

Committee	PLANNING COMMITTEE (C)	
Report Title	MINUTES	
Ward		
Contributors		
Class	PART 1	Date: 21 JUNE 2018

## MINUTES

To approve the minutes of the meeting of Planning Committee (C) held on the 29<sup>th</sup> March 2018.

### LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

MINUTES of the meeting of the PLANNING COMMITTEE (C) held in ROOMS 1 & 2, CIVIC SUITE, LEWISHAM TOWN HALL, CATFORD, SE6 4RU on 29<sup>th</sup> March 2018 at 19:30.

PRESENT: Councillors Clarke (Chair), Hooks (Vice Chair), Bernardes, Dacres, Hordijkeno, Sorba, John Paschoud, Jacca.

OFFICERS: Michael Forrester – Planning Service, Kheng Chau Legal Services and Georgia McBirney – Committee Co-ordinator

APOLOGIES: Councillor Curran

#### 1. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

There were no declaration on interests.

#### 2. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting Planning Committee (C) held on the 22<sup>nd</sup> February were discussed. Councillors raised the following amendments to be made.

The last line of paragraph 3 on page 6 should be amended to read: *has not been built in accordance with the plans.*

Line two of paragraph 6 of Agenda Item 5 on page should be amended to read: *stated that the units have only been marketed as B1 as that is what they have consent for.*

#### 3. Basement Flat, 89 Arbuthnot Road, SE14 5NP (Item 4 on the agenda)

The presenting officer outlined that the application is for the construction of a single storey rear extension to basement flat, 89 Arbuthnot Road. It was explained that two objections were received and that one of these was from the Telegraph Hill Society. It was explained that no objections had been raised by the Council's Conservation Officer. No questions were put to the Presenting Officer by members.

The Committee received verbal representations from Nigel Broome who is the applicant. Nigel Broome outlined that the proposal does not cause harm to the conservation area, only 7.5% of amenity space would be lost and that the topography of the site would

prevent the extension being visible from the street as the extension would be two levels below the street level. It was also outlined that the proposed materials would not harm the conservation area as they would not be visible from the conservation area. No questions were put to the applicant by members.

The Committee received verbal representations from Malcolm Bacchus of the Telegraph Hill Society and Richard Wells a resident. Malcolm Bacchus outlined that his objection is on a matter of principle in terms of the Councils application of DM Policy 36 on terms of visibility and comparability with the existing property. Malcom Bacchus further outlined that the proposed extension does not comply with the original building or the form and character of the conservation area. Richard Wells outlined that there is no objection to the principle of the extension but raises an objection in regards to the materials and design of the conservation area.

Councillor Jacca asked the Presenting Officer about whether the materials have to match the existing. The Presenting Officer clarified that materials do not have to match and that it is considered that the design of the extension is appropriate. The Presenting Officer also outlined that the application can be conditioned for samples of materials to be confirmed in writing by the Council.

Councillor Paschoud asked for the Presenting Officer to clarify the position on materials and visibility from the public realm. The Presenting Officer clarified that even if an extension is visible from the public realm the materials do not have to match the existing and that they need to be of a high quality.

Councillor Clarke (Chair) sums up that the main concerns in the regards to the proposal are whether the proposal is appropriate in a conservation area and whether the materials are acceptable.

Councillor Hooks moved a motion to accept the officer's recommendation, it was seconded by Councillor Paschoud.

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Councillors Clarke (Chair), Hooks (Vice-Chair), Bernards, Paschoud and Hordijkeno

Abstained: Councillors Sorba and Jacca

RESOLVED: That the application DC/17/104373 be approved

#### 4. Garages at Crossway Court, Endwell Road, SE4 2NE (Item 5 on the agenda)

The Presenting Officer outlined the details of the proposal for the demolition of one (1) existing single storey garage block comprised of eleven (11) garages and a screen wall at Crossway Court, Endwell Road SE4 2NE and the construction of a part three/part four storey building to provide nine (9) residential units comprised of 5 x 3 bed, 2 x 2 bed and 2 x 1 bed self contained units, together with landscaping, refuse, sixteen (16) secure cycle parks and nine (9) car parks.

