

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE A MEETING

24 August 2022 at 7.30pm

IN ATTENDANCE: Councillor Bernards, Councillor Curran, Councillor Rathbone, Councillor Muldoon, Councillor Malik-Smith and Councillor Burgess

ALSO JOINING THE MEETING VIRTUALLY: none

APOLOGIES: Councillor Olaru, Councillor Paschoud, Councillor Moore and Councillor Schmidt

ALSO PRESENT: Angus Saunders, Samuel James, Alfie Williams, Georgia McBirney, Max Curson (Planning Officers) and Joy Udiake (Legal Representative)

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

1. Minutes

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

2. Declarations of Interest

Councillor John Muldoon stated that he had been lobbied in regards to item 5, and approaches the decision with an open mind.

No other interests were declared.

3. 272 Brockley Road, London, SE4 2SF

The presenting Planning Officer gave an illustrative presentation of the proposed application. The proposal was for alterations and conversion of the existing dwelling and construction of a lower ground floor rear extension with a roof balcony at 272 Brockley Road SE4 to create two self-contained flats, with alterations to front boundary and front garden area, refuse and cycle storage, together with the demolition of outbuildings and structures in the rear garden and redevelopment to provide a partially sunken two storey dwelling with refuse and cycle storage.

It was the officer recommendation to approve this application. The key considerations were: Principle of Development; Residential Quality; Urban Design; Transport Impact; Living Conditions of Neighbouring Properties; Sustainable Development; and Natural Environment. The main consideration discussed was the Living Conditions of Neighbours- it was concluded by officers that a 'high standard' of amenity for existing and future users according to the NPPF and that a 'satisfactory level' of sunlight and daylight for its neighbours were both met.

It was also discussed that at the previous committee meeting members identified that they did not have sufficient information to assess the impact of the proposed garden house to light levels at the upper ground floor terrace at No.274 Brockley Road. The new street elevation drawing confirmed that the first floor of the garden house would be located approximately 6m from the rear elevation of No.274 as stated in the previous Committee Report. The drawing also shows that the roof of the garden house would sit just above the top of the terrace door.

The objector was invited to present. He welcomed the revised drawings. He stated that he sought clarifications on the metrics in terms of the size of the buildings and the distances between any proposed works. He asked that the architect first confirmed that the latest technical drawing is final and accurate and then provide a version containing final specifications and measurements before anything is formally signed off. He also stated that in the report, Area G3 on the aerial shot included his balcony and the balcony above, so he asked for assurance that the sunlight assessment was taken from the correct apartment.

The officer responded to the objectors points. He stated that planning officers were satisfied that the plans were accurate representation and that the amendments and revisions have been uploaded and made publicly available to view. The lighting consultant was also present and clarified that in terms of the impact on the sunlight, the different reports show the different assessments- one showing the hours within a year of sunlight and the other assessing the hours of sunlight for the day that the supply is assessed for amenity spaces.

The applicant was invited to present. The main points made were as follows. The plans submitted were all to scale, however on the CGI images, a scale cannot be applied to such images, but they are generated according to the scaled plans and elevations. The light consultant added that he initially did not assess the upper ground floor amenity space because from experience, the orientation of it compared to their site, he did not think there would be any effect. The assessment now shows in his most recent report that 61.05% of the space will receive two hours of sunlight on March 21st and will still retain 100% throughout the summer months as well.

It was MOVED, SECONDED and RESOLVED that the application was approved, with all conditions outlined in the report.

4. Hesper House, Wells Park Road, SE26 6RQ

The presenting Planning Officer gave an illustrative presentation of the proposed application for the demolition of existing buildings on site and the construction of a 5-storey residential building (plus lower ground) (Use Class C3) at the site known as Hesper House, Wells Park Road, SE26, incorporating off-street parking spaces, together with associated landscaping and refuse and cycle parking facilities.

It was the officer recommendation to approve the application. The scale of the proposal was very similar to that of an approved application from January 2021. The height was the same of the approved building, as was the depth. The key difference was that this proposal was for 15 dwellings compared to 10 of the previous approved proposal. The 6 car spaces proposed to be provided were slightly less than

the maximum provision set out in the London plan and was considered to meet the needs of the development. The key considerations were: Principle of Development; Housing Provision; Standard of Residential Accommodation; Design and impact to appearance of surrounding area; Impact on Living Conditions of Neighbours; Impact on Highways; Natural Environment.

