

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE B MEETING

Thursday 10 November 2022 at 7pm

IN ATTENDANCE: Councillor Lavery (Chair), Councillor Clarke, Councillor Eiles, Councillor Cooper, Councillor Harding, Councillor Onikosi, Councillor Aliya Sheikh, Councillor Sorba and Councillor Johnston-Franklin.

In Attendance VIRTUALLY: no Councillors attended virtually.

Apologies: Councillor Webley-Brown

1. Minutes

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

2. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Lavery declared that he had received some correspondence regarding one of the items as a Member of Sydenham Ward

3. 93 Longton Grove

- 3.1. The officer gave an illustrative presentation of the proposed application for the demolition of the existing garage at 93 Longton Grove SE26 and the construction of a three bedroom semi-detached dwelling house, together with car parking space, cycle storage and private outdoor amenity space.
- 3.2. The key considerations were; Principle of Development; Housing; Urban Design; Impact on Adjoining Properties; Transport; Sustainable Development; and Natural Environment. It was the officer recommendation to approve the application.
- 3.3. It was asked by Members if the view to the main road and junction would be impeded by the development. The officer responded that the development does not have any impact on this view.
- 3.4. It was also stated that daylight and sunlight assessments should always be provided and was asked why it was not. The officer responded that shadow report had been provided by the applicant. The front and rear elevation align with the neighbouring property also so it was not considered that it would have any negative impact on sunlight and daylight. There are also significant separation distances the application site and the neighbouring site. The side elevation would not have any windows so would have no impact on neighbouring amenities in terms of loss of sunlight and daylight. The Presiding Officer added that as the application was not a major development proposal, it was not a requirement for a daylight and sunlight assessment, although this would not prevent the officer from enquiring for further information if there were concerns of its impact.

- 3.5. It was asked if a biodiverse green roof could be submitted via an added condition should the Committee deem it necessary as well as permeable paving, as the details were not submitted in the report. The officer responded that the conditions were included in the report for both.
- 3.6. It was asked if the tree protection plans include a follow up for if trees die, are they replanted. The officer responded that any soft landscaping that fails within 5 years then it is to be replanted, replaced or retained, in accordance with the soft landscaping condition. It was also asked if mature trees were also protected if they were harmed by the proposed development. The officer responded that this would depend on wording of application and that this requirement could be added.
- 3.7. The applicants were invited to give his presentation. Their main points were; this was a positive pre-application process which has refined the proposal; they have provided amended floor plans, access layouts, ceilings and well landscaped garden after consultation which will include new trees and shrub planting; there are dedicated cycle storage and charging points which provide sustainable transport options. The footprint of new house will only be slightly larger and will make for a positive and sensible use of the space. It will be constructed in a “fabric first” approach using materials and construction techniques that are energy efficient; rainwater harvesting, and use of composite building will make for a sustainable construction. Lastly, he said that the applicants had met all officer requirements. He asked the Committee to endorse the report.
- 3.8. The objector was invited to speak. They emphasised that they were speaking as resident not as a Sydenham Society member. They stated that a similar application refused in 2012 by the Lewisham Planning Committee, because “the proposed dwelling house would have a harmful impact on the existing pattern of development resulting in cramped form of development”.
- 3.9. They stated that the officer’s report does not mention that applicants appealed Lewisham’s refusal- and that the grounds that the application was refused was that “sufficient greenery was in evidence to balance the effect of built environment”, and areas of trees and greenery were evident opposite the appeal site. They said the previous proposed development was said to sit unacceptably in area and the pleasantness of the street scene would have been materially and harmfully affected by the development.
- 3.10. The officer highlighted that the previous application from 2012, the policy and principles have revised since then, in 2014 in the Local Plan. It was also refused under substandard accommodation. The officer also said that the proposed development met all criteria of the policies. She also stated that this application provides greenery.
- 3.11. The objector also added that the estate may be redesigned as the property at number 95 is indicating to do the same building to their property. Members

observed the incline of the road. The officer demonstrated the distances and size of the incline to the Committee.

