

ROYAL BOROUGH OF GREENWICH
GREENWICH AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

TUESDAY, 21ST JULY 2020 AT 6.30 PM

MINUTES

PRESENT:

Members:

Councillor Stephen Brain (Chair), Councillors Norman Adams, Geoffrey Brighty, Pat Greenwell, Chris Lloyd, Mariam Lolevar, Maureen O'Mara and Aidan Smith.

Officers

Assistant Director of Planning, Area Planning Manager (West), Planning Officer and Corporate Governance Officers x 2

The Chair made introductions and explained the procedures that would be followed at the meeting.

**Item
No.**

1 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Mehboob Khan.

2 Urgent Business

There was no urgent business.

3 Declarations of Interest

Cllr Lolevar declared that she was acquainted with the niece of an objector to Item 6. The Chair confirmed that Cllr Lolevar would not take part in the vote for this item.

Resolved –

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

4 Minutes

Resolved -

That the minutes of the minutes of the meeting held on 10th March 2020 be agreed as a true and accurate record.

5 Election of Vice Chair

Councillors Lolevar and Adams were nominated. Councillor Lolevar received four votes and Councillor Adams received one vote.

Resolved -

That Councillor Lolevar be elected as Vice Chair of the Greenwich Area Planning Committee for the duration of the municipal year.

6 12 Shooters Hill Road, Blackheath, London, SE3 7BD ref. 20/0518 & 20/0519/L

The Planning Officer gave an illustrative presentation of the application.

In response to a question from Members, the Planning Officer confirmed that the proposed steps going down to the garden were for access only and would not allow sufficient space for a table and chairs. Under the current proposal it would not result in loss of privacy for the neighbours at number 10.

In response to a question from Members, the Planning Officer confirmed that underpinning would be dealt with by building control regulations. A basic impact assessment would be submitted before works started.

Members noted that if the application was approved it would be subject to approval of a basic impact assessment. Officers advised that if Members were minded to approve the application, a condition could be added that enabled neighbours to have site of the impact assessment before it was submitted to the Council for discharge.

Officers advised that the application had been assessed by the Council's Conversation Officer who was happy that the inclusion of the railing and gates would not adversely harm the character and appearance of the host property or the setting of the wider group of listed buildings.

The Committee was addressed by Mr Edward Britton.

Mr Britton confirmed that he resided with his family in the neighbouring property. He was concerned about loss of privacy. He advised that the development at number 14 should not be used as a precedent. The development here was narrower and did not extend as far as the boundary wall. Further, the window on the back elevation was nowhere near the boundary.

Mr Britton further advised that serious overshadowing of main living room would be caused by the proposed build of the high brick wall and submitted that it should not be allowed.

The terrace would also add to loss of privacy. It was big enough for a table and chairs or a sofa. If people stood on it and looked backwards, they would see through his window.

Mr Britton informed Members that when the houses were built, a large ventilation cavity was incorporated underground all the way around the basement. This aimed to keep the air circulating outside the walls to prevent damp. The planning proposals would require the demolition of some of the original Georgian brickwork that formed this cavity.

The Committee was addressed by Mr John Corp.

Mr Corp advised that the villas (numbers 2-20) were Georgian and any decision should be judged in this context.

The Committee was addressed by Mr Howard Shields from the Blackheath Society.

Mr Shields felt the Planning Officer did not do full justice to the comments of the Blackheath Society in her report. They had raised concerns regarding the sub-basement. The plans completely failed to comply with the latest policy and guidance from the Council and he did not accept that the application should ignore this guidance. Significant excavation would be necessary in houses with no real foundations.

The Committee was addressed by Mr Richard Butt from the Greenwich Society.

Mr Butt was objecting in particular to the proposed depth of the sub-basement garage. The ramp down to the garage together with the over sized garage door would create the impression of a void at the front of the house which would weaken the classical symmetry of the house which formed part of an important row.

Mr Butt was also concerned about the electrically operated gates at the front which he felt were inappropriate for the setting.

The Committee was addressed by Mr Dominic Lamb, architect and agent.

