

**ROYAL BOROUGH OF GREENWICH**

**WOOLWICH & THAMESMEAD AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**WEDNESDAY 28 APRIL 2021 AT 6.30 PM**

**MINUTES**

**PRESENT:**

**Members:**

Councillor Stephen Brain (Chair), Councillors Gary Dillon, David Gardner, Averil Lekau (from Item 6), Clive Mardner, Dominic Mbang (from Item 5) and John Hills

**Officers**

Assistant Director Planning and Building Control, Area Planning Manager (East), Planning Officer x 2, Conservation Officer and Committee Services Officer

**Other Councillors in Attendance**

Councillor Ann-Marie Cousins

At the commencement of the meeting, the Chair announced the procedure which would be followed for considering planning applications.

**Item**

**No.**

**1 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Nigel Fletcher.

**2 Urgent Business**

There was no urgent business.

### **3 Declarations of Interest**

#### **Resolved -**

That the list of Councillors' memberships as Council appointed representatives on outside bodies, joint committees and school governing bodies be noted.

### **4 The Stables - East wing, Charlton House, Charlton Road, Greenwich, London SE7 8RE**

The Planning Officer gave an illustrated introduction to the report.

The Committee was addressed by the agent for the applicant, and the representative of the proposed user of the site. It was noted it was not always possible to provide full disabled access to listed buildings; the applicant had submitted an access statement on the matter indicating what could be done. It was added that previous recent usage and planning permission had been without disabled access. If disabled access was required it was likely that part of the site would remain vacant. The proposed usage as a nursery was explained; it was stated that the internal space for that was in excess of requirements.

In response to questions from the Committee, the agent for the applicant, and the representative of the proposed user of the site replied that there would be a travel plan and information packs for parents about sustainable travel methods. It was their understanding from Greenwich Early Years that there was a shortage of nursery places; they would be happy to work with other nursery providers in the area. Early Years were happy with the proposal and would undertake an assessment once the nursery was ready; Ofsted would visit only after the nursery was ready to open. The representative of the proposed user of the site stated it was their first venture as a nursery.

During discussion of the matter it was noted that it was important to ensure the sustainability of the whole of the Charlton House estate, and it was recognised that the applicant had made some effort to address the issues of accessibility and travel.

The matter was put to the vote and it was unanimously

## **Resolved –**

### *Application A (20/3357/F)*

That full planning permission be granted for the change of use of the East Wing of The Stables from Carers' Centre to Children's Day Nursery at first floor and Charity Offices at ground floor and provision of outdoor play space.

Subject to the conditions in appendix 2 of the report, as amended by the second addendum report, to be detailed in the notice of determination. The Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control is authorised to make any minor change to the detailed working of the recommended conditions, as set out in the report and its addendums, where the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control considers it appropriate, before issuing the decision notice.

### *Application B (20/3358/L)*

That listed building consent be granted for the change of use of the East Wing of The Stables from Carers' Centre to Children's Day Nursery at first floor and Charity Offices at ground floor and provision of outdoor play space.

Subject to the conditions in appendix 2 of the report, as amended by the second addendum report, to be detailed in the notice of determination. The Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control is authorised to make any minor change to the detailed working of the recommended conditions, as set out in the report and its addendums, where the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control considers it appropriate, before issuing the decision notice.

## **5 96 Woodhurst Road, Abbey Wood, London, SE2 9HT**

The Planning Officer gave an illustrated introduction to the report. He indicated that the infill extension was now substantially completed.

In response to questions from the Committee, the Planning Officer confirmed that while there would be a significant reduction in garden space, a substantial garden would still remain and in line with policy. He indicated that the loss of vegetation was not considered to be sufficient enough to request re-provision of it. He confirmed that the current application addressed previous concerns regarding proximity to the road. It was expected that emergency vehicles could use the hard standing outside the garages. He explained that the building was for a family, and it was not for a HMO. The

part of the site that already been developed was an extension and had been done so under delegated permission; the application was not for retrospective permission.

The Committee was addressed by Ward Councillor Ann-Marie Cousins. She indicated that because substantial building works had already taken place that had caused some confusion. She was glad to hear that it was not a HMO. Councillor Cousins expressed concern over the size of the development. She questioned why they could not harvest rainwater, she highlighted that there were problems with water retention in the area, or make use of solar energy.

In response to a question from the Committee, Councillor Cousins said that the resident across the road from the site, for example, thought that the current works were the finished development not that there was to be further development.

The Committee was addressed by the architect for the applicant. He suggested that it was a modest sized development. The proposal respected the existing building and a good side sized garden would be retained. He highlighted the history of applications and proposals. He noted there was landscaping proposed as part of the development.

In response to questions from the Committee, the architect for the applicant commented that the developer was a local resident and lived at the site for over a decade and that he would ensure it was a good quality development. He said that a flood risk assessment had been done; no rain water harvesting measures were proposed but it could be expected that the owner of the premises would be open to the introduction of water butts. He said that the front of the site would be landscaped, but stated his client did not own the adjacent concrete area and so could not do anything to it.

The Area Planning Manager (East) advised the Committee that water butts were not something Greenwich as the planning authority recommended but Members could consider a condition to address the water harvesting issue.

The Planning Officer informed the Committee that it was not known who owned the adjacent concrete area. Where there was a loss of biodiversity in a development then there might be a requirement for re-provisioning elsewhere but that was not applicable in this case. He clarified the reduction in garden space but indicated the space was sufficient in terms of planning policy. The Assistant Director Planning and Building Control advised the Committee that it would be disproportionate to try to secure mitigation for off-site planting particularly if it relied on access to third-party land

There was a discussion of the matter.

