

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE A MEETING

Thursday 20 October 2022 at 7.30pm

IN ATTENDANCE: Councillor Bernards, Councillor Olaru, Councillor Paschoud, Councillor Lahai-Taylor, Councillor Muldoon, Councillor Burgess, Councillor Schmidt, Angus Saunders (Presiding Officer), Paula Young (Senior Lawyer) and Sarah Assibey (Clerk)

In attendance VIRTUALLY: Thomas Sinnett, Zahra Rad and Alfie Williams (Planning Officers)

Apologies: Councillor Curran, Councillor Rathbone and Councillor Moore

1. Minutes

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

Doi- councillor burgess also declared an interest as being lobbied as part of the same item.

2. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Muldoon- lobbied in respect of item 4- will approach with open mind.

3. JUNCTION OF SHOOTERS HILL ROAD, GOFFERS ROAD, LONDON, SE3 0UA (DC/20/119712)

3.1. The officer gave an illustrative presentation on the proposed application of the construction of a replacement single storey cafe building (Tea Hut) and associated works at the junction of Shooters Hill Road and Goffers Road (Blackheath Tea Hut Site), SE3.

3.2. The previous site was destroyed in a traffic incident and has been operating in a temporary construction.

3.3. The key considerations were Principle of Development; Urban Design and Heritage Impact; Transport Impact; and Living Conditions of Neighbouring Properties.

3.4. It was the officer recommendation to approve the application, subject to the conditions set out in the officer report.

The applicant was not present at the meeting.

3.5. The objector gave their presentation. Their main points were that the space is sensitive in which the Tea Hut is proposed to be is sensitive. The Telegraph Society is not against the existence of the tea hut at the site, but planning is

not suitable for the development at this location. If granted, highest of standards must be maintained and achieved through conditions. The objector went on to say that the officers report justifies the development as the existing construction was to be replaced by it, however, they said, there is no existing right for the current development to be there. They also disagreed that the form and materiality of the hut would cause no harm to the conservation area and stated that the building was out of character. They also said that if there were no history of tea hut, this proposal would be rejected.

- 3.6. He also stated that the report suggests it is similar to the old construction but it is significantly bigger. He criticised that the officer has not proposed any condition around landscaping and said that the area is eroded due to vehicle use- a condition attached should prevent such things from happening. They proposed that fixed posts are added around the hut, if agreed.
- 3.7. It was asked what was meant in the Society's objection that planning permission not being the right solution and what he would suggest. He responded that the hut has no real status- there should be no permanent presence there. Councillor Paschoud responded that the Tea Hut had been around for decades so it was a prominent development in the area.
- 3.8. It was asked if mitigations can be made to prevent further erosion- the presenting officer responded that it was negotiated that it is placed on the existing eroding land as opposed to the grass area which was initially proposed, to prevent further erosion. He stated that they can be confident then that there will be no further erosion caused by this construction. The Presiding Officer stated that there are 6 tests around imposing conditions provided by the MPPF, which include necessity, and asked the Committee to consider the necessity in imposing certain conditions.
- 3.9. It was also asked of the Principal lawyer, if planning permission was necessary in this instance of an existing hut. She stated that MPPF guidance established the construction and replacement of a building. This is a replacement of a building according to MPPF guidance and not materially larger or can cause further impact than what was already there. She concluded that the recommendation was valid.

It was MOVED, SECONDED and RESOLVED to approve the application.

4. 46 JERNINGHAM ROAD, LONDON, SE14 5NW (DC/22/125363)

- 4.1. The officer gave an illustrative presentation on the proposed application of the construction of two storey plus basement side extension at 46 Jerningham Road SE14, together with associated alterations to side boundary wall.
- 4.2. The key considerations were Principle of Development; Urban Design and Impact on Heritage Assets; and Impact on Neighbouring Amenity. It was the officer recommendation to approve the application.
- 4.3. It was asked why the windows do not match style of adjoining building. It was responded that because of the contemporary design of the proposed

construction, they have taken the same approach to windows. There were some revisions to windows on ground floor- they were reduced in size and they better reflect the bay window in terms of proportions.

4.4. The agent for the application was invited to speak. Their main points were: the additional space is for a growing family and the objective is to make sufficient use of the land; combined with the context of bond damage, resulting in poor quality architecture within the location, this would be an opportunity for enhancement to conservation area; the proposal is a contemporary addition to the unique features of Telegraph Hill; they have substantially reduced scale of proposals, responding positively to the advice; it is a high quality design; the main view along Jerningham Road would be maintained; there are significant greening and biodiversity enhancements, with 4 new trees that will eventually mature and replace the one tree lost during a storm some years ago; and the additional floor space will allow family to live in property for a long time.

4.5. They added that it was not possible to replicate the Victorian design. An attempt at this would result in a contrived design which would dilute the special interest in the host dwelling and its contribution to the conservation area. The applicant is willing to construct the building in a Flemish bond as proposed by the Telegraph Hill Society.

4.6. The objector gave their presentation. Their main points were:

The frontage loses garden space; the replanting does not compensate for what is being lost on the corner; and the bay window will be visible. They stated that it was a wholly unnecessary destruction of the heritage of the area and emphasised that it is possible to keep Victorian design as opposed to the contemporary design proposed.

4.7. Members wanted clarity on whether the contemporary design was necessary. The presenting officer stated that the contemporary design was allowed in conservation areas and as an extension to the existing building, it can connect the contrast between the new and old aspects and further strengthen the design of the older building. The original construction with its materials could not be replicated.

The Presiding Officer added that officers are not recommending that Members approve the application because of the contemporary scheme. He said that the Telegraph Hill Society's point that you cannot produce something that is traditional in its design is not a reason to bring all contemporary designs is correct. However, it is disagreed that the policies are such that traditional forms of architecture should be sought after – policies and guidance are such that it is possible to achieve high quality contemporary schemes, that do not harm the conservation area.

4.8. It was **MOVED** and **SECONDED** to approve the application subject to all conditions set out in the report. The Member vote was split so the Chair gave the casting vote in favour of the application and the Committee **RESOLVED** to approve the application.

5. 8 BROCKLEY VIEW, LONDON, SE23 1SN (DC/22/126353)

- 5.1. The officer gave an illustrative presentation on the proposed application of the construction of a single storey side and rear extension and a first floor extension to 8 Brockley View, SE23, together with alterations to the existing lower ground floor.
- 5.2. The key considerations were: Principle of Development; Urban Design; Impact on Adjoining Properties; Transport; and Natural Environment. It was the officer recommendation to approve the application.
- 5.3. The applicant was invited to speak. They stated that:

They have a good relationship with neighbours and have been transparent about their plans; Many of their immediate neighbours have loft extensions and 3 storeys- their proposal is for a 1st floor extension, not a second; it will only be a 2 storey building at any one point; the windows will continue to get good daylight and the neighbours at number 10 will not have their views obstructed; lastly, no extra parking is needed for the development- a bike storage and charging point will be included.
- 5.4. The objector gave their presentation. Their main points were that the extension should seem subservient to main building and they do not believe it is; their main concern was about types of windows being used and that the perspective changes from their property.
- 5.5. Condition 6 imposed screening for the sake of privacy of the neighbouring property. The Presiding Officer stated it was appropriate to add or amend the condition to ascertain exactly what that screening would be. Any screening would have to comply with ensuring privacy and no overlooking. Members asked that officers amend the wording of the condition to make it “legally watertight” that a screening approved would be one that give privacy and prevents overlooking. It was agreed.
- 5.6. It was MOVED, SECONDED and RESOLVED to approve the application subject to conditions

The meeting finished at 9.05pm