The Presenting Officer outlines that the application site is adjacent to the Telegraph Hill Conservation Area. The Presenting Officer also highlights that the standard of accommodation proposed is unobjectionable and that all of the proposed units would be for social rent. The Presenting Officer explained that three objections were received as well as an objection from the Telegraph Hill Society.

Councillor Paschoud asked the presenting Officer the reasoning behind the proposed flat roof and whether solar panels are proposed on the roofs. The Presenting Officer clarified

that the proposal was designed to be a contemporary block and that a flat roof would reduce the bulk of the building. The Presenting Officer stated that the requirement for solar panels could be conditioned if this was proposed by members.

The Committee received verbal representations from Philip Harvey of PCKO Architects and Kelvin Barker of Lewisham Homes. It was outlined that the proposal is a part of Lewisham Homes programme to deliver 500 new homes for social rent, that five of the proposed units family sized and that all units would be for social rent. Philip Harvey further outlined that the design had been amended in response to consultation by reducing the number of units, amending the cycle storage and the provision of living roofs. Kelvin Baker outlined that all of the proposed units would be for social rent, that all of the proposed units comply all standards and that the units would be allocated to residents on the housing waiting list. Kelvin Barker also outlined that Lewisham Homes has a requirement for contractors to liaise with residents throughout the construction process.

Councillor Sorba asked for clarification on the amended cycle storage. Philip Harvey stated that in response to consultation, the access to the cycle storage was amended so that it can be accessed from the front of the property and confirmed that 16 spaces would be provided.

Councillor Jacca asked whether solar panels have been considered. Philip Harvey responded that both green roofs and solar panels cannot be proposed, and that green roofs were preferred as to improve the energy efficiency of the building.

Councillor Clarke (Chair) asked for clarification on what would happen to the mature trees that are existing on the site. Philip Harvey confirmed that from the group of five trees, two would be removed and that smaller trees are proposed in the new planting.

Councillor Bernards asked whether any of the proposed car parking spaces are disabled. Philip Harvey confirmed that one space would be disabled.

The Committee received verbal representations from Malcolm Bacchus of the Telegraph Hill Society. Malcolm Bacchus outlined that his comments are in regards to DM Policy 36 and that the proposal has a negative impact on the conservation area. Malcolm Bacchus further outlined that the proposed buildings are plainer than those in the conservation area, the window patterns does not complement the conservation area, the proposal does not include a pitched roof and the design is not good enough for a conservation area.

No questions were put to the objector by members.

Councillor Sorba asked for clarification on the existing trees on the site. Councillor Clarke confirmed that two mature trees would be removed. Councillor Sorba also asked for clarification on whether the policy is interpreted differently as the application site is adjacent to a conservation area. The Presenting Officer clarified that the setting of the conservation area still has to be considered and that the Council's Conservation Officer has not objected to the application.

Councillor Hooks moved a motion to accept the officer's recommendation, it was seconded by Councillor Bernards.

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Councillors Hooks, Bernards, Sorba and Jacca.

Abstained: Councillors Clarke, Paschoud and Hordijenko.

RESOLVED: That the application DC/17/105055 be approved.

## 5. Pepys Housing Office, Eddystone Tower (Item 6 on the agenda)

Councillor Dacres joined the committee meeting.

The Presenting Officer outlined the details of the case for the change of use, alteration and conversion of the Class B1 office space at ground and first floor levels of Eddystone Tower, Oxestalls Road SE8 together with the demolition of the existing rear extension, the construction of a two storey rear extension and alterations to the elevations to provide 2 three bedroom maisonettes, 1 two bedroom, 1 three bedroom and 1 four bedroom self-contained flats and a community facility (Use Class D1).

