

# MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE B

Thursday 14 December 2023

Present: Councillor Lavery (Chair), Councillor Muldoon, Councillor Moore, Councillor Paschoud

Apologies: Councillor Harding, Councillor Johnston-Franklin and Councillor Olaru

Also present: Councillor Penfold

## 1. Minutes

The minutes of the last meeting were agreed.

## 2. Declarations of Interest

No interests were declared.

## 3. LAND TO THE REAR OF 14-48 GEOFFREY ROAD, LONDON, SE4

- 3.1. The Planning Officer gave an illustrative presentation of the application for the demolition of existing structures on the site rear of 14 - 48 Geoffrey Road, SE4 and construction of a development comprising of 8 non-residential two-story dwellings (Class C3), with associated landscaping and ecological enhancements, refuse and recycling storage and cycle storage.
- 3.2. The key considerations for the application were Principle of Development; Design; impact on neighbouring amenity; transport impact; and natural environment. It was the officer recommendation to approve the application.
- 3.3. Members asked what the impact would be on the corridor and if officers had considered this. The officer stated that it was considered acceptable by the ecologists and that the application site was not part of the sink but adjacent to it. Under condition 21 outlined in the report, ecology officers will review this.
- 3.4. It was also asked what the evidence was of badgers, bats and hedgehogs on and around the site. The planning officer replied that ecology officers had reviewed and that no badgers found on site. Any reports on bats are secured under planning conditions outlined in the report, which also secures hedgehog highways.
- 3.5. The applicant then gave their presentation. Their key points were:
- 3.6. The scheme was developed following an extensive application process and meetings with residents. The redevelopment of small sites such as this is specifically supported by the London Plan including a target for 3800 new homes in Lewisham on small sites during the London plan. The report confirms that the site complies with the council small sites SPD which is a key material consideration when assessing this application.

- 3.7. He also stated that the proposal was subject to scrutiny by officers, so the concerns were addressed and the proposals have been revised from 9 to 8 homes with smaller footprints and which are lower than they were previously. The applicants also achieved an increase in biodiversity net gain and tree planting with changes to the elevational design. The applicant summarised that the scheme would deliver a number of benefits and comprises the following key features; the redevelopment of an under-utilised Brownfield site in a sustainable location close to Brockley station; the delivery of eight new homes including for families; a scheme which is sensitively designed in the context of the Brockley conservation area as acknowledged by the conservation and heritage officer; a scheme which will result in an uplift to 17 new trees on site; an improved urban green factor of 0.49; and new residents to the area which will bring increased spending capacity for local businesses.
- 3.8. It was asked that, in consideration that the first version of this scheme is currently being appealed, which scheme the applicant would progress with if this application approved. The agent representing the applicant stated that it would be a commercial decision for the client.
- 3.9. The objector addressed the Committee. His main points were as follows:
- 3.10. He highlighted that the revised scheme relies heavily on planning conditions to get it over the line. He stated that it is considered good practise to keep the number of conditions to a minimum and the proposal has at least 27 separate conditions, like refuse collection, tree planting, fire hydrants, parking, assessments of air quality dust prevention and noise. A number of these conditions will be challenging to monitor or enforce and without enforcement they are meaningless.
- 3.11. The objector expressed concern about refuse collection, stating that 24 large bins in eight caddies will block the footpath for pedestrians who will be forced to step out into an already busy and dangerous junction. Increased use of the access road adds further confusion over right of way to an intersection that is already prone to speeding and regular road rage incidents according to the Metropolitan Police and TfL.
- 3.12. The legal conditions required to satisfy the various ecological parties consulted are also unworkable in particular the applicants plan to mitigate the biodiversity loss. Extreme noise levels from breaking trains have slipped through the cracks of the assessment process. He relayed the deep emotional and mental impact this 10 year planning saga has had on some residents.
- 3.13. The planning officer stated that it is a known approach to condition and secure further details as set out in the report and that it is not required that all information be obtained or submitted at the time of application. In terms of the number of conditions, he said that the matters they cover what is necessary and enforceable.

- 3.14. The objector was asked to clarify the issue of road safety. He stated that it was already a confusing junction and that there was a dangerous intersection on a pavement.
- 3.15. It was assured that the refuse collection was not a planning condition but a legal requirement which will be reviewed by highways officer. In terms of enforceability, it would be dealt with by planning enforcement and would need to go to court.
- 3.16. It was asked what consequences of misuse of area for parking would be. The planning officer stated that it would be for the residents of dwellings to raise the issue. Condition 20 refers to the prevention of on-site parking.
- 3.17. Councillor Penfold spoke under standing orders. His main points were:
- 3.18. The issues arising from the previous application were quality, accommodation, effect on the environment including the loss of seven trees, the design, the narrow access road and parking pressures. He said that there had been lots of work done on the development itself. Paragraph 242 of the report says in terms of accessibility for emergency vehicles would be able to access the site safely using the access route. However, the fire trucks would not be able to access the site due to the width of the access road. This was deemed acceptable in the previous application and did not fall under a reason for refusal given there are no changes to the width of the access road.
- 3.19. Concerning the access to the site and how parking will be dealt with, he stated that the issue had not been addressed and that there would be a problem with vehicles getting in and out and reversing out of extremely narrow pathways. He also raised that the adaptations that have been made caused the loss of four parking spaces.
- 3.20. It was MOVED, SECONDED and RESOLVED to approve the application, subject to informative and section 106 agreement as set out in the report.

#### **4. 23 Lammas Green, London SE26 6LT**

- 4.1. The planning officer gave an illustrative presentation of the application for the listed Building Consent for the alteration and partial demolition of existing boundary wall and the construction of new boundary wall adjacent to 23 Lammas Green SE26. The key considerations were limited to section 16 of Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. It was the officer recommendation to approve the application.
- 4.2. There were no questions for the officer. The applicant gave their presentation. their key points were:
- 4.3. The current application is almost identical to the previous but has benefited from the revisions in response to the conservation officers' feedback with a revised heritage statement and more refined configurations. The new timber gates conditions have been deemed acceptable and the new wall will be submitted for the conservation's approval to ensure the proposed material will

reflect the character and setting of the conservation area. He said that it is hoped that the proposed work will be undertaken early next year, and they are mindful that a lot of the comments received to this applications have related to works approved on the 2021 planning permissions and it's not within is not this applications. They wanted to reassure all the members that the city corporation will continue to collaborate with residents.

- 4.4. There were no questions for the applicant. The objector gave their presentation. Their key points were:
- 4.5. The proposed planting did not provide any mitigation for privacy. The proposed wall would be visible and will encroach into the space. On accessibility they stated that gradient of the pathway is steep and may not be compliant with mobility legislation. Concern was expressed in the quality of design and for the quality of life for residents. It was expressed that the City of London had done something of which both they and Lewisham could feel proud of and had designed the estate to sit around the beautiful cedar and oak trees. The original design was sensitive and socially progressive and sheltered the area from traffic and the homes shared the big vast beautiful views over to the north downs. The decision to demolish the wall, they said, was sensitive mitigation measure which was put in place to screen the auto-close garages by ripping it out along with the screening trees.
- 4.6. The planning conformed that sheet-piling had been covered under condition 32 but did not fall within scope of this planning application.
- 4.7. Regarding outstanding complaints regarding damage- the planning officer said that this outside scope of planning application and to be considered by City of London.
- 4.8. It was MOVED, SECONDED and RESOLVED to approve the application.