

# MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE B

Tuesday, 31 January 2023 at 7.00 pm

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

ALSO PRESENT:

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

## 1. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting on 10 November 2022 were agreed as an accurate record.

## 2. Declarations of Interests

There were no interests to declare. Members of the Committee who are Ward Members for wards referred to in the items, stated that they were lobbied by residents in regards to individual items.

## 3. GREEN BANK COTTAGE, TAYMOUNT RISE, SE23 3UL (DC/22/127431)

3.1. The application proposed for the Demolition of the 2 existing dwellings and the construction of a 4-storey building with roof terrace above to provide 16 self-contained flats at (Greenbank Cottage and Taymount Lodge) Taymount Rise SE23, together with the provision of accessible parking spaces, cycle and bin storage and associated amenity space, play area and landscaping. The application received 119 objections.

3.2. The Planning Officer gave an illustrative presentation on the application. The key considerations were: Principle of Development; Housing; Urban Design; Impact on Adjoining Properties; Transport; Sustainable Development; Natural Environment; Planning Obligations. All of the considerations were deemed acceptable and supported by officers. It was the officer recommendation to approve the application.

3.3. Members asked private external amenity space such as balconies. It was responded that 6 of the units do not have balconies which prevents noise and overlooking. The balconies were removed to provide better relationship with unit adjacent to the site. The Planning Officer said that a communal amenity space is provided at roof level.

3.4. Members also asked what pressures were placed on the infrastructure with concerns that 16 units could lead to further flooding. The Presiding Officer replied that Thames Water did not have any concerns and that the area was a flood risk zone 1 location so there was a low level risk- the applicant therefore did not need

to provide a flood risk assessment. It was said that the drainage manager was unable to provide feedback on this application but on the last application, they had no objections.

3.5. Members mentioned that there is significant parking stress in the area and asked how would this be managed. The officer responded that the London Plan policy T6 determines a high public transport rating for such locations and that developments should be car-free. There are 2 accessible parking spaces also located on site.

3.6. It was asked why the development did not include any affordable housing. The Presiding Officer replied that this was becoming more common and likely a consequence of current economy. The London Plan framework allows a viability tested route for any scheme that is not delivering 50% affordable housing. He said that, in this instance, the application was accompanied with a financial viability assessment which was interrogated to assess if affordable housing could be included in the development as the submission came in at 0%. It was concluded that the scheme could not viably provide affordable housing, either on-site or in a cash in-lieu option.

3.7. The applicant was invited to speak on their application. The following was discussed:

3.8. The officers report was robust and balanced; The previous site was for 20 properties and was revised down to 16; Scale and sighting was original reason for refusal; The scheme was developed with conservation officers and co-signed by the highways and design officer; The change allows a reduction in hard surfacing and allows disabled parking; The 5 trees will be replaced by 38; The site will continue to be car free, which is more environmentally friendly; The potential impacts are reduced in comparison to the previously proposed scheme; There is also now an increase of family sized units as recommended by Local Plan.

3.9. Members asked what the service strategy was for the development. The applicant responded that there is a delivery bay on the frontage and the bins are placed within a short distance of the road for collection.

3.10. When asked how residents can use the available parking spaces, it was responded that the bays are right-angled to the road so can reverse in or park with front.

3.11. It was asked how the roof garden design prevents overlooking and if there was a children's play space- the applicant responded that they had done studies and the actual roof garden is set back from the roof itself, and a model was made to ensure this would not happen. He also stated that the children's play space was at back of site.

3.12. The objector was then invited to speak. Their main points were:

3.13. Firstly, it is an excessive scale and mass which falls just within what is deemed acceptable; the footprint of the new proposal is reduced somewhat but still impacts negatively in terms of overlooking both to Forest Croft and Taymont Grange; both flats affected are single aspect and some of the studios only have 1 liveable window. Some of these places impacted are non-habitable. Secondly, the loss of greenspace and roof terrace: the 3rd floor of Forest Croft looks directly into the roof terrace. There will also be a negative impact on residents because of the noise that would come from the roof terrace, as well as light pollution. Thirdly, regarding traffic and parking- there is concern of the safety of the service strategy. Taymont Rise has a steep camber and most service vehicles park in the middle of the street.

3.14. The objector also stated that it was not reasonable for residents in the development to not own cars. Overall, there is a huge negative effects on residents and no affordable housing. They expressed their disappointment that there was a lack of engagement from the developer.

