

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE B

Thursday, 29 September 2022 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillors Liz Johnston-Franklin, Jack Lavery (Chair), Will Cooper, Sian Eiles, Billy Harding (Vice-Chair), Aliya Sheikh, Carol Webley-Brown and Suzannah Clarke

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor John Paschoud

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Rachel Onikosi and Councillor Luke Sorba

9. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting of 7 July 2022 were declared as an accurate record.

10. Declarations of Interests

No interests were declared.

11. WITHDRAWN- Garages at the rear of 4-24 Blythe Vale, SE6 4UJ (DC/21/127282)

This item was withdrawn from the agenda

12. Blackheath Station Carpark, SE3 9LE (DC/22/125578)

The officer gave an illustrative presentation of the application. The proposal was for a Minor Material Amendment in connection with the planning permission DC/21/121756 dated 19 August 2021 to allow a variation of Conditions 2 and 5 to extend the operating hours until 4:00 pm, extend operating days of the market to also include Saturday and to extend closing down and removal hours until 6pm at Blackheath Station Car Park (Farmers Market), SE3. Background Papers: (1) Submission Drawings (2) Submission technical reports and supporting document.

The main planning considerations were: Principle of Development; Urban Design; Transport Impact; Living Conditions of Neighbouring Properties. The officer stated that the proposed conditions were considered sufficient to prevent any harmful impacts on any of the considerations.

It was the officer recommendation that the application was approved.

It was asked that of the overall viability of market i.e. extended opening hours- how much of that is a consideration for the Committee. The Planning Officer responded that they have considered this positive land use, but this is not a planning consideration.

The agent for the application made the following points: the site is an existing carpark. 35 car parking spaces holds the market between the times 10am and 2pm. The market was first established in 2001. The proposal seeks to extend hours from 2-4pm on Saturdays in addition to Sundays. The time allocated to close down the market would be between 4-6pm. This would provide locals with choice and grant opportunities for vendors. There is emphasis on making the market a success and traders will use these hours to its full capacity. This will result in enhanced market for the community and will make the market more vibrant. She stated it would grant more flexibility and strengthen overall the Blackheath village. It could also potentially create jobs. The proposed application also meets the objectives of sustainable development.

It was asked by Members if traders would be able to leave after 2pm as they did or if they were obligated to work all hours. The applicant responded that there was flexibility to work their own hours. After approval the decision would go back to store-holders to make a further decision regarding the hours they would work. The applicant was also asked to address noise objections, to which she responded that noise impact was covered in the officer's report. She said the market had been running for 20 years with no major issues- they do not see how one extra day will cause any more noise than usual.

The objector raised the following points: the issues arising from the 7th condition from planning officer's proposal- he stated this condition would restrict the applicant to operate in accordance with the London Farmers Market. Their group had been advised by the London Farmers Markets they do not favour 2 day markets. There is also not enough demand for a 2 day operation to make them viable. Lewisham Council's website promotes other farmers markets, none of which operate for 2 days. Under LFM rules, no traders would allowed to leave the site before final trading hours. Even so, the stores are packed tightly so hard to get out. Meat and fish sellers will be affected by this the most as they are limited to 4 hours of operation. An assessment of this application is needed before it is approved.

The Planning Officer responded to these points stating that a lot of the matters raised are about the commercial use and not the land use so are not material considerations for the Committee. The key consideration is the land use, and by extended hours of operation allows greater flexibility in terms of the use for the space. He continued that condition 7 relates to the goods and products to be sold so is not the rules of the LFM. If it was found that the range of goods sold went beyond what was reasonably expected to be sold, as defined in condition 7, enforcement action against the market would be able to be taken.

After discussing the proposal, Members moved to vote on the application.

It was MOVED, SECONDED and RESOLVED to approve the application.

13. Valentine Court, Perry Vale, SE23 2LL (DC/22/127024

The presenting officer gave illustrative presentation of the application.

The proposal was for the construction of residential dwellings (Use Class C3) together with new play space, provision of car parking spaces, cycle parking spaces, refuse/recycling stores and associated landscaping works at Valentine Court, Perry Vale, SE23.

The material considerations were: Principle of development; 100% affordable housing; Amenity of existing and future occupiers; Transport; Landscape and ecology- all of which were considered acceptable and the proposed development scored highly with urban green factor. It was the officer recommendation to approve the application.

It was mentioned by Members, the loss of light in the existing neighbouring properties and it was asked if the loss of light was to do with the balconies. The officer responded that the BRE standard to look at the design of existing buildings and that it was common to see the level of daylight provided.

It was also asked why there were less 3 bedroom properties than 1 and 2 bedroom properties. The officer responded that 42% should be family units which has not been met by the proposal- it was advised that the number of units proposed was optimal and this was supported by the Strategic Housing Department.

Members asked why over 12s do not have much provision of play space as the existing estate does not have specific play space for over 12s. the officer responded that the approach is permitted by the London Plan and that the space is not exclusive.

