

**LEWISHAM COUNCIL
PLANNING COMMITTEE A
WEDNESDAY, 8 JUNE 2022 AT 7.35 PM
MINUTES**

IN ATTENDANCE: Councillor Peter Bernards (Chair), Councillors: Oana Olaru (Vice-Chair), Natasha Burgess, Liam Curran, Ayesha Lahai-Taylor Hilary Moore, John Muldoon, John Paschoud, James Rathbone Rudi Schmidt

MEMBER(S) UNDER STANDING ORDERS ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: N/A

MEMBER(S) OF THE COMMITTEE ALSO JOINING THE MEETING VIRTUALLY: N/A

MEMBER(S) UNDER STANDING ORDERS ALSO JOINING THE MEETING VIRTUALLY: N/A

NB: Those Councillors listed as joining virtually were not in attendance for the purposes of the meeting being quorate, any decisions taken, or to satisfy the requirements of s85 Local Government Act 1972.

OFFICER(S) IN ATTENDANCE: Team Leader (TL)

OFFICER(S) ALSO JOINING THE MEETING VIRTUALLY: Planning Officers and Paula Young, Senior Planning Lawyer

Clerk: Committee Officer

Apologies were received on behalf of Councillors: N/A

**Item
No.**

1 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Paschoud advised the Committee that his spouse was a director of Phoenix and on this basis, he would recuse himself from the consideration of Item 3 on the meeting's Agenda.

2 Minutes

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning Committee A meeting held on the 17 March 2022 be agreed.

3 56-60 Farmstead Road, SE6 3ED

The Planning Officer gave an illustrative presentation, recommending the grant of planning permission for the proposal, as outlined in the Officer's report.

The Committee noted the report and that the main issues were: Principle of Development • Housing • Urban Design • Impact on Adjoining Properties • Transport • Sustainable Development • Natural Environment • Planning Obligations

Following the Officers presentation, questions put to the Officer, by Members related to: cycle storage, accessibility, judgement and pre-application process.

The Officer advised Members that cycle storage space beside the proposed play space was not considered by officer to be appropriate. The location proposed would be appropriate to serve both blocks on the scheme.

The Committee were advised by the Officer that housing providers allocated accessible units based on tenant requirements. The TL advised Members that the 10% accessibility policy was a London Plan guideline, not a set standard.

Members were advised by the TL that in making recommendations, officers considered benefits against trade-offs to make a proposal acceptable.

The TL confirmed that the pre-application process was conducted between the local authority and applicants.

The agent and architect addressed the Committee.

The agent described the application and discussed: consultation, height, design, ecological issues and parking.

The architect discussed the design, character, ecological issues and scale.

Questions put to the agent and architect by the Committee related to: accessibility.

The architect advised the Committee the desire to maintain symmetry of the proposal, therefore 2 separate buildings on either side of the entrance. The design meant the proposal was too small to include lifts.

The Members were also advised that viability was a critical consideration.

The TL advised the Committee that the application site was in a very densely built suburban area and the applicant had found a balance to maximise the application site.

A resident addressed the Committee with objections.

The resident discussed: decision-making, parking, privacy, and ecological concerns.

Before Members' questions, the Chair assured the resident that the officers made recommendations to Committee that were considered and then voted upon.

Questions then put to the resident by the Committee related to: parking, privacy, and ecological concerns.

The Officer advised Members that a parking survey had been conducted, which concluded there was sufficient vehicle space.

The TL advised the Committee that the London Plan objective was to move away from schemes with parking. The TL detailed the parking survey process and reiterated the Officers advice that the report conclusion conveyed sufficient space for vehicles on the neighbouring road. The TL noted the report was reviewed by the local authority highways officer and deemed satisfactory.

Members were advised by the Officer that an assessment of privacy, found that in some cases privacy was adequate. In other instances screening would be required, secured by condition.

The TL confirmed that a condition could be put to the applicant to prevent development at ecologically sensitive times.

During the applications consideration, Members raised concerns with regard to accessibility. A Member felt the proposal was a trade-off of accessibility rights, which set a precedent for future developers, that was not acceptable. Another Member stated their dissatisfaction with the proposals tenure mix, which conveyed a lack of family sized wheelchair accessible units.