The Presenting Officer outlined that five units would be provided as a part of Lewisham Homes 500 Homes Programme and that all of the units would meet or exceed the required space standards. The Presenting Officer outlined that one objection was received.

Councillor Hooks asked whether the application was being determined at Committee due to the objection, this was confirmed by the Presenting Officer.

The Committee received verbal representations from John Milner of Baily Garner LLP and Kelvin Barker of Lewisham Homes. John Milner outlined that five social rent units and a community space would be provided, all units would benefit from private amenity space and that cladding has been removed from the proposal. Kelvin Barker outlined that the management of the community facility is yet to be confirmed but it will either be managed by the Council or Lewisham Homes. Kelvin Barker states that everything he stated in regards to the community liaison on the previous item on the agenda is applicable to current application. Councillor Clarke states this is fine and it does not need to be repeated.

Councillor Paschoud asked if the Tenants Residents Association (TRA) have raised concerns over the move of the office. Kelvin Barker stated that the housing office was moved a few years ago and that this was subject to consultation.

Members also asked questions in regards to use of the community space and Kelvin Barker stated that the proposed use of the community space is in response to consultation with residents.

The Committee received verbal representations from Malcolm Cadman a resident and from the Chair of Tenants action Group and Pepys Forum. Malcolm Cadman outlined that he is not opposed to the provision of social rent units but does not consider the proposal to be attractive. Malcolm Cadman also raised concerns about the proposed use of the community space and the lack of consultation in the design of the proposal. It was stated that consultation events were regularly cancelled.

Councillor Paschoud outlined that the objectors raise valid points in regards to the communication between existing tenants and Lewisham Homes but that they are not relevant to the current planning application. Councillor Paschoud asked Councillor Clarke (Chair) to raise these concerns to the relevant bodies/committees.

Councillor Sorba and Jacca asked for clarification on the consultation process as the objectors stated that consultation was not carried out correctly. The Presenting Officer clarified that there are two types of consultation, there is the statutory consultation for the planning application and that there is a separate corporate consultation process.

Councillor Paschoud moved a motion to accept the officer's recommendation, it was seconded by Councillor Hooks.

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Councillors Clarke (Chair) Hooks, Paschoud, Dacres, Hordijkeno, Sorba and Jacca.

ABSATINED: Councillor Bernards

RESOLVED: That the application DC/17/104445 be approved.

Councillor Hooks left the committee.

6. 14 Manor Lane, SE13 5QP (Item 7 on the agenda)

The Presenting Officer outlined the details of the case for the construction of a hip-to-gable roof extension and rear roof extension together with installation of two replacement front rooflights at 14 Manor Lane, SE13. The Presenting Officer clarified that the application site is in the Lee Manor Conservation Area Extension which was extended in 2008. The Presenting Officer outlines that a number of properties in the street altered their roofs under Permitted Development prior to the extension of the conservation area.

The Presenting Officer outlines that two neighbour objections were received and that an objection was received from the Lee Manor Society. The Presenting Officer outlined that ordinarily the proposed extension would not be supported in a conservation area but as the street has a different character from the rest of the conservation area the proposal is not considered to cause any harm to the conservation area. The Presenting Officer also outlined that a similar extension to that which is proposed was allowed on appeal at No. 26 Manor Lane and a development approved at no 22 Manor Lane.

Councillor Paschoud asked for further information on the appeal at No. 26 Manor Lane. The Presenting Officer stated that extension at No.26 was refused by the Council in 2016 and approved on appeal as the Planning Inspectorate did not consider the extension to detract from the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Neel Dakshy of Neel Dakshy Architects stated that he would only speak on behalf of the applicants if members had any questions. Members did not have any questions.

