

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE B

Thursday 24th August 2023 at 7pm

Present: Councillors Jack Lavery, Billy Harding, Aliya Sheikh, John Paschoud and Oana Olaru

Also present: Sarah Assibey (Committee Support Officer), Aaron Lau (Presiding Officer), Antigoni Gkiza (Presenting Officer) and Paula Young (Legal Officer)

In attendance virtually: Barnaby Garcia (Presenting Officer), Max Curson (Presenting Officer),

Apologies: Councillor Johnston-Franklin

1. Minutes

The minutes of the last meeting were agreed as an accurate record.

Councillor Paschoud stated that his declared interest at the last meeting was anonymised and would like to be identified.

2. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Harding declared that the first item is regarding a development in his ward.

Councillor Moore declared that item 3 takes place in her ward.

3. Horniman Museum and Gardens DC/23/ 130987 & DC/23/130988

- 3.1. The proposed application was for a Sustainable Gardening Zone, including demolition of existing structures and the construction of two new glass houses with external covered area in the nursery hub, paved terrace, paths and landscaping for the Winter Garden, paving and planting for Community wellbeing garden, new cafe, toilet block, store building and play area within old boating lake to Nature Explorers Zone, interpretation panels and entrance gate and ramp on the nature trail; external works to the Natural History Gallery to include new roof coverings, louvres to eastern windows; enlargement of western plant enclosure; plant enclosure on west side of gallery; ductwork penetrations, guardrail's to east elevation, new fencing and gates and other internal and external alterations to the elevations at Horniman Museum and Gardens, 100 London Road SE23.
- 3.2. The officer gave an illustrative presentation outlining the proposal. It was the Officer recommendation to approve the application. The Presenting Officer highlighted that the site is in the Forest Hill conservation area and is a Grade II statutorily listed heritage asset.
- 3.3. Officers were satisfied the proposed development would not have negative impact. Nature rail will improve accessibility and allow for more exploration. The developments to the Sustainable gardening zone would further

enhance the area and provide several opportunities for community engagement. The public would also benefit from accessibility, community activities, environmental sustainability and multi-cultural activities and this would outweigh the less than substantial harm.

- 3.4. The key planning considerations were: principle of development, urban design and impact heritage assets; impact on adjoining properties; transport; sustainable development; and natural environment subject to the conditions outlined in the report. Officers were satisfied that all of these considerations would not cause any substantial harm and were acceptable.
- 3.5. It was asked if the toilets would be accessible as long as the gardens were open to which the officer confirmed they would be. The question of the use of Horniman drive for construction traffic was also raised. The officer responded that the highways officers have reviewed the plan and raised concerns of use of Horniman Drive. As a result, they requested that only London Road, Honor Oak Park and Westwood Park be used for vehicular access. The conditions outlined in the report includes the restriction.
- 3.6. It was also asked if Noise impact to neighbours had been considered. The officer responded that the area is quiet, but all things considered it is a park. The adventure zone and café are open during the same hours as the park so there would be no substantial noise impact outside of park noise during the operational hours. There also is a maximum separation distance of 80m and the environmental protection teams review outlines that they were overall satisfied.
- 3.7. It was asked if the new developed zones would create more urbanisation and be too modern for the conservation area. The officer responded that no green space would be reused, and the developments are hidden away from main park. The applicant team had explored different options in terms of design and any impact has been compensated because of additional facilities.
- 3.8. The Applicant was invited to speak. Their main points were: the project is the outcome of a master planning exercise undertaken before the pandemic to resolve several challenges. The visitor numbers have increased significantly since 2001. The facilities were inadequate and there was a lot of congestion.
- 3.9. The museum is London's only museum where you can see nature and culture together. The projects were designed to improve entrance facilities and encourage people to spread themselves over the site as a whole and engaging people in more nature. It is also the aim to engage a more ethnically and socially diverse audience.
- 3.10. The strength of the project had meant that 90% of funding has been secured. The applicant stated they are happy to engage directly or as a group if there are still concerns about the development. In terms of noise levels, they had employed an additional noise impact assessment and it was found to be not detrimental to nearby residents. In terms of increased footfall, it is likely more people will visit the trail- but the aim of the project is

not to primarily increase the number of visitors but to diversify the range and spread them around more. It is estimated there would be 250 more visits per day. This is not considered to have an appreciable impact.

- 3.11. It was asked by Members that the applicant confirm that in changes to outdoor areas would not result in a reduction in space that is freely accessible to public, to which the applicant confirm that the space would still be freely accessible. It was also asked why there were no revised proposals put forward regarding how the architectural character was going to be preserved. The applicant responded that cases outline in the report are to be retained, but slightly reconfigured to make space for wheelchair users. The few that are not able to be retained will be donated to other galleries. The proposal to remove the balustrade cases is because they are inaccessible in size and are not original to the gallery.
- 3.12. It was asked if the applicant was confident that all construction traffic can be managed. The applicant responded that they would want to discuss that as part of the conditions. There is a safety concern about traffic turning into Horniman Drive off from the South Circular.
- 3.13. The objector was invited to speak. They stated that they are a resident from Horniman Drive just outside the park gates. Their main concern was the serious impact caused by traffic turning into Horniman Drive. There are traffic problems during the working week and during events which cause problems with turning movements and access. They stated that they believe construction traffic should come off A205 through the main gate which can be managed by banksmen. There is also significant air pollution from heavy vehicles as well as dust and smell, which is an issue for nearby residents. He stated that the main objection was about vehicle access.
- 3.14. It was the Officer perspective that they had reviewed the anticipated movements of vehicles on and around the site and that the most obvious entry point was from the south circular. He stated that the condition is worded that the Applicant must submit details about how the development was constructed post approval, should Members approve the application. The Applicant would have to explain how the development would be constructed which would be reviewed by officers. The applicant may choose to consult residents before submission. An Informative could be included to discuss with residents before submitting final details.
- 3.15. The wording in Condition 3 subsection H outlined the roads around the site which should be used. The wording does not require size of construction vehicles, as well as times of use. It was agreed that subsection C.2 would include the size of construction vehicles. It was also agreed that an informative would be included if application approved, to discuss the plan with residents.

