out in LPP D6. The two exceptions would be Units 7 and 9, located on the upper floors of the existing building. It would not be possible to provide balconies to those units, due to potential overlooking to the neighbouring gardens.

During the Members discussion, concerns were raised again with regard to the units that did not have external space, but were not compensated internally. It was felt by Members that this was not compliant with planning policy.

As a result, a Member proposed a motion to refuse the proposal on this basis, with wording for the refusal to be delegated to planning officers. The motion was seconded by another Member.

Members voted on whether to refuse the recommendation in the report. As there was a tie, the Chair cast the deciding vote, with a result of 3 in favour of refusal and 2 in favour of granting the recommendation in the report. It was

**RESOLVED**

That it be noted that the Committee agreed to:

**REFUSE** planning permission for the demolition of the existing extension to the rear of 433 New Cross Road SE14 and the change of use, alterations and rear extensions to the existing building, together with the construction of a 5 storey building at the rear of the site with access onto Glenville Grove to provide 9 self-contained flats incorporating balconies and terraces, provision cycle store, bin store and plant structure in the centre of the site (to be accessed directly off Mornington Road) for the following reason:

The impact on the standard of the residential accommodation would on balance, be negative as the proposal would:

○ Fail to provide external amenity space without equivalent internal compensation for Units 7 and 9.

**4. 3 Arbutnot Road, London, SE14 5LS - DC/21/123299**

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 • Urban Design and impact on heritage assets • Living Conditions of the Neighbours.

No questions were put to the Officer by the Committee.

The agent addressed the Committee and described the application site. The applicant discussed: design, scale, footprint, boundaries, daylight, height, drainage and materials.

No questions were put to the agent by the Committee.

A representative from the Telegraph Hill Society (THS/Society), with objections addressed the Committee. The representative discussed: materials, design, preservation of character, conservation area. The representative also discussed a refused application, that went to the Planning Inspectorate.

After the representative addressed the Committee, Members asked questions that related to: the Society, protection as opposed to conservation.

The representative assured the Committee that the next THS meeting with select committees, would be in April 2022. Members were also assured that the THS encouraged the democratic process, by sending emails inviting involvement and by hosting public events. It was acknowledged that the Society had not held an AGM recently.

The Officer cited Article 4 to advise that parts of buildings in conservation areas, not facing the public realm could be removed. This was because they were not protected by conservation policy.

The Officer noted the application discussed by the Society, was dismissed on appeal. The Officer advised the current application was not comparable to the application appeal discussed by the Society, as the changes in the current application, were not viewable to the public. The DMTL provided support to the Officers advice, by noting that the application appeal referred to by the THS representative, related to a change to the window of a development that would have been visible in the public realm. The DMTL stated that in the case of the current application under consideration, no such harm would occur.

During the Members discussion, the Chair raised concerns regarding amenity societies, continually attending meetings to raise concerns with regard to conservation of properties, when any change was undertaken. Concern was raised with regard to the effect on tax payers, as a result of such objections. The Chair noted that often historic buildings, benefitted from modernisation, noting palaces as an example. The Chair thanked the Officer and the DMTL for the clarification they provided on the matter of conservation.

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 construction of a single storey rear and side infill extension at 3 Arbuthnot Road, SE14.

Subject to conditions and informatives outlined in the report

**5. 36 Gellatly Road, London, SE14 5TT - DC/21/123044**

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 • Urban Design and impact on heritage assets • Living Conditions of the Neighbours.

No questions were put to the Officer by the Committee.

Neither the agent nor the applicant, attended the meeting. Following the advice provided by the Officer and DMTL for the application considered under item 4 of the meeting Agenda, the representative from THS, withdrew their objections to the current application, under consideration.

The Committee considered the submission made at the meeting, and **RESOLVED - unanimously**

That it be noted that the Committee agreed to:

**GRANT** planning permission for the construction of a single storey infill extension at the rear of 36 Gellatly Road, SE14, together with the demolition of the existing rear extension, insertion of rooflights to the outrigger roof slopes, and installation of replacement timber sash windows at the front and rear elevation and replacement of the slate roof tiles.

Subject to conditions and informatives outlined in the report

**6. Ground Flat, 5 Glensdale Road, London, SE4 1UE - DC/21/123314**

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 • Urban Design and Impact on Heritage Assets • Transport Impact • Living Conditions of the Neighbours  
• Sustainable Development • Natural Environment

Question put to the Officer by the Committee related to access, developer, trees and conservation.

The Officer advised the current existing access track was acceptable. Clarification was provided by the Officer, with regard to the identity of the developer, as outlined in the Officers' report.

Members were advised by the Officer, that there would be no impact on conservation or the Brockley conservation area, with regard to the rear wall of the development.

The Committee were assured by the Officer that the applicant would agree to soft landscaping, that would compensate for the removal of the existing tree on the application site.

The applicant addressed the Committee and described the application proposal. The applicant discussed: use of space, off-street parking, electric car charger space, biodiversity, design and pleasant views for neighbours.

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

A representative with objections addressed the Committee. The representative discussed:

There were no representatives with objections, at the meeting.

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 demolition of rear garden wall to create a parking space and other works to improve the garden at Ground Floor Flat, 5 Glensdale Road SE4.

Subject to conditions and informatives outlined in the report

The meeting closed at 9.12 pm.