

**LEWISHAM COUNCIL  
PLANNING COMMITTEE C  
THURSDAY, 2 DECEMBER 2021 AT 7.30 PM  
MINUTES**

**MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:** Olurotimi Ogunbadewa (Chair), Stephen Penfold, Mark Ingleby, Silvana Kelleher, John Paschoud, James Rathbone, Joani Reid.

**MEMBER(S) UNDER STANDING ORDERS ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:**  
N/A

**MEMBER(S) OF THE COMMITTEE ALSO JOINING THE MEETING VIRTUALLY:** N/A

**MEMBER(S) UNDER STANDING ORDERS ALSO JOINING THE MEETING VIRTUALLY:** N/A

*NB: Those Councillors listed as joining virtually were not in attendance for the purposes of the meeting being quorate, any decisions taken, or to satisfy the requirements of s85 Local Government Act 1972.*

**OFFICER(S) IN ATTENDANCE:** Development Management Team Leader (DMTL), Senior Committee Manager (In Person Clerk)

**OFFICER(S) ALSO JOINING THE MEETING VIRTUALLY:** Planning Officers (Officer), Committee Officer (Remote Clerk)

**LEGAL ADVISOR:** Joy Ukadike, Senior Planning Lawyer Legal Services

**Item  
No.**

**1     Declarations of Interest**

**2     Minutes**

RESOLVED that the minutes of the Planning Committee C held on the 30 September 2021 be amended to record that:

- Councillor John Paschoud was in attendance remotely.

Then agreed and signed as a correct record.

The Chair also advised there would be a variation of the meeting's Agenda.

**3 113-117 Kirkdale, SE26 4QJ**

Item removed from agenda.

**4 36 Spring Hill, SE26 4LD**

The Planning Officer gave an illustrative presentation, recommending the grant of planning permission for the proposal, as outlined in the Officer's report.

The Committee noted the report and that the main issues were:

Principle of Development • Housing • Urban Design • Impact on Adjoining Properties • Transport • Sustainable Development • Natural Environment

Following the Officers presentation, no questions were put to the Officer, from Members.

The agent addressed the Committee and described the application site. The applicant discussed: regulations the proposal complied with and the benefits of the proposal to the borough.

Members' questions to the agent, related to: materials, conservation and parking.

The Officer provided clarification regarding materials to be used for the windows, as outlined in the Officer's report.

The DMTL confirmed there were no Article 4 restrictions applicable to the proposal.

The agent clarified the parking arrangement for the development.

During Member discussion it was agreed that all concerns raised, would be adequately dealt with by officers.

The Committee considered the submissions made at the meeting, and

**RESOLVED – unanimously**

That it be noted that the Committee agreed to:

GRANT planning permission for the construction of a three-storey, one-bedroom separate dwelling to the side of 36 Spring Hill, SE26, including associated landscaping, cycle and bin storage

Subject to conditions and informatives outlined in the report.

## **5 46 Ringmore Rise, London, SE23 3DE**

The Planning Officer gave an illustrative presentation, recommending the grant of planning permission for the proposal, as outlined in the Officer's report.

The Committee noted the report and that the main issues were:

Principle of Development • Housing • Urban Design • Impact on Adjoining Properties • Transport • Sustainable Development • Natural Environment

Following the Officers presentation, Members questions related to: accommodation, parking, design,

The Officer advised the Committee that planning policy prevented single dwellings from being converted into multiple smaller dwellings. Members were advised the current application site being demolished and rebuilt as to family dwellings was viewed as acceptable by officers.

The Committee were informed by the Officer that professional judgment was used, to assess the impact of the parking arrangement on the proposal. It was felt by officers that 1 additional car added to the street, as a result of the proposal would not create parking stress. The Officer told the Committee that the excavation of the development went downwards and that the height of the proposal would be higher than the current existing building. It was also confirmed that a soft landscaping condition was in place as opposed to hard landscaping. The Officer advised an assessment as to if the paving for the development was permeable would be undertaken at condition stage.

The applicant addressed the Committee and described the application site. The applicant discussed: a previous similar application, the earlier advice provided by the Officer, regarding the demolition of one family dwelling, to create two family dwellings, the

history of the pre-application advice received and the reduction of parking space for environmental reasons.

Members' did not put any questions to the applicant.