It was MOVED, SECONDED and RESOLVED to approve the application, subject to amended conditions and added informative.

4. Nicholas Court DC/22/129343

- 4.1. The application was for Prior Approval under Schedule 2, Part 20, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) for the construction of an additional storey to provide 5 self-contained flats at Nicholas Court, 166 Burnt Ash Hill, SE12. It was the officer recommendation to approve the application.
- 4.2. The prior approval conditions were as follows: Transport and highways impact; Air traffic and defence asset impact; Contamination risks; Flooding risks; External appearance of the building; Provision of internal natural light to habitable rooms; Impact on neighbouring amenity; Impact on protected views; Fire safety where the building is over 18m in height. It was considered that all the conditions were considered acceptable and that there was no considerable impact on them.
- 4.3. It was asked what the waste management plan would be. The Officer responded that the residents would be using 1100l capacity bins- the refuse storage would be enlarged to what it currently is. The waste management plan condition was outlined in the report.
- 4.4. It was also asked if the building would be any higher than surrounding flats. The officer responded that it would be of lesser height than blocks to the north.
- 4.5. There was no applicant present at the meeting. The objector was invited to speak. Their main objections were as follows:
- They stated that the applicant had not engaged with residents enough. They contested the view that the loss of space is minimal and that the refuse space takes up 4% of the rear garden area whereas the proposed cycle and refuse space will take up 15% according to their calculations. The block is near 3 schools and potentially 12 or more children might be residents-providing outdoor space for children is a priority for the council. The previously refused application proposal was non-contextual that would cause visible harm to the character of the area, and they felt that the current application was not much different. The proposed cladding does not resemble any existing construction material in the area from which Nicholas Court is visible. It is also less attractive than original proposal. The inset should be deeper or be inclined. They stated the proposal was ugly, with minimum space and was an uninhabitable space.
- In terms of lighting, they stated that some units only have a roof window for natural light and that there was no clothes-drying area. Objectors felt the quality is substandard.
- 4.6. The Officer was asked to respond to the objector's points. He highlighted that the application was for prior approval and not planning permission so the assessment that can be made is minimal. He stated that it meets all accommodation requirements, in terms of space standards and light requirements. The building itself is of its time and lacks architectural merit. It would not be built today, so there is very little scope on the appearance. For roof extensions, officers ask for modern materials so there is distinction between the old and contemporary. The material often asked for is zinc as it is both sustainable and high quality. He stated that it is the officer belief

that it meets the required standards and in regard to loss of garden space, the minimum sufficient amount remains. The bin store could be allocated at the front or rear, the applicant determines this, and their decision meets all policy guidance.

It was MOVED, SECONDED and RESOLVED to approve the application subject to the conditions in report.

5. 3 Mantle Road DC/23/130851

Councillor Muldoon was present for the final item and therefore able to vote.

- 5.1. The proposal was for the construction of a six-storey building at 3 Mantle Road SE4 comprising a ground floor commercial unit and 9 self-contained flats, together with the provision of refuse and cycle storage.
- 5.2. The Planning Officer gave an illustrative presentation, outlining the proposal. The key planning considerations were; Principle of Development; Housing; Urban Design; Impact on Adjoining Properties; Transport; Sustainable Development; and Natural Environment

The Officer commented that the development meets requirements and that the proposed scheme has much cleaner design than the previously submitted application. It was the Officer recommendation to approve the application.
- 5.3. It was asked by Members if a waste management scheme condition could be added. The officer responded that a condition similar to that of the previous scheme could be included. He added that it was the view of officers that there was street level access to storage which was in an unsuitable area due to the proximity of the school.
- 5.4. The officer confirmed that impact on school with regards to light is minimal. He stated that in terms of privacy, there were minimal windows to south elevation, which would otherwise overlook into the school, which are obscure glazed. The balcony also has opaque screens.
- 5.5. The applicant summarised their argument as follows:

The development would transform a poor quality, unattractive employment site. The building currently only supports 2 jobs, but the development would create about 11 jobs. This revised application addresses issues of quality. The final design respects the local context while adding interest and raising design standards. The sites potential is raised through job creation in the borough and the delivery of high-quality homes. It exceeds minimum internal space standards and generous private amenity spaces. As well as a communal courtyard.

There were no further questions from Members. There was no objector present.

It was MOVED, SECONDED and RESOLVED to approve the application, subject to the additional condition discussed.