

ROYAL BOROUGH OF GREENWICH
WOOLWICH & THAMESMEAD AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

TUESDAY 22 JUNE 2021 AT 6.30 PM

MINUTES

PRESENT:

Members:

Councillor Stephen Brain (Chair), Councillors Gary Dillon, John Fahy and Clive Mardner (from Item 6)

Officers

Area Planning Manager (East), Planning Officer x 3, and Committee Services Officer

Other Councillors in Attendance

Councillor Matthew Morrow

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

The Chair varied the order of business and took Item 6 after Item 3

**Item
No.**

1 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Sandra Bauer and John Hills.

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 8 Streamdale, Abbey Wood, London, SE2 0PD

The Planning Officer gave an illustrated introduction to the report.

In response to questions from the Committee, the Planning Officer replied that internal works had taken place to divide the property into two but he stated that the property was currently one dwelling unit. The garden had been also been subdivided. There was no legal limit on how much extensions to a property could be proposed, but there were limits on how much could be done under permitted development. The proposed Condition 6 restricted permitted development so any further extensions would require planning permission. The previously refused application which was appealed against did specifically note that part of the reason for refusal was undersized bedrooms and the Appeal Inspector overturned the reason for refusal specifically. He confirmed that parking surveys typically took place late at night to get a feel of the base level of residential parking of those who actually lived in the area. He said that there was no biodiversity assessment and none was expected for this kind of development. The nearest tree was in a neighbouring property and was far enough away from the proposed development to not be of concern.

The Committee was addressed by Ward Councillor Matthew Morrow, on behalf of Plumstead Ward Councillors. He noted that some works had gone ahead which while not a planning matter was presumptuous. It was felt that the previous reasons for refusal still stood; concerns were raised about the impact on parking. Councillor Morrow recognised that the Committee was constrained by the results of the previous appeal decision.

In response to a question from the Committee, Councillor Matthew Morrow replied that it was felt that a precedent was being set in a peaceful cul-de-sac with family homes being turned into a business opportunity.

The Committee was addressed by the agent for the applicant. He detailed the nature of the extensions and changes that had previously taken place to the building. He commented that the traffic survey was thorough and noted its conclusion. He rejected the objections as being too far away and not relevant.

The agent for the applicant refuted that the building had been sub-divided but rather that it should be two separate premises titles, 8 and 8A, the original building and an extension which just so happened to have been previously linked, and that 8 was now under different ownership and his client owned 8A. He said that though linked there had been two entrances.

In response to questions from the Committee the agent for the applicant stated that the house and garden had not been sub-divided, but rather there had been a separation of the two premises titles. He contested that the application related to 8 and not 8A, that they were now separate properties as proven by 8 having already been sold. He confirmed his client was the applicant for the application recently refused.

The Area Planning Manager (East) advised that it was the planning authority's understanding that at the time of the application a signed Certificate A was submitted for sole ownership of the property. A Certificate B for shared interest was subsequently received. She explained that it was possible for an applicant to submit an application that did not cover their sole ownership, there could be multiple people that had an interest in the land. She advised that it was the planning authority's understanding that the correct notices had been served and that the property had always been in lawful use as a single family dwelling house and the red line boundary covered the entirety of the site and that conditions would apply to everything within the red line boundary on the application.

In response to questions from the Committee, the Area Planning Manager (East) replied that it was possible for a property to have two council tax records but not to have the lawful planning permission to be used as two separate self-contained dwelling houses, they might then submit a retrospective planning permission to convert into two separate units. She advised that from the planning perspective it was a single unit.

The meeting adjourned at 17.25 to comply with public health recommendations in relation to Covid-19 and meeting places. The meeting reconvened at 19.35.

During discussion of the matter Members recognised that they were constrained by the decision of the Planning Inspector. Members felt that there should be clarity about whether it was actually two separate properties.

The Area Planning Manager (East) advised the Committee that from the perspective of the planning authority it was a single family dwelling house, the red line boundary went around the totality. Even if there were a subdivision with the Land Registry or there were now two separate owners on the site or two separate council tax records from a planning perspective it was not a lawful division until there was planning permission to convert it into two or there was a Lawful Development Certificate.

In response to further questions from the Committee, The Area Planning Manager (East) replied that a red line boundary might cover a range of different ownership titles, it was not a material planning consideration in the assessment of an application, the onus was on the applicant to submit the correct application form.

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

Resolved -

That full planning permission for a part-retrospective application for the construction of two (2) single storey rear extensions and other associated external alterations to allow the conversion of the house into two (2) self-contained C3 houses. (Resubmission) be granted.

Subject to:

- i. The conditions in appendix 2 of the report, to be detailed in the notice of determination; and
- ii. The Authorisation of the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control to make any minor change to the detailed working of the recommended conditions, as set out in the report and addendum report, where the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control considers it appropriate, before issuing the decision notice.

5 340 Wickham Lane, Plumstead, London, SE2 0NZ

The Planning Officer gave an illustrated introduction to the report.

In response to questions from the Planning Officer he confirmed that the dormer window had been built. There would be a degree of overlooking but

generally no greater or worse than from the first floor windows below or from the properties either side so it did not generally raise concerns. Details had not been provided with regard to the number of bins, but refuse provision would be dealt with by the proposed Condition 2.

The Committee was addressed by Ward Councillor Matthew Morrow, on behalf of Plumstead Ward Councillors. Councillor Morrow said that Plumstead Ward Councillors objected to the conversion of family homes to HMOs. It was acknowledged that there was a need for HMOs as well as family homes but it was felt the balance was wrong and that Plumstead had too many HMOs. Some streets underwent a change in character as the number of HMOs increased. Families who wanted to live in Plumstead were being outbid by businesses who want to turn houses into a profit-making venture. Councillor Morrow indicated that most of Plumstead was subject to parking stress and that a HMO could lead to an increase in vehicles being parked in the area.

The Committee was addressed by the applicant. He understood there was issues with poor standard HMOs. He explained the reason why the property was being converted to a HMO. He detailed the proposal which sought to provide spacious accommodation for young people who were sometime working in the city or sometimes working from home. He said the aim was to have 5 bins.

In response to questions from the Committee, the applicant replied that it would be operated by a local management company who ran about 15 HMOs in the area. The company would select the occupants and be on call as required.

During discussion of the matter Members noted the reason for the proposal and were satisfied with the interior design.

The matter was put to the vote and it was unanimously

Resolved –

That full planning permission for the proposed change of use from dwelling into HMO (6 people) with associated internal alterations be granted.

Subject to:

- i. The conditions in appendix 2 of the report, to be detailed in the notice of determination; and

- ii. The Authorisation of the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control to make any minor change to the detailed working of the recommended conditions, as set out in the report, where the Assistant Director of Planning & Building Control considers it appropriate, before issuing the decision notice.

6 38 Wellington Street, Woolwich, London, SE18 6PE

As no one was present for the applicant the Chair proposed that the item be deferred.

The proposal was put to the vote and it was unanimously

Resolved -

That consideration of the application be deferred to the next meeting of the Committee, because the applicant, nor their representative, were in attendance and Members felt that there were questions they needed clarification on.

The meeting closed at 8.05 pm

Chair