Members considered the submissions made and

RESOLVED - unanimously

That it be noted that the Committee agreed to:

GRANT planning permission for the demolition of all existing buildings and comprehensive redevelopment to provide residential units (Use

Class C3), with associated access works, landscaping, refuse storage, cycle parking and the installation of a sub-station at 56-60 Farmstead Road, SE6.

Subject to conditions and informatives outlined in the report and,

- A planning condition precluding development at ecologically sensitive times, with the final wording to be agreed with the Ecological Regeneration Manager and the Chair
- An informative expressing the committee's disappointment with the unit mix and lack of family sized wheelchair units.

4 Land To The Rear Of 105a & 107, Honor Oak Park, SE23

The Planning Officer gave an illustrative presentation, recommending the grant of planning permission for the proposal, as outlined in the Officer's report.

The Committee noted the report and that the main issues were: Principle of Development • Housing • Urban Design • Impact on Adjoining Properties • Transport • Natural Environment

Following the Officers presentation, questions put to the Officer, by Members related to: ecological concerns, conditions, parking, traffic and gardens.

The Officer provided reassurances and clarification to the ecological concerns and noted the mitigation measures that would be taken, as set out in the Officers' report.

The TL advised the Committee that maintenance of the landscaping scheme and boundary walls would be secured by condition to ensure a high-quality landscape.

Members were assured that with regard to soft landscaping, a plan for management and maintenance of the landscaping, covering a five year period, would be submitted by the applicant to the local authority for approval.

Members were assured by the TL that conditions imposed by officers onto the applicant, would be enforceable by the local authority, if the applicant failed to comply with them.

The Officer acknowledged that applications submitted by the applicant prior to the current under consideration, had been refused due to parking concerns raised. However, it was noted that the current application proposed a car free scheme.

The agent addressed the Committee. The agent described the applications' history and then discussed: architecture design inspiration, rear gardens, ecology, housing, consultation, amenities and benefits to the local community.

Questions put to the agent by the Committee related to: design, the Construction Management Plan (CMP), parking and back gardens. The agent described the design of the proposal and made comparisons to another similar scheme.

Members were assured by the agent that a CMP had been submitted to the local authority for approval.

The agent also assured Members that vehicles would not enter the scheme after completion, a loading bay would be provided for servicing purposes.

The TL advised the Committee that the space to the rear of the scheme, was unused as garden space since the 1980's and in the local authorities view, almost fit the Small Sites SPD criteria as a 'small site', as discussed and accepted in principle, in the Officer's report.

No individuals with objections attended the meeting.

During the consideration of the application, the Members discussion raised concerns regarding traffic risk due to vehicles entering and exiting the application site. Members were assured a CMP would be submitted to the local authority before work on the development began. A fellow Member commended the proposals design and noted the traffic risk mitigation measures, as outlined in the Officer's report.

Members considered the submissions made and

RESOLVED - unanimously

That it be noted that the Committee agreed to:

GRANT planning permission for the construction of 6 two storey, three bedroom houses on the land to the rear of 105A and 107 Honor Oak Park SE23, together with the provision of cycle and refuse stores and associated landscaping. (Please note amended description 6 proposed dwellings, not 7)

Subject to conditions and informatives outlined in the report.

5 272 Brockley Road, London, SE4 2SF

The Planning Officer gave an illustrative presentation, recommending the grant of planning permission for the proposal, as outlined in the Officer's report.

The Committee noted the report and that the main issues were:
Principle of Development • Residential Quality • Urban Design •
Transport • Impact on Adjoining Properties • Sustainable Development
• Natural Environment

Following the Officers presentation, questions put to the Officer, by Members related to: back gardens.

The Officer advised Members the paving of the garden space by the applicant is a permitted development. It was advised that consideration should be applied to the change of usage of the garden space.

The agent addressed the Committee. The agent/applicant described the application site and discussed: the pre-application advice, design, cycle storage, parking, overlooking, daylight and sunlight report, materials and enforcement action regarding a nearby property.

Questions put to the agent by the Committee related to: screening. The agent advised Members that the proposal originally included screening, but the additional bulk that resulted was viewed as unacceptable. In addition the screening created confusion with regard to the location of the front and rear of the scheme. Members were assured soft screening would be implemented, which would be preferable to complete screening.

A resident addressed the Committee with objections. The resident discussed: positive increase in housing stock, proposals garden shape, loss of natural light to various parts of their property, pollution, biodiversity, traffic and validity of presentation and report images used by Officers.

