

## **Appendix 2 – Local Meeting Summary**

### Virtual Local Meeting

Proposal: Demolition of the existing garage and construction of a two storey, two-bedroom dwellinghouse in the rear garden of 1 Liphook Crescent, SE23, together with the provision of 1 cycle space and refuse storage.

### Panel

Chair: Cllr Davies

Agent/Applicant: RDA Architects

LB Planning: Georgia McBirney (GM)

Cllr Davies opened the meeting at 7:30pm and introduced the panel and explained the reason for the meeting.

The planning agent gave a presentation in respect of the proposed development.

Pre-submitted questions were discussed first.

A question was raised in respect of whether Planning Officers consider that the proposal overcomes the identified in the appeal decision in respect of overlooking and loss of privacy. GM set out that the application is still under consideration and that the assessment in respect of overlooking and loss of privacy would be set out in the officer report for the application.

Concerns were raised that the plans do not show all the street trees and clarification was sought as to whether this was an oversight or whether the trees were proposed to be removed. RDA Architects confirmed that this was an error on the plans and that the trees would be remaining; it was also stated that the trees would not be impacted by the proposal. GM highlighted that a Tree Protection Plan could be secured by condition if required.

Confirmation was sought in respect of the material of the roof and the concern was raised in respect of quality of the proposed materials. RDA Architects confirmed the proposed materials and set out why they consider the materials to be high quality. GM stated that materials can be secured by condition and that if the details submitted at condition stage are not considered to be high quality, the condition application would be refused.

Concerns was raised in respect of the building line and how this was not in keeping with the policy for the Tewkesbury Lodge Estate. RDA Architects explained why the building line is designed the way it is. GM set out that the Planning Inspector raised no objection to the building line in the appeal decision and significant weight has to be given to this in the assessment of the current application.

Cllr Davies set out that all the pre-submitted questions had been discussed and that the meeting would move comments and questions from the meeting.

A local resident outlined that the objection from the Tewkesbury Lodge Residents Association is not representative of all local residents and that residents who live closer to the site should be the only ones who asked their views on the proposal. GM set out that all

comments received have to be taken into consideration in the assessment of the planning application.

A local resident asked why the application has not been refused to date as the building on back garden land is contrary to the adopted policy. GM set out that the previous application was refused and that the applicants submitted an appeal with the Planning Inspector. GM went on to outline that the Planning Inspector found the principle of development to be acceptable and that Planning Officers are bound by this.

A local resident raised concern in respect of overlooking and loss of privacy. GM set out that the application is still under consideration and that the assessment in respect of overlooking and loss of privacy would be set out in the officer report for the application.

Local residents and the representative from the Tewkesbury Lodge Residents Association raised concern in respect of a dwellinghouse being built on garden land and the design of the dwellinghouse. Concern was also raised that approving this application could set a precedent. GM set out that the Planning Inspector did not raise an objection to the principle of development and the design of the dwellinghouse and that Officers have to take this into account in the assessment of the current application. GM set out that any future application on another site would be assessed based on the merits and constraints of each site.

Cllr Davies set out that due to the number of objections that have been received that the application would be determined by a Planning Committee and that those in objection to the application are able to speak at planning committee and that residents in objection would have a shared 5 minutes to speak. Cllr Davies asked GM to outline what can happen if a decision is made contrary to an appeal decision on the site. GM outlined that if officers make a decision contrary to the conclusions of the appeal decision in matters that the Planning Inspector has deemed to be acceptable, the applicant can appeal the decision and it is highly likely that costs would be awarded against the Council.

Cllr Harding asked the Planning Officer to confirm that in the appeal decision that the Inspector considered the proposal to be infill development rather than a back garden development. GM confirmed that this is correct and that this set out in paragraph 12 of the appeal decision.

A local resident asked if the impact on the natural environment and wildlife would be considered. GM set out that an assessment would be made in line with policy.

Cllr Davies closed the meeting at 8:30pm.