A representative with objections addressed the Committee. The representative discussed: personal impact of the proposal, distance, scale and mass, design, height, proximity of properties to the boundaries of the proposal, overlooking, the feeling of being 'hemmed in' and a prior similar application, that had been refused planning permission.

Members' questions put to the representative, related to: the prior refused application, distance, scale and mass and design. The Officer gave Members a history of prior applications up to the current application, to be considered. The Committee were advised the prior applications were not seen as relevant to the current application. The DMTL also advised that the history of the application was extensive. In addition, the current application was materially similar to previous applications that had been granted planning permission. The DMTL provided examples and reasons for clarification. Members were assured that issues that had led to prior applications refusal, had been addressed by the current application under consideration. The Committee were assured that a site visit was conducted. From the visit officers were satisfied with the distance between the proposal and neighbouring properties. Members were informed that the approved extension was in keeping with the surrounding buildings and was in keeping with the character and appearance of the area.

During Member discussion a Member stated the design as outlined in the current application was an improvement of the previous proposals.

The Committee considered the submissions made at the meeting, and

**RESOLVED – unanimously**

That it be noted that the Committee agreed to:

GRANT planning permission for the demolition of 46 Ringmore Rise SE13 and the construction of a:

- two storey plus basement, plus roof space semi detached building consisting of 2x four bedroom dwellings, together with the provision of cycle and refuse storage, 1 off-street parking space and associated landscaping.

Subject to conditions and informatives outlined in the report.

## **6 19 Haredon Close, London, SE23 3TG**

The Planning Officer gave an illustrative presentation, recommending the grant of planning permission for the proposal, as outlined in the Officer's report.

The Committee noted the report and that the main issues were:

Principle of Development • Urban Design • Impact on Adjoining Properties

Following the Officers presentation, Members questions related to: HMO licensing.

The Officer advised the Committee that licensing of the HMO, did not form part of the application under consideration. The Officer confirmed that the proposal was a single family dwelling. The DMTL advised that the applicant wanted to create an extension, reiterating the advice that the issue of licensing was not relevant to the current application. Members were advised, that if a future breach of planning control occurred, the appropriate authorities would assess the matter but this was not material to the planning decision on the extension. .

The applicant did not attend the meeting.

There were no representatives with objections.

During Member discussion a Member wondered why an application for an extension came to Committee, as it may be a Permitted Development (PD). The DMTL advised if the development subject of the application amounted to PD was not relevant and provided further clarification the proposal was for planning premission. The Officer

confirmed the extension would consist of a single added storey and a loft conversion.

The Committee considered the submissions made at the meeting, and

### **RESOLVED – unanimously**

That it be noted that the Committee agreed to:

GRANT planning permission for the construction of a first floor rear extension at 19 HAREDON CLOSE, SE23, together with a loft extension

Subject to conditions and informatives outlined in the report.

### **7 7 Waller Road, London, SE14 5LE**

The Planning Officer gave an illustrative presentation, recommending the grant of planning permission for the proposal, as outlined in the Officer's report.

The Committee noted the report and that the main issues were:

Principle of Development • Housing • Urban Design • Transport • Impact on Adjoining Properties

Following the Officers presentation, Members questions related to: amenities.

The Officer advised the Committee of the local authority's conservation officers' assessment of the amenity space, provided by the proposal. Members were advised that the space was considered acceptable by officers.

The Officer advised no legal definition existed for amenity space and used the Officers' presentation slides to provide clarity regarding the shared garden space provided. The DMTL advised that material judgment had been applied and the amenity space was considered on balance to be compliant with planning policy

The applicant addressed the Committee and described the application site. The applicant discussed: no objections received, the existing building use, accommodation, benefits of communal space,

design improvements, landscaping enhancements and conservation area.

Members' put no questions to the applicant.

A representative from the Telegraph Hill Society addressed the Committee, with objections. The representative discussed: consultation, development plans, design, policy, conversion concerns, roof lights, character and bin storage.

Members questions related to: conversion concerns, HMO status, materials and bin storage.

The applicant advised Members that the conversion of the existing development would be an efficient use of the site space, which would result in 3 'good sized' flats.

During the course of the meeting, Members raised concerns regarding the loss of a family home, if the proposal was granted planning permission. The DTML advised that Committee that the London Plan was supportive of retaining HMOs. However, as the current HMO development was in poor condition, the proposal for the change of use was deemed acceptable. Members also raised concern regarding the roof lights for the proposed development. The Officer advised Members that the roof lights, were considered to be acceptable by officers.

