

Committee	PLANNING COMMITTEE (C)	
Report Title	MINUTES	
Ward		
Contributors		
Class	PART 1	Date 03 NOVEMBER 2016

## MINUTES

To approve the minutes of the meeting of Planning Committee (C) held on the 11 August 2016.

### LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

MINUTES of the meeting of the PLANNING COMMITTEE (C) held in THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, LEWISHAM TOWN HALL, CATFORD SE6 on 11<sup>th</sup> August 2016 at 7:30PM.

PRESENT: Councillors: Bell (Chair), Hooks (Vice-Chair), Klier, Bernards

OFFICERS: Max Smith - Planning Service, Colm Harte – Planning Service, Fiona Shanahan - Legal Services, Andrew Harris - Committee Co-ordinator.

APOLOGIES: Councillors: Clarke, Curran, Dacres, Milne, Paschoud

#### 1. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

There were no declarations of interest.

#### 2. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of Planning Committee (C) held on 17 March 2016 were agreed by Members to be a true and accurate record.

#### 3. SITE B, LEE GREEN ESTATE, SE12

The Planning Officer Colm Harte outlined the details of the case and displayed photos of the site. It was noted that the application had been deferred from the previous Planning Committee (C) on 4<sup>th</sup> February 2016 for the following reasons:

- Clarification was sought regarding the potential impact on the amenity of surrounding properties, in particular the residential units located between No. 11 and 25 Cambridge Drive to the rear of the site;
- Members raised concerns regarding the scale and massing of the proposed development;

- Clarification was sought regarding bin storage arrangements

The Planning Officer Colm Harte informed members that several changes had been made to the application following the previous deferral. Changes included the relocation of balconies, new opaque glazing to the rear elevation, reductions in the height and mass of the proposed building and the relocation of the refuse and cycling stores.

The Planning Officer Colm Harte informed the Committee that further objections had been received since the previous meeting. These outlined concerns regarding the scale and massing of the proposed building, increased parking stress and impact on amenities of adjoining properties.

Questions from Members followed regarding rent prices, distances with adjoining properties and the heights of the proposed balconies. Councillor Bell (Chair) enquired whether the height of the proposed structure would affect the levels of light to adjoining properties. The Planning Officer Colm Harte confirmed that a daylight and sunlight assessment has been received, which demonstrated that the impact would be acceptable.

The committee then received verbal representation from Caroline Wilberforce (Agent) and Amy Corrigan (Architect), acting on behalf of the Peabody Trust (Applicant). Ms Wilberforce relayed to Members that the scheme would provide both affordable and social housing and that the units would be large family size dwellings, which was supported by the Housing Officer. Ms Corrigan went on to outline the local community engagement which had occurred and which had resulted in the reduction of the overall size of the development. She also requested that objections regarding loss of views be disregarded, as this was not a planning consideration.

Councillor Hooks asked for further clarification regarding the level of changes following the local community consultation. Ms Wilberforce gave further details regarding the changes and informed Members that any further reduction in floor and ceiling heights would result in structural issues. Ms Corrigan then stressed that the proposal was already in compliance with the council's planning policy, and therefore further amendments should not be required.

The committee then received verbal representation from two objectors, Ms Elaine Naden and Ms Janine Rakine. Ms Rakine outlined concerns regarding the height and massing of the proposed building and the distance between the surrounding buildings. She went on to state that insisted that the amendments did not address the height issue and that the development of the site would have a negative impact on levels of social and affordable housing for local key workers. Ms Naden then stated that she was speaking on behalf of Tony Hall House, which had a number of housebound and disabled residents. Ms Naden highlighted concerns regarding increased noise levels due to the proposed balconies, possible light spillage and loss of views and amenity space.

Councillor Hooks asked questions regarding the view of local residents. This was followed by a question from Councillor Klier about the height of the existing surround buildings.

Councillor Bell (Chair) stated that he felt the concerns regarding the massing had not been adequately addressed. Councillor Hooks agreed, but noted that there were no reasons under planning law to refuse the application and that there was a desperate need for social housing within the borough.

Councillor Bernards enquired as to the Planning Officer's views regarding the sense of overbearingness which would result from the proposed development. The Planning Officer Colm Harte confirmed that the applicant had worked with the Council through pre-application

negotiations and further discussion with the Council's Urban Design team to reduce the impacts of the development. He stated that following this, the proposed development had been considered acceptable in regards to neighbouring amenity and had been outlined as such in the Officer's report.

Following deliberation by Members, Councillor Bernards moved a motion to accept the officer's recommendation, subject to conditions. It was seconded by Councillor Hooks.

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Bell (Chair), Hooks (Vice-Chair), Bernards, Klier

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted in respect of application No. DC/15/92724 subject to the conditions outlined in the report.