The Committee received verbal representation from Charles Batchelor of the Lee Manor Society. Charles Batchelor stated that the proposed hip to gable and the size of the rear dormer was concerning, that four of the seven examples provided are from before the extension to the conservation area and that different Planning Inspectors take different views, as hip to gable extensions have been refused in the conservation area. Charles Batchelor also made reference to a draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and stated that the proposal would be inconsistent with the draft SPD.

No questions were put to the objector by members.

Councillors Paschoud and Sorba raised questions about the status of the draft SPD. The Presenting Officer stated that this draft SPD is not policy and holds no weight as it has yet to be consulted on.

Councillor Sorba asked for reaffirmation as to if why the proposal is inconsistent with policy, why is it recommended for approval. The Presenting Officer stated that this has been debated and that the proposed hip to gable in its specific terrace is not considered to harm the character of the conservation area and that no objections have been raised by the design and conservation officers.

Councillor Sorba moved a motion to reject the officer's recommendation, this was seconded by Councillor Jacca. However this motion was not carried forward.

Members voted as follows:

For: Councillors Sorba and Jacca

Against: Councillors Bernards and Paschoud

Abstained: Councillors Clarke (Chair), Dacres and Hordijkeno

Members deliberated the recommendation further. Councillors John Paschoud moved a motion to accept the officer's recommendation, this was seconded by Councillors Bernards.

Members voted as follows:

For: Councillors Clarke (Chair), Paschoud, Bernards and Hordijkeno

Against: Councillors Sorba and Jacca

Abstained: Councillor Dacres

#### 7. 58 Effingham Road, SE12 8NU (Item 8 on the agenda)

The Presenting Officer outlined the details of the case for the construction of a dormer extension to the rear roof slope together with the installation of two roof lights to the front roof slope at 58 Effingham Road SE12. The Presenting Officer outlined that the roof lights on the front roof slope would be flush and that the proposed rear dormer would be recessed.

The Presenting Officer outlined that one objection was received from the Lee Manor Society in regards to the proposed roof lights. The Presenting Officer outlined that there are numerous examples of roof lights on the front roof slopes in the vicinity of the application property.

Members had no questions for the Presenting Officer.

The Committee received verbal representations from the applicant Guy Swarbeck. Guy Swarbeck outlined that the proposed extension is to accommodate his growing family and that proposal is consistent with other extensions and alterations on the street. The applicant clarified that the proposed roof lights would be conservation style. Members had no questions for the applicant.

The Committee received verbal representations from Charles Batchelor of the Lee Manor Society. Charles Batchelor confirmed that the objection was only in regards to the proposed roof lights on the front roof slope as they lead to spreading of light at night and result in additional detailing on the roof line. Charles Batchelor stated that an alternative to having the roof lights on the front roof slope should be found as they erode the character of the conservation area.

Councillor Paschoud asked the objector if a condition to address light pollution would address the concerns. Councillor Clarke (Chair) stated that clarification should be sought from the Presenting Officer. The Presenting Officer stated that that a condition to address light pollution would not be reasonable or enforceable, it was stated that an informative can be added to a decision. Councillor Clarke (Chair) asked whether the type of glazing could be conditioned as to reduce light spill. The Presenting Officer stated that there are different technical types of glazing, but it should be remembered that this is a residential street in London so there is an existing light spill.

Members asked the Presenting Officer if there was an alternative to having roof lights on the front roof slope. The Presenting Officer outlined that as the proposal includes a rear dormer they cannot be proposed on the rear roof slope. The Presenting Officer clarified that the proposed roof lights would be flush to the roof slope and that the Conservation Officer raised no objection to the proposed roof lights.

Councillor Dacres moved a motion to accept the officer's recommendation, this was seconded by Councillor Jacca.

Members voted as follows:

For: Councillors Clake (Chair), Bernards, Dacres, Paschoud, Hordijenko and Jacca.

Abstained: Councillor Sorba

The meeting ended at 9.30pm.  
29<sup>th</sup> March 2018

Chair