Members were assured the bin storage provision for the proposal, would not have any significant impact, on the street scene. It was advised that this aspect of the proposal was conditioned, so that the officers would need to be satisfied with the bin storage provision before the condition was discharged.

Another Member raised concern with regard to the materials to be used in regard to the proposed extension. The Officer assured the Member that a condition requiring Flemish bond would be added, with amendments agreed by the Chair.

The Committee considered the submissions made at the meeting, and Members voted on the recommendation in the report with a result of 6 in favour of the proposal and 1 against. It was

## **RESOLVED**

That it be noted that the Committee agreed to:

GRANT planning permission for the reconfiguration and change of use of 7 Waller Road, SE14 to provide:

- three self-contained flats, together with the construction of a single storey extension to the rear elevation, a dormer extension to the rear roofslope, one rooflights in the front roofslope, replacement front elevation windows, replacement roof slate, bin and cycle storage and associated hard and soft landscaping to the front elevation.

Subject to conditions and informatives outlined in the report and, A requirement that officers should:

- Add a condition to advise that Flemish bond must be used with respect to the proposed extension.

## **8 Nelsons Archway, Brigade Street, London, SE3 0TW**

The Planning Officer gave an illustrative presentation, recommending the grant of planning permission for the proposal, as outlined in the Officer's report.

The Committee noted the report and that the main issues were:

Principle of Development • Urban Design • Impact on Adjoining Properties • Transport • Sustainable Development • Natural Environment

Following the Officers presentation, there were no questions put to the Officer by the Committee.

The applicant did not attend the meeting.

There were no representatives with objections.

The Committee

### **RESOLVED – unanimously**

That it be noted that the Committee agreed to:

GRANT planning permission for the change of use from lock up / open storage yard (Use Class B8) to an office (Use Class E)

including the construction of a roof over the whole site and all associated works at Nelsons Archway, Brigade Street, SE3.

Subject to conditions and informatives outlined in the report.

## **9 Land to the rear of, 29 Ladywell Road, London, SE13 7UW**

The Planning Officer gave an illustrative presentation, recommending the grant of planning permission for the proposal, as outlined in the Officer's report.

The Committee noted the report and that the main issues were:

Principle of Development • Housing • Urban Design • Impact on Adjoining Properties • Transport • Sustainable Development • Natural Environment • Planning Obligations,

Following the Officers presentation, Members questions related to: Officer's report, vehicle splays, materials and parking.

The Officer confirmed to Committee, there was a typo in paragraph 162 of the Officer's report.

Members were advised by the Officer, that it was possible to add a condition to ensure visibility splays would be provided by the developer, in accordance with the standards in 'Manual for Streets' where required

The Committee were assured by the Officer that a condition was recommended to confirm the materials, including colour of the London Stock Brick, as well as the colour/finish of the timber doors and aluminium framed windows. Officers would need to be satisfied with the developer's proposal, before the condition were discharged. The Officer confirmed that the developer was working with Officers, in regard to parking permits for the development.

The applicant addressed the Committee and described the application site. The applicant discussed: the history of the application and the application site, consultation with the local authority and residents, parking, highways and conservation.

Members' questions to the applicant, related to: boundary treatment  
The applicant provided clarification with regard to the boundary treatment. The Officer used their presentation slides to support the clarification provided.

A representative with objections addressed the Committee. The representative discussed: the application history, character, conservation, scale, height, view obstruction, setting of the development, flood risk, health and safety risks and another similar application that was refused.

Members questions that followed, related to: traffic speed, flood risk  
The Officer provided clarification with regard to traffic speed, as outlined in the Officers' report.

The Committee were assured by the Officer, that experts were satisfied the development would not pose a flood risk.

During the meeting, a Member arrived late into the proceedings. As they had not heard enough of the item under consideration, they advised they would not be voting. Another Member advised they could not hear all the Officers presentation and so would not be casting a vote.

The Committee considered the submissions made at the meeting, and Members voted on the recommendation in the report with a result of 5 in favour of the proposal and 2 abstentions. It was

## **RESOLVED**

That it be noted that the Committee agreed to:

GRANT planning permission for the Demolition of two garages on land at the rear of 29 Ladywell Road SE13 and the construction of a:

- one storey house incorporating basement and associated landscaping.

Subject to conditions and informatives outlined in the report.

The meeting closed at 10.00 pm

Chair

---