

Committee	PLANNING COMMITTEE (B)	
Report Title	MINUTES	
Ward		
Contributors		
Class	PART 1	Date: 19 July 2018

## MINUTES

To approve the minutes of the meetings of Planning Committee (B) held on the 26<sup>th</sup> April 2018 and 7<sup>th</sup> June 2018.

### LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

#### **MINUTES of the PLANNING COMMITTEE (B) meeting held in Council Chambers, Civic Suite, CATFORD SE6 on Thursday 26 April 2018 7:30pm.**

#### Present

Councillors: Reid (Chair), Ogunbadewa (Vice Chair), Hilton, McGeevor, Ingleby & Muldoon.

Apologies: Councillors Mallory, Moore, Wise & Siddorn

Officers: Suzanne White – Planning Service, Paula Young - Legal Services, Alfie Williams - Planning Committee Co-ordinator.

#### 1. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

There were no declarations of interests.

#### 2. MINUTES

The Minutes of the Planning Committee (B) meeting held on 15 March 2018 were agreed by members.

#### 3. 53 Canonbie Road

The meeting began at 19:30. Planning Manager Suzanne White outlined the details of the application to members and explained that the primary planning considerations for the application were design and impact on neighboring amenity. Councillor Ingleby asked whether the development involved any increase in massing. Suzanne White replied that there would be no increase in massing given that the terrace would be installed within the existing roof space.

The Committee then heard a verbal representation opposing the development from Mr. Maynard Firth representing the Tewkesbury Lodge Estate Residents' Association. Mr. Firth explained that a condition was imposed on the permission for the construction of the house restricting the use of the flat roofs to protect the amenity of neighboring properties. Mr. Firth then stated that the wording of the condition is ambiguous and does not refer to a specific flat roof.

Councillor Hilton asked how the roof terrace would permit overlooking. Mr. Firth replied that it would allow views of rear gardens and of Sydmons Court. Councillor Hilton stated that the side elevation shows that the roof terrace would be set forward of the rear making it difficult to overlook the gardens due to the distance and buildings obscuring the view. Mr. Firth then stated that the roof terrace would represent a departure from the character of the street.

Councillor McGeever stated that she did not find the wording of the flat roof condition ambiguous. Councillor Muldoon asked whether a condition can be revised by a new planning permission. Paula Young confirmed that the permission would supersede the condition. Councillor Hilton explained that she could understand the concerns of some local residents but agreed with the officer recommendation and moved to approve the application. The motion was seconded by Councillor Muldoon.

Members voted as follows:

FOR APPROVAL: Reid (Chair), Ogunbadewa (Vice Chair), Hilton, McGeever, Ingleby & Muldoon

AGAINST: None

**Resolved:** That planning permission be approved in respect of application DC/18/105333.

#### 4. 9-19 Rushey Green

Planning Manager Suzanne White introduced the details of the application to members and noted that the massing had been reduced in the north-east corner to avoid an overbearing impact on properties within Meadowcroft Mews. Suzanne White explained that the consultation involved the display of two site notices and hand delivered letters to which no objections were received. It was noted that a contribution would be made to local employment training as the development would result in a loss of employment space. Suzanne White then gave an overview of the viability assessment and confirmed that the development would exceed the expected number of affordable units.

Councillor Muldoon confirmed that the application had resulted in no objections from the local ward councillors and stated that he welcomed the dispersal of the affordable units throughout the development. Councillor Muldoon then noted concerns regarding the disabled parking on Davenport Road. Suzanne White explained that the disabled spaces could be provided on the red route subject to TFL approval.

Councillor McGeever noted that the condition states that residents would not have access to the CPZ permits but that in practice residents are often not aware of this condition. Suzanne White stated that an obligation would be added ensuring that the developers informed residents. Councillor Muldoon stated that in cases in which flats are sublet tenants are not always informed. Councillor Hilton criticized the number of 1 bedroom units but welcomed the design. Councillor Ingleby asked whether any comments had been received on Common Place as part of the Catford Town Centre Masterplan. Suzanne White explained that representation had to be made directly to the council.

The Committee then heard a verbal presentation from Richard Quelch and Dominic Chapman representing the agents for the application. Mr. Quelch outlined the pre-application process which included meetings with council officers and an evaluation from the Design Review Panel which informed the massing of the development. Mr Chapman explained that the three disabled parking spaces had originally been located within the courtyard but that the proposal was revised due to highway safety and space constraints. Mr Quelch stated that the studio units are larger than the national technical standards and explained that the studios were originally 1 bedroom units.

