

Committee	PLANNING COMMITTEE (A)	
Report Title	MINUTES	
Ward		
Contributors		
Class	PART 1	Date: 17 NOVEMBER 2016

MINUTES

To approve the minutes of the meeting of Planning Committee (A) held on the 06 October 2016.

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

MINUTES of the meeting of the PLANNING COMMITTEE (A) held in ST LAURENCE, CATFORD 37, BROMLEY ROAD, SE6 on THURSDAY 06 October 2016 at 7.30pm.

PRESENT:	Skip Amrani (Chair), Andre Bourne (Vice Chair), Maja Hilton, James Walsh, Stella Jeffrey, Alan Till, Pat Raven, Amanda de Ryk
OFFICERS:	Michael Johnson, Luke Mannix, Russel Brown, - Planning Service, Kevin Chadd - Legal Services, Joshua Ogunleye - Committee Coordinator
APOLOGIES:	Pat Raven, Obajimi Adefiranye

1. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

There were no declarations of interest.

2. MINUTES

The minutes for Planning Committee (A) dated 25th August 2016 were agreed and approved by members.

Councillor Amrani (Chair), noted the committee was awaiting minutes of were for Planning Committee (A) dated 14th July to be brought to committee so it can be approved. The minutes should be brought to the next Planning Committee (A) to be held on 17th November 2016.

3. OUR LADY AND ST PHILIP NERI RE PRIMARY SCHOOL 208 SYDENHAM ROAD, LONDON SE26 5SE (Item 3 on the agenda)

The Planning Officer Michael Johnson outlined details of the proposal.

Planning permission is sought for the redevelopment of the Our Lady and St Philip Neri school site on Sydenham Road, incorporating the separate infant school which currently operates from Mayow Road and providing a new nursery. This would result in a 2 forms of entry school (420 pupils) plus a 25 place nursery.

Michael Johnson received questions from Councillors Walsh and Jeffery concerning the proposed material cladding and would the proposed community only be for school use only.

The Committee received verbal representation from Simon Whitley the agent and architect presented the applications design brief and Matthew Henaughan from Lewisham's community resource gave an overview of the application's contribution to the community. Explain the proposal would result in an improved education facility, increase the capacity of school spaces and work closely with parents to ensure there are minimal impacts to traffic and highways safety.

Representatives of the application received questions from Councillors De Ryk and Walsh, concerning details of proposed composite timber cladding on the proposed buildings, details of boundary design and its proportion to the school building. Who are the current users of the community hall and the current hours of use?

Matthew Henaughan told the committee, the community hall is currently used by scouts and cubs and is closed by 20:30pm there are no plans to intensify its use.

Councillors De Ryk asked if the proposed travel plans were practical in terms of plans to control staff parking practices. What are the practical measures for making the transport plans more robust? Asked for clarity on catchment area of the school and the percentage of students expected to be driven to school?

The Committee received verbal representation from Erica Cattle a resident of fair bank park who was objecting to the transport plan, expressing concerns about impact more children being dropped off at the school would have on the neighbouring roads. At present there are noise, road safety and public safety concerns by residents and it is expected that this will get worse if the school's capacity is increased as more parents and staff will be driving to the school making it difficult for nearby residents.

Councillor Liam Corrum spoke to the committee under standing orders and declares his support for the planning application. He raised concerns about the parking situation outside the school, but considered the proposal to be an improvement on the existing school building. He recommended Condition 18a is strengthened to include new and additional lighting areas of the park closest to the school. It should be well designed and well light

Case officer Luke Mannix provided an explanation of the conditions attached and gave a summary of the application.

Councillor Walsh enquired about the types of cycle parking space that would be made available and recommended the lambert parking system. Enquired what action the council takes on unlawful parking. The solar panels to be installed on the green roof to be installed flushed. Would the proposed works have an impact on existing disabled parking facility?

Highways Officer Kathrine Patterson told the committee the proposed work would not result in the removal of existing disabled parking bays. The council currently uses mobile ticketing officers for parking enforcements, residents are encouraged to contact the council's parking team.

Councillor Walsh conditions should be applied to restrict the use of the hall, to no later than 9pm Monday to Sunday and the details of new additional lighting to brb rough before committee as well as proposed landscaping details.

Legal service Kevin Young asked councillors to be clear on which conditions members would like to remove delegate powers.

Councillors would like to remove delated powers for Conditions 12, 15 and 18

Councillor Till moved a motion to accept the proposal subject to the applicant submitting additional details of the proposed additional conditions detail to the halls use hours, additional lighting and boundary landscaping. It was seconded by Councillor Bourne.

FOR: Councillors Amrani, Bourne, De Ryk, Jeffrey, Till, Walsh Passed unanimously.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted in respect of application DC/16/96041 subject to the conditions outlined in the report and additional informative.

a) Notwithstanding the approved plans, details of the proposed boundary treatments including any gates, walls or fences shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to construction of the above ground works.

(b) The approved boundary treatments shall be implemented prior to occupation of the buildings and retained in perpetuity.

Reason: *To ensure that the boundary treatment is of adequate design in the interests of visual and residential amenity and to comply with Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham of the Core Strategy (June 2011) and DM Policy 30 Urban design and local character of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).*

The community hall hereby approved shall not be open for use beyond 9pm Monday to Sunday.

Reason: *In order to safeguard the amenities of adjoining occupants at unsociable periods and to comply with Paragraph 120 of the National Planning Policy Framework and DM Policy 26 Noise and Vibration of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014)*

Condition 12 (boundary treatment), Condition 15 (travel plan) and Condition 19 (improvements to Home Park) require details to be discharged via planning committee.

