

Public Document Pack

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE A

Wednesday, 15 November 2023 at 7.30 pm

PRESENT: Councillors Peter Bernards (Chair), Rosie Parry, Jacq Paschoud, Stephen Penfold and Sakina Sheikh

OTHER MEMBER(S) ALSO PRESENT IN PERSON:
Councillor Carol Webley-Brown (under Standing Orders)

OFFICERS PRESENT IN PERSON: Senior Planning Officers (x2), Planning Officer, Senior Legal Officer, and Senior Committee Manager.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Liam Curran, Councillor Will Cooper and Councillor Sian Eiles.

1. **Declarations of Interests**

The Committee noted that no interest was declared at the meeting.

2. **Minutes**

The Committee amended Paragraph 4.19 of the Minutes by adding the words “assessment was undertaken” after the word “sunlight” to complete the sentence as follows:

- “It was MOVED, SECONDED and RESOLVED to defer the proposal until an in-person daylight and sunlight assessment was undertaken.”

The Committee:

RESOLVED that the Minutes of meeting held on 18 July 2023 be agreed as an accurate record, subject to the amendments.

3. **1-3 ASHBY ROAD - REF: DC/23/130234**

3.1 The Planning Officer gave an illustrative presentation of the report, highlighting that the application was differed at a meeting of the Committee held on 18 July 2023 because Members were unable to reach a conclusion on the impact of adjacent roof lights serving Flat 2 due to a concern with the methodology employed to model the daylight and sunlight impacts of the proposed development.

3.1.1 The Committee noted the report, together with a recommendation to grant planning permission to construct part single-storey and part two-storey roof extensions to create 3 self-contained flats, together with the conversion of an existing studio to provide additional living accommodation

at 1-3 Ashby Road SE4, with associated cycle storage, refuse storage and a new green roof had been maintained.

3.2 The meeting noted responses to questions raised regarding the following:

a) *The level of sunlight into the proposed development.* Officers responded as follows:

- That to meet the Vertical Sky Component requirement, an assessment had to be based on the amount of skylight received at the centre of a window from an overcast sky, and that meant daylight level, not direct sunlight.
- That the Vertical Sky Component had two measures and for any reduction in the level of sunlight into the proposed development to be noticeable, the assessment had to fail on both. It was stated that the first test required a 27% value in accordance with the Daylight / Sunlight Building Research Establishment (BRE) guidance, and if that was not achieved, the assessment had to be modelled in accordance with the reduction to the existing level.
- That although the assessment failed on the second test regarding the existing level, officers were satisfied that the level of sunlight to the proposed development would not be noticeable because the first test level assessment at 27.10% was above the BRE requirement value in absolute terms. Thus, it would be unlikely that residents would perceive much difference regarding the amount of daylight into their premises.

b) *What the hours of sunlight at 27% would equate to, and the time in the day sun rays would penetrate the proposed dwelling.* The Officer responded as follows:

- That the BRE guidance for assessing overshadowing into dwellings had to be assessed in accordance with the Vertical Sky Component regarding daylight, and those hours could not be quantified in accordance with the duration of time.

3.3 A representative for the applicant also addressed the meeting and advised the Committee as follows:

a) That when the daylight and sunlight assessment were re-tested, the new assessment provided no anomalies in relation to previous tests applied in the earlier scheme.

b) That different assessment values were not applied because the BRE assessments were achieved. Nonetheless, the applicant had revised the earlier floorplan to reduce overshadowing into the two adjacent rooflights to Flat 2 in response to a concern expressed by Members at the meeting which deferred the application.

- 3.4 The Committee also noted the submissions by a resident who spoke in favour of the application as follows:
- a) That the proposed development was attractive and would fit into the conservation area and with existing developments in the environmental surrounds.
 - b) That she welcomed the fact that on-site construction work was implemented with minimal disruption to residents in nearby dwellings.
 - c) That she believed that once completed, it was likely that the proposed development would create value to enhance a sense of belonging for existing and potential residents in the vicinity.
- 3.5 Following the direction of the Chair, Councillor Peter Bernards, the proposal was moved by Councillor Rosie Parry, seconded by Councillor Jacq Paschould, and voted upon. The Committee

RESOLVED

Unanimously

To **GRANT** planning permission for the construction of part single-storey and part two-storey roof extensions to create 3 self-contained flats, together with the conversion of an existing studio to provided additional living accommodation at 1-3 Ashby Road SE4, with associated cycle storage, refuse storage and a new green roof, subject to conditions and informatives in the report.