Councillor Hilton stated that the layout of the studio units looked like 1 bedroom units. Suzanne White responded that the development provides a good quality of accommodation. The chair then sought legal advice and clarification from Paula Young regarding the Viability Report. Councillor McGeevor raised a concern that the affordable units would be restricted to the smaller flats. Suzanne White explained that the viability assessment was based on floor space.

Councillor Hilton commented on the layout of the residential units and welcomed the separation kitchens and living areas. Councillor Ingleby welcomed the number of cycle parking spaces and asked where the cycle parking would be located. Richard Quelch identified the two locations within the site. Councillor Hilton noted that some flats would be single aspect. Suzanne White responded many of the flats were dual aspect and that none of the units would be north facing.

Councillor McGeevor commented that Lewisham has a number of developments with vacant commercial units and asked whether the applicants have a marketing strategy. Dominic Chapman replied that the design of the commercial units would allow for subdivision and that the units would have flexible uses to appeal to a wider range of users. Richard Quelch confirmed that the applicant would be happy to agree to a marketing condition.

Councillor McGeevor stated that meanwhile uses should be considered to avoid vacant units. Councillor Hilton stated that voluntary organisations could be approached. Councillor Muldoon stated that historically it was more difficult to let shops on the eastern side of Rushey Green. Dominic Chapman responded that the existing Job Centre created a large block of non-retail uses and that therefore the development would assist in making the eastern side of the road more attractive to commercial organisations. Councillor McGeevor noted that it was regrettable that Rushey Green would lose the Job Centre.

Councillor Reid agreed that vacant commercial units are a concern within Lewisham but noted that it should not be left exclusively to developers to address the problem and emphasised that more needs to be done politically. Councillor McGeevor asked if the Marketing Strategy would have a clause that would allow community uses. Suzanne White noted that marketing would be secured as part of the Section 106 Agreement. Paula Young explained that the flexible uses allowed within the commercial unit does not include community uses.

Suzanne White stated that officers have responded to past experiences of the commercial units within previous developments. Officers now require a higher quality fit-out and allow a greater flexibility of uses. Councillor Reid stated that Councillors need to do more to make Lewisham more attractive to commercial uses. Paula Young noted that the minimum GIA of the affordable units and the approval of a marketing strategy would be added to the Section 106 Agreement in addition to an obligation to inform residents of the CPZ permit restrictions.

Councillor Ogunbadewa moved the motion to approve the application. The application was seconded by Councillor Ingleby.

Members voted as follows:

FOR APPROVAL: Reid (Chair), Ogunbadewa (Vice Chair), Hilton, McGeevor, Ingleby & Muldoon.

AGAINST: None

**Resolved:** That planning permission be approved in respect of application DC/17/101909 subject to the negotiation of the Section 106 Agreement.

**Meeting ended at 20:43**

## LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

### **MINUTES of the PLANNING COMMITTEE (B) meeting held in Council Chambers, Civic Suite, CATFORD SE6 on Thursday 7 June 2018 7:30pm.**

#### Present

Councillors: Clarke (chair), Copley (vice-chair), Anwar, Bourne, Johnston-Franklin, Kelleher, Muldoon, Paschoud, Rathbone

Apologies: Adefiranye

Officers: Michael Forrester – Planning Service, Holly Lucas – Planning Service, Kheng Chau - Legal Services, Alfie Williams - Planning Committee Co-ordinator.

#### 1. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Cllr Copley declared that he was a member of RUSS and that he would not take part in the consideration or voting of items 4 and 5 of the agenda (Church Grove) and left the room for these items.

#### 2. MINUTES

The Minutes of the Planning Committee (B) meeting held on 26<sup>th</sup> April 2018 were not agreed by Members due to it being unknown if these could be agreed by a single Member. The elections has resulted in the change in Planning Committee B and this was deferred for legal consideration.

#### 3. 62 Sunderland Road

Planning Manager Michael Forrester outlined the details of the application to members. He explained that the property was considered to be a non-designated heritage asset. The site is not in a conservation area, and although the Christmas Estate is being considered for a future conservation area, it is currently undesignated and that cannot be given any weight. Michael Forrester then gave an overview of the site history and explained how officers have come to a balanced decision where the proposed building is considered to be of an acceptable quality and the loss of the non-designated heritage asset justified.

The committee then received a verbal representation from the agent for the application who stated that the scheme had been revised to address the previous refusal for a larger development. The viability of the scheme had been presented to officers who were satisfied that the dwelling could not be retained and redeveloped. The scheme had also been amended to improve the design. Members questioned the agent with regard to the demolition of the building and whether this had arisen out of site investigation or whether the property had been purchased with the intention of demolition. The agent confirmed the latter.

Members then heard a verbal presentation from a local resident objecting to the loss of a non-designated heritage asset, scale of the proposals and wider impacts on parking and the locality.

