

Committee	PLANNING COMMITTEE (A)	
Report Title	MINUTES	
Ward		
Contributors		
Class	PART 1	Date: 07 DECEMBER 2017

## MINUTES

To approve the minutes of the meeting of Planning Committee (A) held on the 19<sup>TH</sup> October 2017.

### LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

MINUTES of the meeting of the PLANNING COMMITTEE (A) held in ROOMS 1 & 2, CIVIC SUITE, LEWISHAM TOWN HALL, CATFORD, SE6 4RU on 19<sup>th</sup> October 2017 at 19:30.

PRESENT: Councillors Amrani (Chair), Jacq Paschoud (Vice Chair), Adefiranye, Bourne, Till, Raven, Walsh, Jeffrey, Kennedy. (Councillor Raven and Kennedy arrived late and were unable to vote on Item no.3)(Councillor Paschoud arrived late and was unable to vote on Items no.3 & 4)

OFFICERS: Suzanne White and Richard McEllistrum – Planning Service, Paul Clough – Legal Services, Catherine Paterson – Highways and Amanda Ghani – Committee Co-ordinator

APOLOGIES: Councillors De Ryk

#### 1. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

There were no declaration of interests.

#### 2. MINUTES

Members approved minutes for Planning Committee (A) held on 14<sup>th</sup> September 2017.

#### 3. Land and buildings, Beckenham Place Park, BR3 (Item 3 on the agenda)

The Planning Officer Suzanne White outlined details of the proposal for the regeneration of part of the park, sited west of the rail line. Members were informed that there were two applications to be considered, one for planning permission, the other for Listed Building Consent. An addendum report dated 19<sup>th</sup> October 2017, addressing comments received subsequent to the main reports publication was made available to members. The comments were received from The Westgate Road Working Group, Sport England and a local resident.

The planning officer outlined vehicle and pedestrian access to the park and highlighted the listed buildings included in the proposal. The officer spoke of the removal of the tennis courts and reinstatement of the original pleasure grounds; the removal of the car park to the front of the house with the area being returned to lawn. Members were informed of the new siting for

the 108 uncontrolled and uncharged car parking spaces, resurfacing of footpaths and the re-provision of a lake; the planting of 12,000 trees and creation of a wet woodland would provide enhanced ecology. A potential future application regarding the remainder of the park was touched upon.

The officer detailed the number and content of objections received and recommended approval of the scheme.

Questions put to the planning officer by members included the displaying of site notices which the officer stated met the legislative requirements.

The proposed small addition of extra parking spaces was queried, as was bio-diversity and re-establishing animal and plant species within the old fairways. Members' attention was brought to paragraph 7.55-7.56 in the officer's report regarding anticipated visitor numbers and parking demand concluding that demand may slightly exceed parking provision at times. A way finding strategy would be used in facilitating access to the park using sustainable modes of transport.

Provision to stop other motorised traffic getting into the park would be considered a management issue. Cllr Jeffrey commented on the loss of the toilet block and the need to provide additional facilities near the car park and at other locations within the park. The officer stated that toilet facilities would be available in the new stable block.

Potential conflict between pedestrians and cyclists was highlighted and although there are no proposals for limiting cycle speeds, there would be a number of alternative paths with differing surface materials for users to choose from.

The Committee received verbal representation from the applicant Alison Taylor who gave an overview of the history of the park, it's under use as a space. Ms Taylor touched on future plans for the east side of the park and steps to renovate all the buildings in the park and bring them back into use. Members questioned Ms Taylor regarding the loss of the tennis courts. These have been sacrificed to allow the restoration of the original pleasure gardens. A number of alternative courts within a 2km radius of the site were identified.

Councillor Walsh queried the amount of proposed parking. Ms Taylor stated that the Travel Plan noted the most frequent park users as living very close by. A future proposal regarding the east side of the park could provide additional parking. Cycle routes were looking to be improved and events at the park would promote sustainable travel. There would also be a designated overflow car park.

With regards to provision for swimmers at the proposed lake, an unsupervised access model would be in place with the provision of life rings, a deep water indicator and a platform.

Councillor Jeffrey noted that the park is being used by professional dog walkers who do not pick up after their dogs. Ms Taylor informed members that by-laws will be in place to ensure no more than four dogs can be walked by a dog walker at any one time; there would be areas of the park where dogs would have to be kept on a lead and dog owners/walkers would need to clean up after their dog(s).

The committee received verbal representation from Mia O'Donoghue (Westgate Road Working Group), Janet Waldon (Local Resident) and Lee Witherell (Beckenham Place Park Community Trust). A number of postcards showing pictures of vehicles parking along Westgate Road were disseminated amongst members.