Members noted that the reduction of the garden space was less than under permitted development and that the garden remained an adequate size, that the development was similar to those in the immediate area, and that it was not going to be a HMO. It was requested that the applicant consider green measures such as use of solar panels. It was felt engagement should have been better as there had been confusion as to what the actual development was.

In authorising the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control to make any minor change to the detailed working of the conditions where considered appropriate, Members recommended that there be provision for water harvesting detailed in the decision notice<sup>1</sup>.

The matter was put to the vote and it was unanimously

### **Resolved –**

That full planning permission be granted for the erection of a two storey two-bedroom dwelling attached to 96 Woodhurst Road and associated works.

Subject to the conditions in appendix 2 of the report, to be detailed in the notice of determination. The Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control is authorised to make any minor change to the detailed working of the recommended conditions, as set out in the report and its addendums, where the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control considers it appropriate, before issuing the decision notice.

---

<sup>1</sup> On the basis of the Members' recommendation, the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control made a change to the conditions included in the decision notice with the addition as follows:

- a) Prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved, details of the proposed water harvesting methods should be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority
- b) The water harvesting methods approved should be implemented prior to the occupation of the development and should be maintained for the lifetime of the development thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that proper mitigation methods to reduce the risk of flooding is installed and to ensure compliance with Policies D11 and S112 of the London Plan (2021) and Policy E2 of the Royal Greenwich Local Plan: Core Strategy with Detailed Policies (2014).

## **6 13 Bracondale Road, Abbey Wood, London, SE2 9HR**

The Planning Officer gave an illustrated introduction to the report.

In response to questions from the Committee, the Planning Officer stated that it was not a retrospective application and he commented on the history of the extensions to the building. He stated that disability accessibility requirements were not required for conversions from Class C3 dwellings into HMOs. He clarified that there would be a lounge-kitchen space; it was considered that the relevant kitchen facilities could be adequately provided within that space. It was accepted that it would be better for the downstairs bedroom to be adjacent to a communal hallway rather than the lounge-kitchen but that did not constitute a reason for refusing the application. He confirmed that the previous refusal with regard to bedroom size had been addressed by moving an internal wall to make it larger. He said that there was no requirement for an applicant to illustrate bathroom facilities within planning drawings; Licensing when determining the application for a HMO licence would consider whether there were adequate toilet facilities. He said that there was no requirement to have a side access to the back garden; if the cycling parking was brought to the front it would have to be within the red line boundary of the application site. He confirmed that the environment agency were consulted about the existing hard standing and had not raised an objection to the proposal; the hard standing was the currently existing lawful situation.

The Area Planning Manager (East) advised the Committee that from a planning perspective they needed to consider whether the size of the rooms were acceptable but they did not necessarily need to see the details of bathroom arrangements as it would be for HMO licensing to consider the details of toilet facilities, and the issue of the insulation between the downstairs bedroom in relation to the lounge-kitchen would be covered under building regulations.

The Committee was addressed by Ward Councillor Ann-Marie Cousins. She felt the HMO proposal was not in keeping with the area, and highlighted that Ward Councillors received complaints about HMOs for example over noise and the dumping of rubbish. Councillor Cousins did not think that the lounge-kitchen space was a suitable arrangement. She raised concerns about the reality of the parking proposals and the number of occupants.

The Planning Officer advised the meeting that the HMO proposal was for a maximum of six persons only. The Chair noted that HMOs were subject to

inspection and if they were found to contain more people than licensed for then they would be closed down.

The Committee was addressed by the applicant's agent. It was indicated that the reasons for previous refusal had been addressed. He confirmed the application was for a HMO of six occupants only. It was noted that the bathroom facilities would have to be adequate to obtain the HMO licence, and while ideally they should have been indicated on the plan it was not a planning requirement. It was noted that the relation of the bedroom adjacent to the lounge-kitchen would be considered under building regulations. While there was no requirement for disability access the ground floor front bedroom was big enough to accommodate a disabled person. He said it was reasonable to have the cycle storage in the back garden and for the cycles to be carried through, but provision at the front could be considered if the Committee desired.

In response to questions from the Committee, the applicant's agent replied that the intention was to retain the two parking spaces which was the maximum allowed; none of the neighbours had objected about parking and it was not expected that the proposal would have an undue impact on parking in the area. It was noted the site was near public transport. Any occupation above their maximum permitted number would be a breach of the HMO licence and could result in a heavy fine which was a deterrent. As far as was known there used to be four adults living in the property. The hard standing was permeable and had been there for some time.

During discussion of the matter Members indicated they were not satisfied with the proposal. Members were not happy with the layout, or the lack of details, and felt they were deferring responsibility to HMO licensing and building regulations. Concern was expressed about HMO availability for disabled people. The Chair requested Officers look to revise to the policy with regard to HMOs.

The Assistant Director Planning and Building Control advised that HMO policy could be developed through the Local Plan and SPD policy. The Committee were advised that planning permission did not override other legislation relating to HMO licensing and building regulations.

The matter was put to the vote, and with four votes in favour and three abstentions it was

**Resolved –**

That full planning permission be granted for the change of use from Residential (Class C3) to HMO for 6 occupants (Class C4)

Subject to the conditions in appendix 2 of the report, to be detailed in the notice of determination. The Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control is authorised to make any minor change to the detailed working of the recommended conditions, as set out in the report and its addendums, where the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control considers it appropriate, before issuing the decision notice.

The meeting closed at 9.02 pm

---

Chair