Members asked the officer to comment on the separation distance from the proposed balcony from the walkway and between the blocks, as it appears very close. The officer stated that in terms of daylight and sunlight and the BRE standards, the distance is compliant but stated he understood the impact on outlook because of the short distance

The applicant was invited to speak and made the following points: the proposal is for new affordable homes- meaning families can move out of temporary and emergency housing into a home of their own. The scheme evolved through extensive pre-application engagement. Since 2020 Lewisham Homes have also engaged with key stakeholders in the wider community and resident currently living on the estate. Amendments have been shaped in response to the feedback. The development will deliver 41 affordable homes. 10% will be wheelchair homes. High quality residential homes meet or exceed the minimum space standards with private and communal amenity space. All homes have been designed so they have a dual aspect. Additional tree planting, new paving and resurfacing of existing routes will improve the area. Opportunities have been maximised with urban greening and biodiversity net gain. The scheme is being assessed from a heritage perspective which concludes there will be no harm to the ability to appreciate both the significance of the Grade 2 listed Christ church not the special character and appearance of the conservation area. The privacy outlook has been

minimised and proposed to be acceptable. Some residents have concerns- they are balanced and answer Lewisham's pressing need for new affordable homes.

Members expressed concern that there were more families on the housing waiting list and asked what the thinking was behind building less 3 bedroom properties. The agent responded that Lewisham Homes have been testing options and viability testing the issue. The aim was to strike a balance between family homes and optimising the amount of affordable homes.

It was asked if the existing mature trees could stay within design. The agent responded that they had tested impact of trees and the scheme has evolved through this which is why the existing trees around block D had been amended to remain.

The objector made the following points: the proposed construction, although not within the conservation area, affects the area as it is very close to boundary. The separation distance is very short. There are characteristic gaps in the proposed development which are not protected. She stated that the development has the potential to set very bad precedent. There will loss of views from the conservation area and less daylight/sunlight coming through the existing homes on Gainsborough Rd. Community engagement has not resulted in any design amendments to block A. The development will affect health of trees as there will be incursion along their roots. A lot of screening in the area is also reliant on trees.

The officer responded to the objector's comments stating that the conservation officer has been consulted and has identified the harm to the conservation area and is detailed in the officer report. When harm is found in a heritage asset they must first quantify what the harm is and balance the harm against the public benefits of the scheme- it was quantified at the lower end of substantial harm.

Councillor John Paschoud addressed the meeting under standing orders. He made the following points: The development is substantial. He stated that he agrees on impact and issue of Christmas conservation area. He also stated that officers are correct in their assessment in the report. The harms identified have been fairly. He stated that it is important to consider both the existing 100 Residents of valentine court and of 41 additional residents. Overall there are benefits to an additional pedestrian crossing making it an even safer area. The improvements to play area and improvements to greenery of estate should be noted. He concluded that the officer report was a fair assessment.

After discussing the proposal, members moved to vote on the application. It was MOVED, SECONDED and RESOLVED to approve the application.

14. Former Allotment Gardens at rear of 2-20 Arcus Road, BR1 4NW (DC/21/124509)

The presenting officer gave an illustrative presentation of the proposed application. The application proposed the demolition of garages and re-development of the land to provide residential units, together with associated access works, car parking, cycle parking, landscaping, refuse storage and the installation of a new substation to the rear of Arcus Road and 1-10 Chingley Close BR1.

The officer made a correction to the report, on paragraph 86 table 3: should read as 4 2beds for the shared ownership tenure.

The key considerations were: Principle of Development; 100% affordable housing; amenity of existing and future occupiers; transport; landscape and ecology. It was the officer recommendation to approve the application.

The applicant was invited to speak and made the following points: Phoenix Housing provides local resident, community-led social housing. Phoenix held events for the scheme and the engagement was dynamic. Half of the development will be family sized homes. Phoenix is keen to promote zero carbon in the context of the Council's own climate emergency declaration. The proposal would follow an ultra-low energy dependent design with no use of natural gas. This would lead to up to 80% smaller energy bills in comparison to housing of a similar size, which would be helpful in this current economic climate.

The objectors were invited to speak. The following points were made: The height and massing of the development is considered acceptable in the report but at its highest point the distance is just 16m between the block and the properties on Glenbow Rd. they asked if there will be new back fences to protect privacy of gardens and if there will be measures in place to stop people from dumping rubbish in the alleyway. They also objected against the height of the proposed buildings. They stated that the building would cause overlooking the gardens of numbers 2 and 4.

The officer responded to the points raised by objectors. He made the following points: It is a tight adjacency between the terrace on block 1 and properties on Glenbow Rd. The SPD recommends in such instances 16m being acceptable. If the alleyway falls inside the red line boundary treatment it is restricted with a hard and soft landscaping condition. Members asked Officers to ensure an informative is included that would ensure issue of motorcycle access is addressed.

The officer finalised that Condition 39 can address a need for control obscured glazing to the actual section of the terrace to minimise overlooking into the gardens. Condition 32 has recommended to provide details of acoustic performance enclosure in relation to the substation to ensure there is no unreasonable impact on residents.

The Members considered the application and presented and it was MOVED, SECONDED and RESOLVED to approve the application, subject to the informatives in the officer report. The applicant is advised that the final detailed hard and soft landscaping shall be designed insofar as possible so as to deter anti-social behaviour (including that through inappropriate use of motorcycles and

e-bikes) on the approved pedestrian and cyclist access road from Arcus Road, to the rear of existing properties on Glenbow Road.