Ms O'Donoghue informed members that Westgate Road lies within the Borough of Bromley but is owned by Lewisham Council, but has not been adopted by Bromley and so residents

maintain the road at their own expense. Due to the increased use of the park, the residents have seen an increase in parking on the road, dangerous driving, damage to and obstruction of the road so that rubbish bins cannot be collected during collection days and a loss of tranquillity previously enjoyed. The residents would like to see the creation of resident only permit holder parking on the road and are looking toward Lewisham Council to achieve this.

Ms Waldon informed members that she objected to the proposed cycle tracks which in her opinion would encourage and create informal tracks over ancient woodland within the park. Ms Waldon also objected to the creation of wetlands as this is not an historic feature on the site, the education facility proposed was not a useful size and there would be no visitor centre. She stated that an environmental statement should be submitted.

The planning officer concurred that the northern half of Westgate Road is owned by Lewisham Council but as it is not the Highway Authority, Lewisham is unable to introduce parking controls (as specified in the addendum report).

The Highways officer informed members that as the Highway Authority, Bromley would be responsible for enforcing parking controls. Further discussion between members and officers concluded that Lewisham Council could approach LB Bromley to have parking controls put in place, however they may decide to refuse such application proposal due to lack of funds.

The planning officer advised members that an environmental statement was not required. Submitted ecology surveys had been done and included a high level of detail; soft landscaping, tree protection plan, planting, replacement boundary treatments, bat boxes, a landscape and ecological management plan and surface water drainage have all been secured by conditions. The ancient ash plantation is not affected by the proposal and the visitors centre would remain within the Mansion.

Councillor Walsh asked if a condition could be added to require management of cycle use on paths to ensure safety of pedestrians.

The planning officer stated that an additional condition could be added to require this.

After summing up from the Chair (Cllr Amrani), Councillor Walsh proposed a motion to accept the officer's recommendation, it was seconded by Councillor Till.

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Councillors Amrani (Chair), Adefiranye, Bourne, Till, Walsh and Jeffrey

RESOLVED: That the applications DC/16/099042 & (FUL) DC/16/099043 (LBC) be accepted with additional conditions

**Additional condition:** Prior to the first occupation of the refurbished Stable Block, a Cycle Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Plan shall include measures to manage the safe use of the proposed new routes within the Park by all users.

**Reason:** To comply with Policy 14 Sustainable movement and transport and Policy 15 High quality design of the Core Strategy (June 2011).

**Additional informative:** The applicant is encouraged to approach the London Borough of Bromley to request that resident parking restrictions are introduced on Westgate Road.

4. 28 Sydenham Hill SE26 (Item 4 on the agenda)

The Planning Officer Suzanne White outlined the application for the demolition of Hill House, 28a Sydenham Road and the alteration, change of use and extension to Highfield House, 28 Sydenham Road to provide 40 self-contained extra care home units to provide specialist dementia care services for older residents.

Members were reminded that the proposal had previously been presented to Committee A on 30<sup>th</sup> March 2017 with a recommendation to refuse planning permission. On that occasion members motioned to defer a decision to enable submission of further information, including a parking survey and justification for the 40 proposed units along with allowing officers an opportunity to negotiate improvements to the scheme.

In response, a parking survey was undertaken by the applicant and a confidential viability report for members to view was submitted. The highways officer reviewed the parking survey and agreed that there are locations on the surrounding streets where overspill parking from the development may be accommodated. However, many of the locations are considered undesirable as parking in these unrestricted locations would impact the free flow of traffic by reducing carriageway widths. It would result in parking on footways and impact on pedestrian movement and would cause visibility issues. Officers concluded that the exclusion of undesirable parking locations left a reduced number of acceptable on street parking leading to an unacceptable level of parking stress on surrounding streets.

No further plans for the amendment of the scale and/or appearance of the proposed development were submitted. The officer listed the objections received and described how the proposal has now split the number of units for social rent as 30 and 10 units as shared ownership. The officer said that the proposal represents an over intensification of the site which is why the application is recommended for refusal.

The Committee received verbal and pictorial representation (documents tabled) from the applicants Mr Adrian Kearley (Planning consultant from Strutt and Parker) and Mr Peter Dickeson (Architect) who outlined the chronic need for dementia care. The applicants stated that a new courtyard has been designed with dementia care in mind being wheelchair accessible, shaded and secure. Elements of the proposal were highlighted to members, including the siting of the building, number of storeys, standard of accommodation and daylight/sunlight report. The applicant stated that the design and layout of the building meant that single aspect flats were inevitable as heated corridors needed to link rooms with communal spaces. A third of the units would be sited on corners and would be double aspect. However, internal windows would look out on to corridors and receive borrowed light from the corridor windows. The applicants said that Abbeyfield who designed the scheme had been given an award for best dementia scheme in the country.