4. **293 STANSTEAD ROAD, LONDON, SE23 1JB - REF: DC/23/131562**

4. The Senior Planning Officer gave an illustrative presentation of the report, highlighting proposal to install an internally illuminated digital LED sheet sign at Right Side of 293 Stanstead Road, SE23.
- 4.1 The Committee noted the report, and a recommendation to approve the proposal.
- 4.2 Councillor Carol Webley-Brown addressed the meeting under Standing Order as a ward councillor of Crofton Park on behalf of residents. Councillor Webley-Brown advised that she was against the proposal for the following reasons:
- a) That it was contrary to the Council's commitment of providing open green spaces for residents.
 - b) That there were concerns that public safety would be at risk.
 - c) That residents would welcome proposals to improve the area, however, they were unconvinced that the digital advertisement sign would achieve that because of the following concerns:

- The proposal would distort the residential element of the area to create a growing commercial area.
- The existing advertisement light, although it had not been working for some time, was impacting adversely on residents' wellbeing and mental health.
- That the potential for an accident was high because of the dazzling factor associated with digital lighting.

4.3 The meeting also heard from residents who advised that they were against the proposals and representing the views of objectors at Ravensbourne Road. The residents advised the Committee as follows:

- a) That residents were disappointed to hear about the proposal because local groups in the area were making plans to improve the vicinity of Stanstead Road to create greenery and a sense of place, with a view to enhance civic pride in the community.
- b) That the existing LED advertisement sign was causing a great deal of upset in the neighbourhood because of the glaring lights, and the proposal had exacerbated the concern.
- c) That they welcomed views expressed by officials at Transport for London (TfL) regarding public safety because the proposed site was near a nursery school and a senior residents' centre.
- d) That the proposal would create increased visual clutter in the residential area, with adverse impact on cyclists and pedestrians.

4.4 In response to questions raised, the Officer advised the Committee as follows:

- a) That although the sign on the proposed site was not in a working condition, and a new policy was introduced in 2021, the Committee should note that a consent was granted for by the Planning Inspectorate for an illuminated sign in 2018. It was stated that officers determined in the assessment that the change post the Planning Inspectorate decision was not substantial.
- b) That TfL officials' response to the consultation on the application was a blanket objection because there was no data to substantiate their claims of injury or accident because of harmful interactions of LED lights and the speed cameras.
- c) That TfL officials had indicated that they would be agreeable to the granting of the advertisement consent permission if conditions were imposed to address potential impacts of the illumination level, times of advertisement, intervals between digital displays, and application of default mechanisms for visual displays to switch off in the event of a malfunction.

- d) That the recommendation to grant permission for advertisement consent was made because Planning officers were satisfied with the Council's Highway Team's assessments that there would be no detrimental effect in implementing the proposal in the Stanstead Road environment.

4.4.1 The Committee was guided by officers on the following matters:

- a) That the application under consideration was an application for an expressed consent for advertisement, and not a planning application, therefore planning permission was not required.
- b) That that the amenity element highlighted by TfL officials was not relevant in the determination of the application.

4.5 In considering submissions made at the meeting, the Committee acknowledged that although the Council was constrained by the appeal outcomes regarding the previous refusal, it was worth noting that the speed camera impact in the area was not addressed at the appeal considered by the Planning Inspectorate.

4.5.1 Following the direction of the Chair, Councillor Peter Bernards, Councillor Stephen Penfold proposed that the recommendation should be refused because it had not been established that there would not be a public safety element because of the impact of the speed camera. The proposal was seconded by Councillor Rosie Parry and voted upon with a result of two against and three in favour of a refusal. The Committee

RESOLVED

Not to **GRANT** advertisement consent for the installation of an internally illuminated digital LED sheet sign at Right Side of 293 Stanstead Road, SE23, by reason of its unacceptable impact on highway and pedestrian safety, as it has not been established the new sign would not affect the operation of the speed camera opposite the site.

The meeting closed at 8.59pm.

Chair