3.15. The objector was asked about their opinion of the Highways Officer's report on the scheme. She responded that the report did not detail the full scope of the issue. She stated that there has been an occurring issue that because of pavement parking, lorries have been unable to reverse in or out of the area safely. The enforcement of safe parking is scant and pedestrians continue to lose out.

3.16. The Officer clarified that the refuse management plan deemed acceptable, servicing condition 13, condition 31 and condition 39.

3.17. Members acknowledged the objectors points and asked officers if there was a condition for management of roof terrace. They stated that use of the space needed to be regulated. The Presiding Officer stated that Members could add a condition to the recommendation. 8am to 10pm was agreed by Members.

3.18. It was MOVED, SECONDED and RESOLVED to approve the application subject to updated conditions.

#### **4. LAND ON WICKHAM MEWS, REAR OF 4 WICKHAM ROAD (DC/22/128099)**

4.1. The application was for the construction of a single storey office/studio on site of 3 demolished garages at Wickham Mews rear of 4 Wickham Road.

4.2. The Planning Officer presented an illustrative presentation of the proposal. He highlighted the following considerations: Principle of Development; Urban Design & Heritage Impact; Transport Impact; Living Conditions of Neighbours; Natural Environment. Planning officers considered these considerations to be satisfied. It was the officer recommendation to approve the application.

4.3. Members asked about use of the site- enforcement which would prevent the conversion to residential space- the officer responded that this is covered by condition 10.

4.4. Members asked about the height of the building stating that it is relatively shorter than neighbouring sites. The officer said that it was keeping with the heights accepted for the Mews development.

4.5. Members asked officers to outline the features compared to previous versions of application. The presenting officer explained that it was not fit for purpose for a commercial unit and it was not providing appropriate workspace.

4.6. The applicant was invited to present the proposal. Their main points were: dangerous levels of white asbestos were found in the small garages which were removed for the safety of residents; discussion with local groups, neighbours and the Council took place and ultimately, no residential application was made initially; the design was adapted; the planners support for the application shows that the applicant has successfully overcome all technical constraints; the structure can be built economically and would be bringing new life to underused resource of Wickham Mews; the rent will form a vital part of income in retirement.

4.7. Members asked how many people would use the space. The applicant responded that they could be approached by a single company or multiple people may want to use the space. Time constraints on the use of the property have been conditioned. The Presiding Officer added that the use class had been proposed for the scale of the development and it is expected numbers would be fairly minimal-typical use of such developments are 4-5 people.

4.8. The objector was then invited to speak. Their main points were:

4.9. The building line, proximity, scale, materials and height are the main issues. Wickham Mews is the last surviving undeveloped site in the area and is considered an unpopulated solitude. Regarding the building line, the 3 garages demolished were decades old and the applicant is applying to extend much further to include the forecourt. the effect of coming far forward would be to narrow the length of the Mews by 5metres. That is below the width that is recommended on the Lewisham small sites SPD.

4.10. The national 43 degree BRE rule aims to avoid overbearing proximity and squeezes tightly to its northern boundary. The proposed ridge height is 4.5metres. this is an unnecessarily lofty roof space for a single storey building. The Mews is a conservation area and a heritage asset.

4.11. Officer clarified that the utility connection is not material consideration. He added that there are 25m between the application site and the upper floors of 4 Wickham Road. The extension at basement level reduces that distance to 19m it is of planning officers judgement that the impact in terms of enclosure and overbearing impact would not be unacceptable. This is a usual separation distance. The area does have tranquil character, but portion of the Mews also has such development.

4.12. He also said, in terms of overbearing impact, that the applicant has provided an analysis of a 25 degree line which is the correct assessment.

4.13. Members expressed concern over sunlight and daylight accessible from the basement flat of 4 Wickham Road and wanted to know how much sunlight and daylight would be lost if any. The Presiding Officer responded that if the application or proposed development does pass the 25 degree test then further testing is not required. He advised that the application should not be refused for lack of daylight or sunlight on this basis, but if necessary, to gather further information on the daylight and sunlight. Planners were of the opinion that the impact was acceptable.

