

Committee	PLANNING COMMITTEE B (ADDENDUM)
Report Title	11 Cooper's Lane SE12
Ward	Grove Park
Contributors	Zahra Rad

Reg. Nos.

DC/21/120142

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This report has been prepared as Councillor Clarke has made additional comments on the application. An additional representation has also been received from a neighbour following the publication of the committee report.
- 1.2 This addendum provides a clarification for Item 4 (11 Cooper's Lane, SE12) of the Committee agenda.

## 2.0 SUMMARY OF ISSUES

### *Additional Objection*

- 2.1 1 additional representation has been received. This was sent to the Director of Planning and was forwarded to Planning Officers. This objection has been added to the neighbour representations for Member's reference.
- 2.2 Planning Officers have reviewed this representation. The following material issues are raised:
- The proposal radically alters the front of the house and the shape of the roof to the side and will give rise to local heritage impacts.
  - The proposal will set a precedent which will undermine the visual character of the street.
- 2.3 These issues have already been considered in the committee report at paragraphs 47. No new issues are raised.

### *Additional Comments from Councillor Clarke.*

- 2.4 Cllr Clarke has made additional representations on the scheme. These are set out at **Appendix 1** below.
- 2.5 Cllr Clarke's additional comments are noted by Officers. Officers confirm that each application is considered on its merits. The submission notes other examples of similar development in the vicinity of the site. While the policy context for these recent schemes may be similar, Lewisham has published an Alternations and Extensions SPD since these applications were approved. The officer position remains that the proposed rooflight and dormer are consistent with the adopted guidance in the SPD in this case. The officer report contains an assessment of the character of the surrounding area.
- 2.6 As the application does not form a new planning unit, the internal layout of the dormer is not a material planning consideration for committee.

2.7 The Chair has advised Officers of her view that the draft Grove Park Neighbourhood Plan (GPNP) should be a material planning consideration in this case as the draft GPNP is currently progressing toward adoption.

2.8 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) at Paragraph 48 states that:

*Local planning authorities may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to:*

*a) the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced its preparation, the greater the weight that may be given);*

*(b) the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and*

*(c) the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to this Framework (the closer the policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given) .*

The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) states that:

*“an emerging neighbourhood plan is likely to be a material consideration in many cases. [Paragraph 48](#) of the revised National Planning Policy Framework sets out that weight may be given to relevant policies in emerging plans in decision taking.*

*Factors to consider include the stage of preparation of the plan and the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies. A referendum ensures that the community has the final say on whether the neighbourhood plan comes into force as part of the development plan. Where the local planning authority publishes notice of a referendum, the emerging neighbourhood plan should be given more weight, while also taking account of the extent of unresolved objections to the plan and its degree of consistency with NPPF.”*

Additionally the NPPG states that:

*Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) provides that a local planning authority must have regard to a post-examination draft neighbourhood development plan, so far as material to the application.*

2.9 At this juncture, the draft GPNP has been examined, however the Examiner’s report has not yet been published. The Mayor and Cabinet have not yet considered the plan Examiner’s report on the draft GPNP (including the Examiner’s recommended modifications to ensure the plan meets the ‘Basic Conditions’, as required by law); and has therefore not taken a decision as to whether the draft GPNP should proceed to a local referendum. Officers intend to publish the Examiner’s report and recommendations (‘the post examination plan’) when the GPNP is considered by Mayor and Cabinet.

- 2.10 At this point, the post-examination plan has not been published in the public domain, and the application is therefore not assessed against the policies of it; nor has it been assessed against the 'submission' version of the GPNP, which was not subject to independent examination. Officers note the weight to attribute the draft plan is a matter for the Decision Maker.

### 3.0 CONCLUSION

- 3.1 The additional objection and comments from the Chair have been received and reviewed, and are not considered to change the assessment undertaken or the conclusion and recommendation of the officer report to committee for 11 Cooper's Lane.

## APPENDIX 1

### Additional Comments from Cllr Clarke:

*Our oldest historic buildings should be preserved for future generations to enjoy. For this reason I began the campaign to save the Baring Hall Hotel in Lewisham, which was not in a conservation area and due to be demolished. It is now Grade 2 listed.*

***A building does not have to be in a conservation area to be of significant value – as is shown by the Baring Hall Hotel.***

### NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – AREA OF SPECIAL CHARACTER

***The Grove Park Neighbourhood Plan lists these houses as being an area of special character. As it has passed examination it has material weight, but this is not listed in the policy guidance in this application.***

*The Neighbourhood Plan highlights what residents value and is the last remaining bastion of local democracy in the Planning system.*

***An area of special character prohibits development that is detrimental to the façade of buildings that are of note, and impacts on the heritage aspect of the street line.***

*These houses date from around 1905, and run the full length of the street and their architecture and roof line remain unaltered. **They are unique, as it is rare to get such uniform and unspoilt buildings. They are an important historic asset and visual amenity on a busy road.***

*A side extension and front roof light, if approved, would set a precedent allowing many more similar developments, of different shapes/sizes/materials, resulting in a degradation of the uniformity and ultimately a **loss of their historic value.***

### PREVIOUS APPLICATION

*Three years ago an **application at Number 12, for a roof light to the front, was turned down** by officers due to the historic nature of the buildings and the visual impact considering the uniformity of the roofs. The applicants amended the plan to place the roof light out of sight behind a chimney. This had less impact and the development went*

ahead. I am surprised that three years later not only a front roof light, but also a large side extension would be acceptable.

It must be made clear that **there is no objection to development in the roof area with extensions to the rear and roof lights not visible from the street** in this, or any of the properties, on Coopers Lane.

#### **SIDE EXTENSION AND FRONT ROOF LIGHTS**

There is another application which has recently been granted for number 5 Coopers Lane. It is a large development allowing for 2 bedrooms, a bathroom and living space. This is being done without alteration to the front or sides of the roof. **Side extensions and front roof lights are not necessary to provide more living space.**

**A large development in the roof can take place without affecting the historic amenity of these buildings.**

I would urge the committee to turn down this application and ask the applicant to amend it to preserve the historic integrity as recognised in the Neighbourhood Plan and the Council's own policies which aim to be **"sensitive to the local context and respond to local character"**.