

# ROYAL BOROUGH OF GREENWICH

## LOCAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

TUESDAY, 26 NOVEMBER 2024 AT 6.30 PM

### MINUTES

#### **Present:**

Councillors Councillor Gary Dillon (Chair), David Gardner, Sam Littlewood, Asli Mohammed, Jo van den Broek and Pat Greenwell

#### **Under Standing Orders:**

Councillor

#### **Officers:**

Assistant Director Planning and Building Control, Area Planning Manager (East), Planning Officer, Planning Officer, Senior Principal Planning Officer, Committee Services Officer, Business Support Team Leader (Planning Administration), Senior Planning Support Officer and Assistant Head of Legal Services

At the commencement of the meeting, the Chair announced the procedure which would be followed for considering the item(s) before the Local Board Committee and confirmed the names of those who had been registered to speak, clarifying that only those people would be called to address the Planning Committee

#### **Item**

#### **No.**

#### **I Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Issy Cook, Calum O'Bryne Mulligan and Dave Sullivan.

Councillors David Gardner and Jo van den Broek were in attendance as appointed deputies.

## **2 Urgent Business**

There were no items of urgent business.

## **3 Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Pat Greenwell advised she would reclude herself, due to pre-determination, in respect of Item 7– Land to rear of 182-184 Avery Hills Road – Ref: 24/1100/F as one of the Members who called the item in for consideration.

### **Resolved -**

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

## **4 Minutes**

It was noted and agreed that the following amendments were required to the Minutes of 22 October 2024 – that Councillor Baker was not in attendance and the Councillor Jo van den Boerk should be listed as in attendance.

### **Resolved -**

That the Minutes of the meeting of the Local Planning Committee held on 24 September 2024 and 1 October 2024 and amended 22 October 2024 be agreed and signed as a true and accurate record.

## **5 24 Lucknow Street, Plumstead, London, SE18 2SN Ref: 24/2093/F**

This application was previously presented to the meeting of 22 October 2024; the Committee had accepted the objectors presentations and deferred in order to allow the applicant or their agent to attend before determining the application. The Committee re-convened consideration of the application at this point.

At the request of the Chair the Planning Officer re-presented the illustrative presentation covering the proposed layout of the development.

The applicants agent apologised that they were unable to attend the previous hearing and were in attendance to answer questions the Members had in relation to the application. He confirmed the hallway was between 90cm to one metre, which was common in similar sized HMO's.

He advised the kitchen was sufficient for the doubling of kitchen equipment and would be ventilated by way of a large window. Residents would use the kitchen and eat in their own rooms, which were furnished with table chair and small fridge, noting it would be unusual for several residents to be cooking and brining through cycles to park in the rear bays. It was common to have to take bikes through the house to rear garden storage and it was their experience that the residents preferred large rooms than a communal area and would work around each other to make living in the space work.

In respect of parking, the applicants agent felt that this was unlikely to be an issue and it was unlikely that the residents of HMO's would also own a vehicle.

In response to Members questions the applicant's agent confirmed that all rooms would have proper sound proofing.

The Area Planning manager (East) clarified that kitchen was rectangular and met the minimum size requirements for a 6 person HMO and that ventilation was not a planning consideration and, as with the kitchen set up, would be an issue for HMO Licensing. Further, minimum room sizes were set by policy but not how they were used however, if one bedroom were removed, to be used as a communal area, the size of the remaining bedrooms could be reduced. Also, there was no minimum garden space requirement for HMOS.

The Area Planning manager (East) advised that the bins must be stored in the front area of the house and access to rear garden cycle storage, via the kitchen, was not dissimilar to other consented HMO's. Whilst it may not be desirable for bikes to past two bedrooms and through a

kitchen this was acceptable and it would be for the applicant to set out how this would function, as part of the Management Plan

In considering the applicant it was expressed that all spaces were tightly to the minimum requirements, as if to get the maximum occupancy possible and felt the HMO would function better with 5 people and conversion of 1 bedroom to a living room.

Whilst HMO's provided a form of required housing discomfort was expressed at the conversion of a 3 bed family home to a 6 person HMO and was concerned at the restricted size having an impact on safety and the mental health of the occupants.

At the agreement of the Chair the applicant's agent addressed the proposal to reduce occupancy and bedrooms advising there was a high housing need that was not being met and that at 5 persons the proposal would be just viable but not at 4.

Members put further questions to the applicant's agent who confirmed the applicant had experience of managing HMOs; residents would be provided with a 24 hour emergency contact number and cleaning would be undertaken every 2 days.

A Member noted that the Members may not be happy with the proposal but were governed by planning regulations and requirements only.

The Chair put the recommendation to grant planning consent to the vote with –

2 Members in favour

1 Member against

1 Member abstaining

**Resolved –**

That full planning permission be granted for the change of use of single family dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) to five-bedroom small HMO with a maximum capacity of six persons (Use Class C4) and construction of two single-storey rear extensions, cycle and refuse storage and associated external alterations (amended description).