Mr Lamb explained that both he and his client had worked closely with the planning team to develop a high quality and sensitively designed proposal that respected the host listed building and surrounding conversation area. All relevant policy and guidance had been satisfied and work had been undertaken in response to pre-application advice. This included:

- Reducing proposed height of side extension in line with height of number 14;
- Reinstatement of central window at first floor;
- Numerous iterations of how the stairs to the second floor could be reconfigured to retain the planned form of the first floor whilst allowing safe access to the second floor;
- Boundary treatment and gates to the front that were in keeping with the existing character of the area and did not exceed the height of adjacent railings;
- Omission of ground floor coats cupboard from the application.

Mr Lamb stated that all the points raised by objectors had been addressed in the Planning Officer's report.

With regard to the impact on amenity to number 10, the intention was to address the height of the boundary treatment in this area to afford privacy to number 10 and the Applicant. Mr Lamb proposed that details of the wall could be conditioned if planning permission was granted.

Mr Lamb further submitted that this application mirrored applications permitted at numbers 8 and 14.

In response to a question from Members, Mr Lamb confirmed that the staircase could be redesigned to reduce the size of the terrace to a standard step by omitting the playroom from the back at the lower level.

In response to a question from Members, Mr Lamb confirmed that the double construction at basement level could be maintained by reducing the width of the basement.

Members felt that a site visit was necessary in order to assess the impact of any overshadowing at the rear, and the concerns around loss of privacy by use of the proposed terraced area. A motion to defer the planning application was moved, seconded and put to the vote and declared carried.

Resolved:

That this application be deferred for a site visit to examine issues around privacy and overshadowing.

7 Blackheath Service Station, 37A Shooters Hill, Blackheath, SE3 7HS ref. 19/4145/F

The Planning Officer gave an illustrative presentation of the application.

In response to a question from Members, the Planning Officer confirmed that the underground petrol interceptor was being replaced due to the existing one being located where the proposed extension would be built.

In response to a question from Members, the Planning Officer was aware there had been issues with waste at the rear of the site. As part of the proposal a new bin store would be located at the front of the service station.

In response to a question from Members, the Planning Officer confirmed that no new light would be emitted from the proposals.

The Committee was addressed by Ms Barbara Fitzpatrick, making objection.

Ms Fitzpatrick was concerned about the negative impact on her family's ability to enjoy their outside space. Further, a tree at the end of their garden attracted a variety of birds. She referenced the Council's Greener Greenwich Strategy which safeguarded residents against the impact of air pollution and climate change. She felt this was contradictory to the proposals.

Ms Fitzpatrick advised there was a problem with rats in the area which she claimed stemmed from the petrol station. She felt the new two-metre bin store would not address this problem.

Ms Fitzpatrick further submitted that her youngest daughter had a heart condition. She was concerned this would be exacerbated with increased use of the petrol station and with the increase of dust during building works.

Members proposed a construction method statement setting out the hours of work.

The Assistant Director of Planning confirmed it would not be possible to apply a condition for the applicant to obscure the fencing with foliage. The condition would not be enforceable.

The Committee was addressed by Julian Sutton, agent for the applicant.

This application was a resubmission of a previous planning application which was refused on 5th July 2019. He explained this application fully addressed the previous reasons for refusal.

The ability for local residents and motorists to undertake top up shopping in a convenient location was a significant benefit and needed to be supported. It allowed motorists to avoid unnecessary journeys and local residents to walk to pick up supplies, avoiding unnecessary vehicular trips.

Motor Fuel Group (MFG) had sought to engage with the residents of numbers 25 and 27 Stratheden Road. Residents at number 27 had no objection to the application but they have not received a response to their calling card from number 25.

Since the last application, the height of the proposed extension had been reduced by 40% to 3m. The fence had been proposed to obscure it from the view of neighbouring properties but the applicant was happy to exclude it from the proposals if the residents so wished.

The applicant was happy for a construction method statement condition to be attached and they were happy to discuss with neighbours when works would commence in order to provide advance notice.

Mr Sutton would relate the rat issue to the applicant.

Mr Sutton confirmed the proposal had no effect on the tree in Ms Fitzpatrick's garden. The Council's tree officer had suggested a condition regarding an arboricultural impact assessment to protect the tree and address the concerns of Ms Fitzpatrick.