Questions put to the by the Committee to the resident related to: light impact and validity of presentation images.

The resident described the impact of the loss of natural light to their own property noting their kitchen and living room. The resident also described the loss of natural light due to the proposals position in relation to their property.

The Officer advised the Committee that the Daylight and Sunlight Assessment (Daylight/Sunlight report) submitted with the application,

was fully compliant with the relevant BRE guidance and conducted by a professional assessor.

The Officer advised Members that in the CGI images used by officers only the proposal was accurately represented. It was acknowledged that the property of the resident present at the Committee meeting with objections, was not accurately represented in the CGI presentation images provided. However, the Committee were assured the plans for the proposal were accurate.

During consideration of the application, the Members raised concerns that the Daylight/Sunlight report submitted, did not include an assessment of the amenity space for one of the flats near to the proposal.

The Officer advised that although the Daylight/Sunlight report submitted had not included that information for the property, the omission would not be reasonable grounds for refusal of the application.

The TL supported the Officers advice that the Daylight/Sunlight report had been conducted professionally. Members were also directed by the TL to view planning documents that were available for the application under consideration.

The agent also confirmed the Daylight/Sunlight report submitted had been conducted by a professional assessor.

Members reiterated their views and advised that due to the lack of information for their decision-making on the matter, it was felt the application should be deferred with a Daylight/Sunlight report to be submitted for the omitted property in question.

Standing Orders were suspended at 9.50 pm.

Legal advice provided confirmed the Members were within their rights to request a deferral and to request a Daylight/Sunlight report be submitted for the property missed from the original Daylight/Sunlight report assessment.

Members considered the submissions made and

RESOLVED

That it be noted that the Committee agreed:

Application would be **DEFERRED** to allow an update to Daylight/Sunlight reporting addressing impacts to an adjoining amenity space at 274 Brockley Road.

The Chair called for an adjournment of the meeting at 9.58pm.

A Member of the Committee left the meeting at 9.59pm.

The Committee meeting was reconvened by the Chair at 10.07pm

6 324 Brockley Road, London, SE4 2BT

The Planning Officer gave an illustrative presentation, recommending the grant of planning permission for the proposal, as outlined in the Officer's report.

The Committee noted the report and that the main issues were:
Urban Design • Impact on Adjoining Properties

Following the Officers presentation, questions put to the Officer, by Members related to: changes proposed.

The Officer used their slide presentation to provide further clarification of the proposed changes as outlined in the Officers' report.

The agent addressed the Committee. The agent described the application site and discussed: design and the proposals impact on adjoining properties.

No questions were put to the agent by the Committee.

A resident addressed the Committee with objections. The resident discussed: applicant's decision to paint the flue installation black, misleading pictures provided at the Committee meeting, internal and external space issues for flue installation, impact of flue installation on neighbouring properties, fire safety issues across 2 building levels and emergency exit issues with flue installation in place.

Questions put to the by the Committee related to: plans, fire safety and change of property use.

The Officer advised Members concerns had been expressed in prior meetings with the applicant and the plans conveyed new revisions in place to change the current situation. Conditions were put in place that

required works to be put in place within 3 months of the application being granted, if approved.

The Officer stated that fire safety was not a material consideration. This would be the responsibility for building control regulations, which would be addressed by the local authority.

The Committee were advised by the Officer that the property was previously in use as a bar. It would be required to make a separate application to the local authority regarding the change of use of the property.

During the Members discussion, concerns were raised regarding the unauthorised change of use of the property by the applicant. The TL appreciated that the Committee did not approve of the unauthorised change of use by the applicant. The TL advised Members the issue of change of use was however, a separate matter from the current application under consideration. It was agreed that an informative would be included in the approval notice on the matter.

Members considered the submissions made and

RESOLVED

That it be noted that the Committee agreed to:

GRANT planning permission for the part retrospective planning permission for the installation of an external ventilation flue to the rear of 324 Brockley Road SE4

Subject to conditions and informatives outlined in the report

AND two additional informatives:

- The applicant is advised to contact the Council's building control department in order to certify that the extraction equipment is installed in compliance with building and fire safety regulations.
- The applicant is advised that an application for planning permission is required for the change of use of the premises to a restaurant.

The meeting closed at 10.28 pm.

Chair