- 3.12. Members considered the application. It was **MOVED, SECONDED** and **RESOLVED** to approve the application

4. Vale Lodge

- 4.1. The Planning Officer gave a detailed and illustrative presentation of the proposed application. The proposal was for the construction of 3no. three storey, four-bedroom terraced houses on the former garage land at the rear of Vale Lodge, Perry Vale, SE23, together with one car parking space and associated landscaping, amenity space and provision of a refuse and recycling storage and cycle spaces.
- 4.2. The key considerations were Principle of Development; Housing; Urban Design; Impact on Adjoining Properties; Transport; Sustainable Development; Natural Environment; and Planning Obligations. Having considered these, it was the officer recommendation to approve the application.
- 4.3. The location of the bin store of the property was questioned. Members felt that the location would impact the residents that were already living there. The Presiding Officer stated that details of the location of the bin storage are reserved by condition, so the applicant would need to submit this for approval before being formally adopted. He stated that Members could make their points about the bin storage for officers to note in the informative.
- 4.4. Members raised that the application was previously refused due to lack of parking space for the number of cars proposed to the site, in 2020.
- 4.5. It was asked what the treatment for road access was for the path and park for pedestrians. The officer clarified that this was a part of the soft and hard landscaping conditions set out in the report, which required general improvements to the access road, including lighting, to make a safer environment.
- 4.6. The agent was unable to attend the meeting and their presentation was read out by the present planning Officer- the main points raised in the statement were:
The revised application seeks for the same development but with the omission of car parking spaces to present a scheme in line with regional and local plan policy and therefore addressed the only grounds for refusal. The revision was now subject to no objection from the Highways Department. The scheme remained acceptable in terms of delivering housing as per the planning history and remained acceptable in design, layout and dwelling as well as daylight/sunlight.

- 4.7. The objector was invited to speak. They raised the following points: the documentation does not contain the extent of proposal; the refuse and recycling arrangements are unsatisfactory; a detailed plan should be provided for each bin store site; there is also concern over the potential loss of space, including car parking space, due to the location of the bin store; there are no parking provisions; there is a question of the safety on the sole access drive; overall the proposed plans are unclear.
- 4.8. The Officer clarified that bin store was twice considered acceptable in the previous application, by the Planning Inspectors, on previous applications.
- 4.9. There was a stipulation from the objector, firstly that a mixed English hedgerow is planted along the neighbouring gardens to delineate between the safety of their lawns and housing access drive; and secondly that any drive resurfacing includes the introduction of traffic calming measures; and lastly that cycle storage provided for Vale Lodge residents as the garages were demolished in 2016 by the applicant and by doing so, took away bike storage for many neighbours.
- 4.10. The Chair clarified that the previous application was refused by officers, not Committee, when it was asked if the application could be refused on different grounds than in the previous applications.
- 4.11. Some Members proposed to defer the application to a time where the applicant is present to attend- however it was decided that with conditions and clarification from officers, deferring the application would not necessarily mean that the applicant would address anything different to what was set out in the report and their statement, if they were present. The applicant had addressed the issues which resulted in the refusal of their previous application in their statement.
- 4.12. The Presiding officer also clarified that the refuse/bin storage details which were reserved by condition would not be approved if officers were not satisfied with the proposal.
- 4.13. Members asked if an informative to engage with Vale Lodge residents prior to submitting refuse storage and highways safety for traffic calming could be stipulated if approving the application. It was clarified that Condition 8 refers to refuse condition. Members concluded the condition was sufficient.
- 4.14. Condition 17 in the report included traffic calming. Members concluded the condition was sufficient but should include an informative that consideration given to resurfacing and noise generation from material and/or traffic calming measures, which officers will word.
- 4.15. In regards to cycle storage, members were informed that there was no such policy that would require cycle storage be provided for existing neighbours. It was noted that LBL encourage cycling and it would be in good will for the developer to consider the sacrifice of cycle and storage space lost from neighbours.

- 4.16. The above was considered and it was MOVED, SECONDED and RESOLVED to approve the application subject to conditions and informatives discussed.