In response to a question from the Committee, Mr Sutton confirmed that he would happy to speak to the resident about changing the fence to trellis or removing it from the proposals entirely.

The Chair put the recommendation to grant planning permission for the construction of a single storey extension to side and rear of the existing forecourt sales building and insertion of a new class 1 petrol interceptor to the rear of the site, alterations to shop front including new auto sliding door and provision of a 2 metre high timber bin store and additional boundary treatment to the west of the site, subject to the conditions set out in Appendix 2 of the report, to the vote with 8 Members in favour, 0 against and 0 abstentions.

The Chair confirmed the application was approved subject to an arboricultural impact assessment and construction method statement.

The meeting closed at 8.36pm

Chair

GREENWICH AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

TUESDAY, 8TH DECEMBER 2020 AT 6.30 PM

MINUTES

PRESENT:

Members:

Councillors Stephen Brain (Chair), Geoffrey Brighty, Pat Greenwell, Mehboob Khan, Chris Lloyd, Mariam Lolevar and Aidan Smith

Officers

Assistant Director of Planning, Area Planning Manager (West), Planning Officer and Corporate Governance Officers x 2

The Chair made introductions and explained the procedures that would be followed at the meeting.

Item No.

2 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Maureen O'Mara.

3 Urgent Business

There was none.

6 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Lolevar declared that she knew the applicant for Item 6. The chair confirmed that should would not be permitted to participate in this item.

Cllr Brighty declared he knew the family of the applicant for Item 6 in his capacity as Councillor for Blackheath and Westcombe Ward. The Chair confirmed that this did not rule out his participation.

Resolved –

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

8 36 Kidbrooke Grove, Kidbrooke, London, SE3 0LG ref. 20/0742/HD

The Chair confirmed the names of members of the public who had registered to speak.

The Planning Officer gave an illustrative presentation of the application.

In response to a question from the Committee, the Planning Officer confirmed there would be around a 28cm difference between the height of the boundary treatment and the apex of the greenhouse. He declared it would barely be seen from the street. Further, the neighbouring property, no. 44, would not be adversely affected by the planting of the trees. If the occupants considered the planting undesirable, this could be discussed as part of the conditions relating to the landscaping.

Councillor Brighty referred to Condition 3 regarding the brickwork. He asked how strictly could this be enforced. The Planning Officer explained that the Conservation Officer had been consulted in relation to this condition and it would be strictly enforced.

Councillor Lolevar asked why loss of garden space was not considered a concern with this application. The Planning Officer said the materials used would be high quality, and the combination of soft and hard landscaping would enhance the existing garden area and positively contribute to the architectural significance of a listed building. In addition the Conservation Officer was satisfied with the proposals.

Cllr Greenwell enquired as to the loss of light raised by local residents. The Planning Officer showed the Committee where the hornbeam trees would be located and also the window of the neighbouring property which was significantly obscured by existing foliage.

The Chair put to the Committee that the item be deferred for a site visit to gain a clearer understanding of the application. All Members were in favour.

Resolved:

That the matter be deferred for a site visit in order to gain a better understanding of the proposed application.

9 23 Wycherley Close, Blackheath, London, SE3 7QH ref. 20/1024/HD

Councillor Lolevar left the meeting.

The Planning Officer gave an illustrative presentation of the application.

The Committee was addressed by Farah Caswell, speaking against the application. She objected due to the proposed staircase which would be adjoined to the party wall, running behind both bedrooms in her property. She had been under the impression that noise was a planning consideration. She could already hear the occupants of number 23 climbing the stairs from the ground floor. She appreciated that informative guidance would be provided for construction noise. She asked the Committee to object to the proposed plans.

The Planning Manager confirmed that internal works to the property did not require planning permission. All the works requiring permission were external. The party wall matter fell outside of the planning process and was a private matter but should be agreed between the neighbours before commencement of works.

The matter was put to the vote with five members voting in favour and one voting against.

Resolved:

That planning permission be granted for the installation of three roof lights to front roof slope and two roof lights to rear roof slope, subject to the conditions set.

The meeting closed at 7.23pm.

Chair