#### 4. WOODSTOCK COURT, BURNT ASH HILL, SE12

The Planning Officer Max Smith outlined the details of the application. This was followed by questions from Members including discussion as to whether the proposed development would be out of keeping with the local area, the access and management of parking and the impacts on amenity space. Councillor Hooks requested clarification regarding the reduction of amenity space and the reduction of grassed areas. Following clarification from the Planning Officer Max Smith, Councillor Bell (Chair) noted that a large area of grass would be removed as a result of the proposed.

The committee then received verbal representation from local objectors, as no representative for the applicants were present. Ms Geraldine Omahoney, Mr Richard Corfied and Mr Paul Adams spoke against the proposal. They stated that 56 households would be affected by the proposal and highlighted concerns regarding loss of amenity area. They stated that the loss amenity area which would result from the proposed development would have a negative impact on the local community, as the area was frequently used by local families, especially children. They stated that the proposed would result in a loss of amenity space for existing houses. They also objected to loss of lime trees and lack of parking.

Councillor Bernards asked how far the application site was from local community amenity areas, such as local parks. Ms Omahoney clarified that the nearest local parks were approximately a 15 minute walk away. Councillor Hooks asked the objectors whether they believed that the principle of removing the garages was acceptable. The objectors all confirmed that they had no objections to the principle.

Councillor Hooks outlined his concerns with the proposed development, specifically regarding the reduction of green space. Councillor Klier queried whether the new amenity spaces were to be shared or if they would be allocated to specific flats. Councillor Bell (Chair) also raised concerns regarding the loss of amenity and suggested the proposal was looked at again.

Following deliberation by Members, Councillor Bell (Chair) moved a motion to defer the application to a future meeting. It was seconded by Councillor Hooks.

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Bell (Chair), Hooks (Vice-Chair), Klier, Bernards

RESOLVED: That in respect of the planning application No. DC/15/094702, the decision be deferred to allow time for further consideration of the application.

5. 43 GREENLAND MEWS, SE8.

The Planning Officer Max Smith outlined the details of the application and informed Members that amendments had been received following the initial submission of the application. Councillor Bell (Chair) asked whether the site was in use as a house of multiple occupation, which the Planning Officer Max Smith confirmed it was not.

No representatives for the applicant were present.

The committee received verbal representation from Dr Claus Laqueur who was in opposition to the application. Dr Laqueur outlined his objections to the proposal which included, material harm to the architectural integrity of the Mews, overdevelopment and stress on local parking and that the proposal would set a precedent if approved. He also noted that the continued re-submission of applications was seen as a form of harassment for local residents.

Further discussion took place between Members. Councillor Bell (Chair) asked how the current application was different to the previous version which was dismissed at appeal. The Planning Officer Max Smith confirmed that the proposal had been reduced in size and that the overall appearance had been made more subordinate through the use of more appropriate materials.

Following deliberation by Members, Councillor Bell (Chair) stated that the application was too similar to the previous application which had been dismissed at appeal and moved a motion to reject the application, contrary to the officer's recommendation. The motion was seconded by Councillor Hooks.

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Bell (Chair), Hooks (Vice-Chair), Klier, Bernards

RESOLVED: That planning permission be refused in respect of application No. DC/16/095640 for the following reason:

The proposed additional storey, on account of its design, position and scale, would be harmful to the street scene, the design concept of the terrace of which it forms part and the character of the mews, contrary to Policies DM30 'Urban Design and Local Character' and DM31 'Alterations/Extensions to Existing Buildings' of the Development Management Local Plan 2014, Policy 15 'High quality design for Lewisham' of the adopted Core Strategy (June 2011), and policies 7.4 'Local character' and 7.6 'Architecture' of the London Plan (2016).

6. HATCHAM LIBERAL CLUB, 367 QUEENS ROAD, SE14

The Planning Officer Colm Harte outlined the details of the case. It was also noted that no representatives for either the applicant or the objectors were present at the meeting.

Councillor Bell (Chair) expressed his concerns that the reduced size of the club room would lead to the club room becoming unviable and eventually to the site being converted into residential units. Councillor Bell (Chair) also raised concerns regarding the access to the club via a side alley.

Councillor Klier asked how many members were registered with the club, which the Planning Officer Colm Harte confirmed was around 100, but clarified that it had a low turnout.

Councillor Klier enquired as to whether the proposal would lead to increase in noise pollution. Councillor Hooks responded, stating the low membership numbers meant there would not be a large increase in levels of noise.

Following further deliberation by Members, Councillor Hooks (Vice-Chair) moved a motion to accept the officer's recommendation, subject to conditions. It was seconded by Councillor Klier.

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Hooks (Vice-Chair), Klier, Bernards

AGAINST: Bell (Chair)

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted in respect of application Nos. DC/14/90110 and DC/14/90111 subject to the conditions outlined in the report.

The meeting ended at 9:30pm