Members voiced concerns over the single aspect nature and lack of outlook from some of the units.

The Committee received verbal representation from Debra Van Jaarsveldt (local resident and architect) and from Annabel McLaren (Sydenham Society)  
Ms Van Jaarsveldt outlined her concerns which included the siting, scale and massing of the development, overshadowing, loss of view and privacy, insufficient off street parking.

Whilst Ms McLaren was supportive of Abbeyfield wanting to provide extra care units, she agreed with the grounds for refusal and supported neighbouring objectors; regarding the proposal as inappropriate for the site and objecting to the removal of ancient trees.

The Committee received verbal representation from Councillor Hilton under standing orders who spoke in favour of the proposal, stating the proposed development would not be overbearing and that parking was not a problem. The Councillor stated that there was no conflict regarding the proposed height of the development, since there were a number of equally high and higher buildings along the road. The Chair pointed out that Councillor Bernard also supported the application.

Next, the Committee received verbal representation from Councillor Best who spoke under standing orders. Concerns were voiced over no amendments to the scheme being brought forward by the applicant; the quality of the scheme, the change in the tenure mix. The Councillor urged the applicant to take another look and see if there was a way of redesigning the building and addressing officers concerns. After further discussion by members,

Councillor Adefiranye moved a motion to defer the application, the motion was seconded by Councillor Till. The vote was 5-3 against; motion failed.

Councillor Walsh moved a motion to accept the officer's recommendation and refuse planning permission. It was seconded by Councillor Bourne

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Councillor Amrani (Chair), Bourne, Jeffrey, Kennedy, Till and Walsh.

ABSTAINED: Councillor Adefiranye and Raven

RESOLVED: That planning permission be refused in respect of application No. DC/15/094733.

#### 5. 13 St Donatt's Road, SE14 (Item 5 on the agenda)

The Planning Officer outlined details of the proposal for the construction of a part one/part three storey extension to the side and rear and a roof extension to the rear roof slope, together with installation of roof lights within front and rear roof slopes and alterations to the front and rear elevations, to provide one, four-bedroom house, one, one-bedroom, one, two-bedroom and one, three-bedroom self-contained flats.

The officer highlighted the high PTAL rating and the parking space for the house and car club details, access to the building, proposed elevations and section, the layout of the flats and materials.

Members asked the officer questions regarding the stacking of bathrooms/bedrooms within the building; which was considered acceptable and condition 9 (car club membership) and the existing on-street parking stress.

The highways officer stated than less than 50% of householders own a car in the borough and that the conversion of the property would not add to the existing car use for the site.

The Committee received verbal and pictorial representation from Mr Sam Selenky the Architect. Mr Selenky spoke to members of the design features of the proposal, the landscaping of the front and rear gardens, bin storage, the retention of one parking space and the proposal having a better reconfiguration of space.

Members asked the architect questions regarding mitigation of transmission of noise between flats and the width of the new house.

The Committee received verbal representation from Mary Kirk a local resident. Ms Kirk showed members photographs of existing on-street parking in the road and spoke of the parking stress being at 100%, double parking, being unable to control car club membership, the proposal not alleviating housing pressure, overdevelopment of the site.

The highways officer outlined how the parking survey was executed to reflect the true number of residents parking in the road and stated that new development in high PTAL areas does not usually have parking attached. The current parking stress was acknowledged, however, members were informed that parking was available a reasonable walk away.

Councillor Walsh suggested the introduction of a car parking zone (CPZ) and calming measures rather than car club membership. The Highways officers encouraged residents to seek implementation of a CPZ in the area.

Councillor Walsh moved a motion to approve the officer's recommendation, with amendments to the car club condition, and approve planning permission. It was seconded by Councillor Jeffrey.

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Councillors Amrani (Chair), Paschoud, Bourne, Kennedy, Raven, Till, Walsh and Jeffrey

ABSTAINED: Councillor Adefiranye

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted in respect of application No. DC/17/100547

Amended condition: Prior to occupation of any of the residential units hereby approved, evidence shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate that car club membership for the occupiers of each of the flats has been provided. The memberships shall be a minimum of two years in duration, commence within 1 month of occupation of the relevant unit and apply 7 days a week.

**Reason:** To limit car ownership/use and encourage sustainable modes of transport in accordance with Policies Objective 9: Transport and accessibility and Core Strategy Policy 14: Sustainable movement and transport (June 2011), and DM Policy 29 Car parking of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).

The meeting ended at 10.15pm. Chair

19<sup>th</sup> October 2017