

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE A

Tuesday, 11 June 2024 at 7.30 pm

PRESENT: Councillors Peter Bernards (Chair), John Paschoud (Vice-Chair), Liam Curran, Liz Johnston-Franklin, Hilary Moore and Luke Warner

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Andre Bourne

1. Minutes

The Minutes of the last meeting and the Council AGM were agreed as an accurate meeting.

2. Declarations of Interest

No interests were declared.

3. 68 RAVENSBOURNE PARK CRESCENT SE6 4YP

3.1. The presenting Planning Officer gave an illustrative presentation of the application for the Construction of 5 two-storey dwellinghouses, together with cycle parking, refuse storage and associated landscaping on Land to the East of 68 Ravensbourne Park Crescent SE6. The application received a total of 14 objections.

3.2. The key considerations of the application were: Principle of Development; Housing; Urban Development; impact on Adjoining Properties; transport; sustainability; natural environment; public health. The planning officer concluded that these considerations of the application were acceptable.

3.3. It was the officer recommendation to approve the application.

3.4. Members asked which is the Grade II listed building that is near the site and why consultation is not required for the site. The officer responded that it is 60 and 62 Ravensbourne Park Crescent and as they are not doing works to the listed building, it does not require consultation on it.

3.5. Members also asked who is responsible for the maintenance of the lockable gate at number 68. The officer responded that the owner of the land would be responsible. As it is a private matter it does not need to be conditioned to the application.

3.6. Members asked if they could impose a condition that gate is of high quality. The officer responded that they could expand the landscaping condition 7 to be explicit about the gate.

3.7. Members asked officers to detail the arrangement the future residents will not be able to obtain car permits on the car-free development. The officer responded that future occupiers will be unable to legally obtain permits

3.8. The applicant gave their presentation. Her key points were:

3.9. The applicant had a full consultation with residents and spoke with the owners of 68. She stated that she would be happy to condition gating security as mentioned by Members. A unit was removed, and the height of the massing was reduced which resulted in a contemporary design scheme. Any loss of amenity will be compensated for by enhancing appearance. The amenity land is not often used and officers concluded that the amenity land is abundant.

3.10. The development is car free, and any buyer would not be able to apply for a permit. Any existing resident spaces will not be used by occupiers of the new development. Quality landscaping materials are being used to build the development. Each house exceeded the minimum space standards. Units are family homes and fitted with obscure windows to prevent overlooking. The impact on existing neighbours is minimal. To mitigate low ecological value, extensive green landscaping is proposed. The gate is fob operated which the Metropolitan Police fully endorse. If successful, the development will be implemented later this year. Lastly, the development would add housing to Lewisham.

3.11. Members had no questions for the applicant.

3.12. Objectors gave their presentation. Their key points were:

3.13. The small parcels of land make the area what it is, which the proposed development will take away. The amenity spaces do have real value and are not being used because they are not being maintained at the moment. The heritage site is not 30m away in distance. The gate is also not secure at the back. There is concern of a security hazard and the southern end of the development. The flank walls at the end of the house will adjoin the main pedestrian route and will create a long closed narrow alley between them, which may attract crime.

3.14. In response, the Officer stated that a lighting condition could be added for the alley, but the concern would be that lighting on the southernmost flank of the building would shine directly into number 9 windows. The buildings proposed to the south only further enclose the pathway by approximately 2.5m.

3.15. The Officer also said that a sensitive lighting strategy could be created by the applicant, investigated and approved by officers and then implemented, if Members wished to endorse.

3.16. It was MOVED, SECONDED and RESOLVED to agree the application, subject to the two conditions discussed, wording to be amended by officers.

4. 1A MARLER ROAD, LONDON, SE23 2AE

4.1. The presenting Planning Officer gave an illustrative presentation for the approval for this application for Full Planning Permission. The case was brought before members for a decision as the application was called in by Cllr John Paschoud.

4.2. The key considerations of the application were: Urban design; and Impact on neighbouring amenity.

4.3. Councillor John Paschoud had called in the application due to complex history of the site. He stated that he was satisfied with the officers recommendation and the conditions would remove the potential for overlooking.

4.4. The applicant spoke briefly, stating that they would like the extra space for their children. He purchased the home in 2022. The seller had concealed that they had not received full planning permission on the extension. The applicant had first tried to save the extension. He said he was still in the legal process with the seller.

4.5. there were no questions for the applicant. There was no objector to the application.

4.5. it was MOVED, SECONDED and RESOLVED to approve the application.