Cllr Wise spoke under standing orders, making objections to the proposals.

Members deliberated the scheme raising concern with regard to the loss of the undesignated heritage asset and how this scheme has not overcome the previous reasons for refusal. The scheme's scale and mass remained of a concern as did the bulk and impact upon neighbouring residents.

Councillor Paschoud moved a motion to refuse the application for the same grounds as the previous scheme (DC/16/99620). Reason 1 would include a reference to non-designated heritage asset. Reasons 2 and 3 would remain the same. Reason 4 would not be included as this issue was resolved in the revised application. The motion was seconded by Cllr Rathbone.

Members voted as follows

FOR APPROVAL: Clarke (chair), Copley (vice-chair), Anwar, Bourne, Johnston-Franklin, Kelleher, Muldoon, Paschoud, Rathbone

**Resolved:** That planning permission be refused in respect of application DC/17/103895

5. Land and garages between 11 and 29 Embleton Road and 44 and 70 Algernon Road, London SE13

Planning Manager Michael Forrester introduced the application to members and explained this formed part of the Council's affordable housing programme and was submitted by Lewisham Homes on behalf of Lewisham Council.

Members then heard a verbal presentation on behalf of the applicant, Lewisham Homes. They explained that the houses would be for social rent and provide genuinely affordable housing.

Cllr Kelleher and Rathbone raised why no wheelchair housing was provided on this site. The applicant confirmed this was due to the sloping land levels and that there were more appropriate alternative sites in the borough. The 4 dwellings proposed also do not meet the trigger for onsite wheelchair housing (5 units).

Members heard from a local resident in objection to the scheme stating that the level levels were inaccurate on the plans and that officers had not made a site visit to the neighbouring property. There were also concerns about daylight and site security.

The presenting officer clarified that the case officer has made a site visit, but that it was not routing to make visits to neighbouring properties. Officers were confident in the land levels being correct, and that there was a boundary treatments condition proposed which would ensure appropriate privacy between dwellings.

Cllr Bourne moved a motion to approve the application, this was seconded by Cllr Paschoud.

Members voted as follows:

FOR APPROVAL: Clarke (chair), Copley (vice-chair), Anwar, Bourne, Johnston-Franklin, Kelleher, Muldoon, Paschoud, Rathbone

**Resolved:** That planning permission be approved in respect of application DC/18/105952

Following deliberation of this item Cllr Copley left the room due to the earlier stated conflict of interest.

6. Land at Church Grove, SE13

Planning Manager Michel Forrester outlined the details of the application to members, the scheme being a community self-build proposal and all homes classified as affordable housing (100%). An addendum report was also presented which recommended additional conditions. It was confirmed that the affordable housing would be secured through s106 agreement.

Members then received a verbal representation the applicant, who stated that all homes would be affordable and that RUSS had carried out significant community pre-consultation ahead of the planning application.

The committee then heard a verbal presentation from a local resident in objection to the proposals. They stated that the scheme was overly dense for the site and was contrary to an earlier scheme of only 9 homes which would have reflected the local surroundings. There was concern regarding the building of the scheme and timber cladding which represented a fire risk. The level of traffic generation was also of concern.

The presenting officer clarified to Members that the planning process was there to control design and amenity impacts and the construction and fire safety of the building is an issue for Building Regulations. Officers had consulted with the London Fire Brigade during the application who have not raised an objection to the scheme, but do confirm the scheme needs to meet building regulations.

Councillor Rathbone moved a motion to approve the application. The motion was seconded by Councillor Muldoon.

Members Voted as follows:

For Approval: Clarke (chair), Anwar, Bourne, Johnston-Franklin, Kelleher, Muldoon, Paschoud, Rathbone

**Resolved:** That planning permission be approved in respect of application DC/18/104264

7. Land at Church Grove, SE13

Planning Manager Michael Forrester outlined the details of the application to members and explained that the application was for a temporary community facility which would form a community base whilst the longer term Church Grove self-build project was completed.

Members than received a verbal representation from the applicant who stated the need for the temporary facility and that this would be dismantled following the construction of the larger scheme and the materials recycled into the development.

The committee then heard a verbal presentation from a local resident in objection to the proposals on the grounds of noise and disruption.

Members deliberated the proposals and Cllr Rathbone moved a motion to approve the application. The motion was seconded by Councillor Muldoon.

Members voted as follows:

IN FAVOUR: Clarke (chair), Anwar, Bourne, Johnston-Franklin, Kelleher, Muldoon, Paschoud, Rathbone

**Resolved:** That the details be approved in respect of application DC/18/105952

**Meeting ended at 10:05**