Consent subject to the conditions, Appendix 2 to the main report and its addendums, to be detailed in the notice of determination.

That the Assistant Director (Planning & Building Control) be authorised to make any minor changes to the detailed wording of the recommended conditions as set out in this report (Appendix 2), where the Assistant Director (Planning & Building Control) considers it appropriate, before issuing the decision notice.

## **6 113 Gregory Crescent, Eltham, SE9 5RU Ref: 23/2710/F**

The Planning Officer gave an illustrative presentation of the application, advising that Condition 2 required modification in response to an error in the application diagram, which was of a non-detrimental impact.

In reply to inquiries from Members, the Planning Officer and Senior Principal Planning Officer clarified the design deliberately intended to resemble an extension of the existing terrace. The two flank wall windows 113 to be blocked were to non-habitable rooms and would be addressed through a party wall agreement. Two off-street parking spaces would be established, one for 113 and another for the new residence, both featuring permeable surfaces and soakaway systems.

That the recommended separation distance of 18 meters between habitable rooms was acknowledged; however, a separation distance of 12.54 meters to the flank wall of 115 Gregory Crescent was deemed acceptable, as the sole window on that flank wall was to a stairwell. It was observed the proposal markedly differed from a prior application for a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) on the site, and it could not be developed as an HMO. While it was not feasible to impose restrictions on the future use of the property, any conversion to an HMO would require planning permission.

The Local Planning Committee received a presentation from the applicant's agent, who reiterated the history of the proposal, the layout, and the design objectives, they also confirmed the applicant and site owner was also the owner of 113 Gregory Crescent. The Construction Management Plan would include outline measures for dust control, noise management, and other relevant factors. Further, the previous owner

had submitted the HMO application, the current proposal was exclusively for a family residence.

In response to Members the applicant's agent advised the site was mainly hard standing and the proposal would see an increase in biodiversity.

In determining the application, it was noted that the site was tight and would produce a narrow house but would see improved biodiversity, with permeable paving and soak away and an acceptable parking level.

The Chair put the recommended proposal to grant planning consent to the vote with –

6 Members in favour

0 Members against

0 Members abstaining

### **Resolved unanimously –**

That full planning permission be granted for the erection of two storey dwelling house (C3 Use) (1 x 2 bed) with rear roof dormer, creation of two new crossovers from Gregory Place to create two hard stand parking spaces and associated waste and cycle storage. (re-consultation of amended plans).

That the Assistant Director (Planning & Building Control) be authorised to make any minor changes to the detailed wording of the recommended conditions as set out in Appendix 2 of the report, where the Assistant Director (Planning & Building Control) considers it appropriate, before issuing the decision notice.

## **7 Land to the rear of 182-184 Avery Hill Road, SE9 2EY Ref: 24/1100/F**

Councillor Pat Greenwell reclused herself in respect of this item, as one of the Members who called the item in for consideration. Further, the chair noted that photographs taken at a pre-meeting site visit had been circulated to all members of the planning committee.

Members accepted an illustrative presentation of the application, which recommended approval, from the Area Planning Manager (East) who

advised that paragraph 6.4, consultation response required amending as the three on-site car parking spaces had been removed and it was considered could be accommodated in the surrounding streets as addressed in the report.

In response to inquiries from Members, the Area Planning Manager (East) clarified that the London Plan parking guideline was 1.5 spaces for three houses. However, due to concerns raised by the Highways expert regarding the long single vehicle access route with extremely limited visibility and safety issues at the site entrance for both vehicles and pedestrians, on-site parking had been removed. Bollards would be installed to prevent vehicle access to the site, except for emergency vehicles. The parking survey revealed sufficient capacity, with public parking spaces available near the site entrance, and there is no obligation to provide on-site disability parking.

He advised that the Construction Management plan and method statement would consider the limited access and constrained nature of the site, highlighting that approval had been obtained for similarly sized developments without adverse impact to local residents. Further, due to the size of the development there was no requirement to provide wheelchair adapted properties and this could not be conditioned, however, they would still need to comply with accessible and adaptable standards.

The Area Planning Manager (East) confirmed that all trees located on the site, including those along the boundaries, would be preserved. Condition 11 required submission of a landscaping strategy, including details regarding additional trees and soft landscaping. That would also be in the communal areas to the front with the private gardens to the rear.

The Planning Committee accepted an address from Councillor Pat Greenwell, speaking as a Ward Councillor in objection to the proposal. She noted that previous applications for residential properties on this site had all been refused, noting that an application for two detached bungalows were also refused at appeal. She felt the proposed two semi-detached buildings would be an overdevelopment and create overlooking with loss of light and privacy to existing residents.