Members asked why affordably housing could not be provided for this development. The officer responded that the affordable housing requirement is assessed through a viability tested route that requires the applicant to submit an economic viability report to the Council- it set out that no affordable housing can be provided. The Council send these reports to an independent consultant to assess them as well who found that the scheme would only produce a surplus of £12,000.

The applicant was invited to present. They were the architects for the application. Their main points were that the proposed development consisted of spacious designs and high quality materials. Increasing the number of dwellings to 15 increased the viability position and optimised housing availability on the site and helped the Council meet its targets by providing more varied dwellings so high provision of family homes. The development would be sustainable and good for the amenity with 66 solar panels on the roof and large balcony spaces. There are also no additional trees to be moved and all high value trees will be retained.

The objector was invited to present. He raised concerns about the parking being narrow and there is a risk of speeding on the road which can cause collision. He also raised concerns about groundwater and flooding given rising concerns about climate emergency. He asked for detail on how these risks would be managed by the developers.

A construction phase engagement with the local community was suggested by Members. There were also concern about the disruption the construction will case to the nearby local roads. The planning officer asked that Members bear in mind the extent to which planning officers can get involved in the construction of such development as all of these things are ancillary aspects of construction works.

It was MOVED, SECONDED and RESOLVED that the application was approved, subject to the conditions outlined in the report.

5. 1 Liphook Crescent, SE23 2BN

The presenting Planning Officer gave an illustrative presentation of the proposed application of the demolition of the existing garage and the construction of a two storey, two-bedroom dwelling house in the rear garden of 1 Liphook Crescent, SE23, together with the provision of 1 cycle space and refuse storage.

It was the officer recommendation to approve the application. A revised site plan was submitted before the meeting to confirm the location species of street trees but no changes were made to the proposed development. The key considerations were: Principle of Development; Housing; Urban Design; Impact on Neighbouring Amenity; Transport and Highways; Sustainable Development; Natural Environment.

Members asked for clarification on the changes to the rear elevation from the previous application. The officer responded that the matter for consideration here,

was whether the overlooking from the rear elevation was still going to meet the threshold and if it didn't, then there are no legal grounds for refusal

The applicant was invited to speak. The main points raised from their presentation were as follows. The design of the proposed development is for an ecologically sound home and ensure the best possible use for the site in terms of impact and appearance whilst having minimal impact on the neighbouring amenity. The project is to facilitate intergenerational living and maximise the use of the existing development land and ownership in order to produce and reinforce sustainable small scale developments. The height and scale is appropriate to its setting with a considered elevation treatment and compositions, specifically designed for this infill site.

The objector was invited to speak. They stated that they do not believe this is a small scale development and the construction would be an invasion of their privacy and there will be considerable loss of amenity. He stated that the back entrance, balcony and staircase all overlook the majority of the garden and that the patio area is very close to the boundary. The necessity of the staircase was also questioned as it only provided access to the rear garden.

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

6. 156 Erlanger Road, London, SE14 5TJ

The presenting Planning Officer gave an illustrative presentation of the proposed application of the construction of a rear dormer roof extension together with the insertion of one roof light to the rear roof slope, two roof lights to the outrigger roof slope and two roof lights to the front roof slope and replacement of the existing roof tiles at 156 Erlanger Road, SE14.

It was the officer recommendation to approve the application. The key considerations were: Principle of Development; Urban Design and Heritage Impact; and Impact on living conditions of neighbours, all considered to be acceptable.

The applicant was invited to speak. Her main points were that the roof lights are low profile and would not harm the original form of the building. There are also roof lights on several of the neighbouring properties. The roof lights are appropriate to the size of their position. The clients want to change the existing tiles on the front bay roof to restore the missing period features back to the fish scale tiles.

The objector was invited to speak. Their objection consisted of the points that the front roof lights should be in the middle third according to SPD guidance. He also stated that the extension at the back of the property and large roof extension are contributing to the destruction of the conservation area. He stated that he does not believe that just because it is hidden it is not important. They are visible from properties and reduce the attractiveness of properties. Members asked if similar objections were made to previous similar applications to which the objector stated he did not know, but believes all applications should be considered separately and precedent should not be used. The officer agreed that while precedent is not a

consideration, the dormers and extensions of neighbouring properties is a material consideration because it speaks to the character of the conservation area.

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

The meeting finished at 9.15pm