Subject to the conditions outlined in the report.

4. LADYWELL TAVERN, 80 LADYWELL ROAD, LONDON SE13 (Item 6 on the agenda)

The Planning Officer Michael Johnson and Russell Brown outlined details of the proposal the application site, located on the south side of Ladywell Road (B236), at the junction with Slagrove Place and opposite Gillian Street. It is occupied by a two-storey building (circa 1846) that operates as a public house on the ground floor with living accommodation on the first. There are two entrances, one to the front on Ladywell Road and one to the side on Slagrove Place.

Planning permission is sought for the demolition of two single storey outbuildings and a garage to create a beer garden to the rear of the Ladywell Tavern, together with the erection of timber gates fronting onto Slagrove Place and new glazed doors to the function room to the rear.

Officers addressed questions from Councillor Walsh about the depth of the rear garden and distance to the neighbouring properties.

Officers advised councillors details of the applications can be achieved under permitted development.

The Council received verbal representation from applicants Peter Bennet and Dan Hills, defended the existing public house use as being neighbourly with little noise and nuisance concerns from neighbouring properties. Applicants advised that the removal of existing out building is to allow additional capacity and suggested the removal of existing outbuilding would be replaced with a screening wall with soundproofing properties.

The Committee received verbal representation from Clare Woods a resident of the property adjoining the proposed development. Objected on the basis that noise levels would increase due to additional user of the pub. Noise levels at the moment are acceptable further increase would be harmful. The use of venue internally often overflows into the back yard and would cause a nuisance.

Councillor Till enquired if it was possible to condition noise levels the pub produces due to the impact it would have on neighbouring properties.

Legal service Kevin Chad advised it was not possible to condition noise within the scope of the application.

Councillor Walsh asked the applicants to applications to consider the retention of the double lobby in order to mitigate noise concerns. Councillor De Ryk requested any noise mitigation measures should remain in place and enquired regarding the sound proof properties of the proposed screening wall.

Applicants inform committee the proposed screening wall would be treated with Eco sound proofing measures to ensure it is suitable for use.

Councillor De Ryk Request the minutes of this meeting should be taken to the next licencing committee meeting so mitigation measures can be recommended for addressing noise concerns.

Planning Officer Russell Brown gave an overall summary of the application.

Following deliberation by Members, Councillor Walsh moved a motion to accept the officer's recommendation and grant planning permission. It was seconded by Councillor Till.

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Councillors Amrani, Bourne, De Ryk, Jeffrey, Till, Hilton, Walsh Passed unanimously.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted in respect of application No. DC/16/097305 subject to the conditions outlined in the report.

Subject to the conditions outlined in the report.

5. 342-342A BARING ROAD, SE23 (Item 7 on the agenda)

Councillor Walsh requested the clerk minute the committee's dissatisfaction with the meeting room, as it was not suitable in terms of heating or A/V facilities.

The Planning Officer Michael Johnson outlined the application outlined details of the proposal which includes the change of use of an A/1 building to A1/D1. Explained the property has been unsuccessful in attracting continuous A1 use as many tenants were put off by its first floor location.

Councillors Walsh enquired about the marketing strategy of the owners and why there has been interest in the shop.

Councillors received verbal representation from the applications' agent Mr Warden, who informed committee that the application has changed since it was last refused based on concerns raised in the previous application. There is now an emphasis increasing the volume of the of downstairs A1 use for bookselling and internet web facilities.

Councillor Hilton enquired about the transport consideration as the property would be within a regularly used carpark around a busy junction.

Councillors received verbal representation from Barry O'Donovan from the Grove Park residents association, who made comments objecting to the application under the basis that the space would better serve as A1 use rather than the proposed D1 use. The proposed D1 use would result in loss of employment space contrary to DM Policy 44. The objector raised concerns details the lack of parking facility for the church users.

Councillor Susanna Clarke spoke to the committee under standing orders and declares her objection to the proposal and recommended its refusal. She objected the landlord's argument that they have been unable to find suitable shops to use the premise. Objected to the amount of space set out for A1 was not justifiable. Also raised concerns about the parking situation and the travel plans report of the proportion of the congregations that are within walking distance of the church.

Councillor Walsh asked planning officers why the TFL consultation response was not considered.

Following deliberation by Members, Councillor Till moved a motion to reject the officer's recommendation and refuse planning permission. It was seconded by Councillor Bourne.

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Councillors Amrani, Bourne, De Ryk, Till, Hilton, Walsh

ABSTAINED Councillor Jeffrey

RESOLVED: That planning permission be refused in respect of application No. DC/15/92925 subject to the conditions outlined in the report.

Subject to the conditions outlined in the report.

Due to the location of the application site outside of a Major or District town centre, the proposed place of worship is not considered to be in an appropriate location with regard to DM Policy 44 Place of Worship of the Development Management Local Plan (2014) and Policy 6 Retail hierarchy and location of retail development of the Core Strategy (2011). Furthermore the transport plan did not suggest enough consideration was given to how users of the proposed church would travel and the safety implications involved in its use.

Councillor Walsh requested that committee minutes show councillors were not happy with the short notice given for the change of venue, the use of inappropriate venue which did not have the suitable A/V facilities. Grievances were also raised concern the scheduling of committee cases and the inconsistency in their numbers which resulted in applications not being heard due to lack of timing.

The meeting ended at 22:15pm. Chair

6 October 2016