4.14. The officer clarified for Members that the passageway, although it has been used by residents, is not a public right of way. Planning legislation does not extend to if there was a public right of way, which would need to be done by highways order and are not material to the planning application

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

## **5. LAND ADJACENT TO 31 CLAYHILL CRESECENT, LONDON, SE9 4JA (DC/22/124954)**

5.1. The application proposed for the replacement of the existing garage with a new two storey, two-bedroom dwellinghouse at the land to the side of 31 Clayhill Crescent, SE9, together with the provision of a car parking space, cycle storage and bin store. There were 4 objections received from neighbours.

5.2. The Planning Officer gave an illustrative presentation for the application. The key considerations were: Principle of Development; Housing; Urban Design; Standard of Accommodation; Impact on Adjoining Properties; Highway and Transportation; Sustainable Development. It was the officer recommendation to approve the application.

5.3. Members asked what the grounds for refusal were for the previous application to which the officer replied was design and impact on amenity. The principle of having a new dwelling to that land was supported and the design had been amended since the previous application.

5.4. It was also asked if fitting a gas boiler was the best decision and if a different heating method was an option, taking into consideration the Council's net zero target. The officer responded that a condition had been set which required the boiler to be in line with new climate changes and policies on boiler gas. The Presiding Officer added that as this is a single building proposed, the most that can be required is a low emissions boiler.

5.5. The applicant then gave their presentation. Their main points were:

5.6. He purchased the land after buying 31 Clayhill Crescent. He had been working with the Council on the new plans for over a year, after the first plans were refused. The land itself had been derelict for many years

5.7. Members had no questions for the applicant. They asked the officer about the positioning of the bin store, and if it were a suitable position for neighbours at the front of the property. The Presiding Officer responded that upon visiting the property, it is his opinion that storage unit would be aesthetically better, than the informal bin storage around the crescent. It is conditioned that full details of refuse storage be submitted for approval.

5.8. The objector was unable to attend the meeting online. There were also difficulties Members accepted that they had previously read the objections that were sent and appended to the report.

5.9. It was MOVED, SECONDED and RESOLVED that application was approved.

## **6. RIVER QUAGGY, JUNCTION OF GRANVILLE GROVE AND LEWISHAM HIGH STREET (DC/22/128176)**

6.1. The proposal was for the provision of a sculpture (3800mm x 1060mm x 1000mm) for the River Quaggy located on the Junction of Granville Grove and Lewisham High Street SE13.

6.2. The Planning Officer gave a presentation of the application. The key considerations highlighted were Principle of Development; Highways and Pedestrian Impacts; and Flood Risk. It was the officer recommendation to approve the application.

6.3. The artist and applicant gave their presentation. they stated that the site was chosen as it was quite built up, and the history of the river being enclosed although the Lewisham Gateway Scheme has opened up part of the river. It was said that the sculpture would be of an abstract design, and is installed as part of Lewisham's status as the London Borough of Culture 2022, recognising the heritage of the River Quaggy. The material would be brushed stainless steel instead of polish so that it does not reflect light in a dramatic way for nearby drivers. The positioning of the sculpture was said to be contextually important for the value of the piece and that it would be good for members of the public to encounter the art that way.

6.4. The objector then gave their presentation. the raised four key points. The first being that the there should have been some pre-application consultation about the proposal. There was a concern that people do not feel engaged due to the visibility of the sculpture. It was also raised that there had been no consultation with disability or equality groups as the location shows a dropped curb in the plan. The objector also said that a better location for the sculpture would be at the bottom of St Stephen's Grover where there is no pedestrian walkway.

6.5. The presiding officer commented that the Committee can only determine if the proposed location is suitable and are not able to consider another location for suitability.

6.6. It was asked by Members to officers what the disability impact would be. The presenting officer highlighted the report which outlined that officers had discussed potential impact with the Highways team who responded that there needed to be a minimum clearance for which there is easy access around the sculpture. It was determined that the sculpture far exceeded this minimum requirement.

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

**7. 1 ALGIERS ROAD, LONDON, SE13 7JD (DC/22/128609)**

7.1. The application proposed the construction of a garden studio in the rear garden of 1 Algiers Road SE13. It was the officer recommendation to approve the application.

7.2. The officer gave a presentation of the application. The key considerations were Character; Heritage; Local Environment and Transport. It was the Planning Officer view that these considerations were satisfied by the proposal.

7.3. After hearing the Officer presentation, Members agreed the vote on the application, as there were no objectors present.

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