She felt the lack of onsite parking would create pressure on the already congested Avery Hill Road which could not accommodate the additional parking. Further, when the undergrowth was cut back that area was prone to flooding as there was nowhere for the water to be soaked up, noting that Holland Park Gardens had flooding issues since being developed. Further, that the site was formally part of the rear gardens to 184 and 182 and felt consent would set an unacceptable precedent for similar proposals on residential gardens.

In response to Members questions, Councillor Greenwell insisted that Avery Hill Road would not easily or safely accommodate additional parking as it was a busy and dangerous road and re-iterated the concerns raised in her address.

The Planning Committee accepted an address from a resident who advised Holland Gardens backed onto the gardens of Avery Hill Road and was prone to significant flooding issues which were not identified or addressed by the application, though the Council was aware of the issue. That there were no issues of flooding until the further development in the area noting that the Linden Homes Construction was postponed due to drainage concerns. He continued that, during heavy rainfall it was common for his garden and others along the boundary to 184 to become flooded, submerging the patio and topping the back door flagstones. *With the consent of the chair he showed Members photos, on his phone, of the flooding.*

In response to Members questions, the speaker advised that all residents back gardens flooded since the new builds.

The Area Planning Manager (East) confirmed the area was identified as Flood Risk zone one and advised that, if Members were minded, they could condition the requirement for a Sustainable drainage system (SuDS).

The Planning Committee accepted a further address from a resident of Overmead who raised concerns at the loss of day and sunlight and overlooking into existing residents gardens from the new development, leading to a loss of privacy. Further, due to the lack of parking In Avery Hill Road, Overmead was similarly congested with parking.



The planning Committee accepted an address from the applicant's agent who set out the history of the proposal, which was in line the NPPF and London Plan. The comments in respect of previously refused proposals had been taken into account as part of the design of the application. It was considered the design was sensitive to the area; all the existing trees would be retained with additional trees and landscaping and the development would be car free.

In response to Members questions the applicant's agent noted the site was located in a flood zone one area and confirmed that they would not oppose the requirement for a SuDS. The boundary treatment, particularly adjacent to Overmead, could be addressed to improve biodiversity levels and improve privacy, noting that the proposed buildings were not as tall as those in Avery Hill Road. She further confirmed that obscured glazing would be used in stair and bathroom windows and there would be no direct overlooking to other properties, either from or to the development.

The Area Planning Manager (East) advised that the separation distances to adjacent properties were similar to other properties on Avery Hill. Due to the 19 meters separation distance to the side elevation of properties in Overmead, and a window to window view line of less than a 25% angle there would be no overshadowing and there was no requirement to undertake a sun and daylight assessment as there would be no breach of BREEAM standards.

Members moved to deliberate and noting the speakers comments in respect of the possible impact on loss of day and sunlight and flooding they had to balance the advantages and disadvantages of the proposal in relation to policy.

It was considered the proposal was in keeping with the area and met housing need and it was felt there was sufficient space between the proposal and existing homes. That the the landscaping should increase privacy, assist with flooding, and soften the look of the development, but more could be done it terms of landscaping.

Surprise was expressed that speakers considered the proposal for family housing as an overdevelopment and that considering refusal of houses due to causing traffic issues was nonsense.

It was felt that the hard standing should be kept to a minimum and, where possible, should be permeable. They expressed concern at the constraints on the size of the site and, given the proximity to existing dwellings, construction should not be undertaken over weekends.

Accepting the Environment Agency website indicated the area was at low risk of flooding and surface water Members expressed concern at the points raised in respect of flooding. Further, whilst the requirement for a SuDS condition was only mandatory for major applications given the concerns raised and the applicant's willingness to accept such a condition it was felt that including a SuDS condition should be considered

The Chair summarised that the construction management plan would need to be robust and address the constraints of the site as required by Condition 4. That Condition 11 would address the issues of landscaping, noting the applicant's agent's confirmation to look at boundary treatments.,

At the consent of the Chair the Area Planning Manager (East) confirmed the applicant would need to submit details construction management plans which would address noise and vibration levels and how these would be monitored to protect residential amenity. They would also need to comply with the Councils small site construction details, which would also cover hours of operation.

The Chair put the proposal to Condition add the requirement for a SUDS in respect of flooding, which was agreed.

The Chair put the recommendation to grant consent with the additional condition requiring a SuDS to the vote with  
5 Members in favour  
0 Members against  
0 Members abstaining

**Resolved unanimously -**

That full planning permission be granted for erection of three dwellings with associated access, landscaping and refuse on land to the rear of nos. 182 - 184 Avery Hill Road.

That consent was subject to -

- the Conditions set out in Appendix 2 of the report.
- Amendment to Condition 11 to include requirement for SUDS drainage system.

That the Assistant Director (Planning & Building Control) be authorised to make any minor changes to the detailed wording of the recommended conditions as set out in Appendix 2 of the report, agreed amendment and the minutes of this Local Planning Committee meeting, where the Assistant Director (Planning & Building Control) considers it appropriate, before issuing the final decision notice.

The meeting closed at 9.10 pm

---

Chair