

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE MINUTES

Tuesday 31 August 2021 at 7.00 pm
Committee Room (B6) - Lambeth Town Hall, Brixton, London, SW2 1RW

PRESENT: Councillor Scarlett O'Hara (Vice-Chair), Councillor Malcolm Clark, Councillor Mohammed Seedat, Councillor Iain Simpson and Councillor Becca Thackray

APOLOGIES: Councillor Ibrahim Dogus and Councillor Joanne Simpson

1 Declaration of Pecuniary Interests

There were none. The Vice-Chair chaired the meeting due to the Chair being absent.

2 Minutes

RESOLVED: The minutes of the 29 June and 13 July meetings were agreed as the correct records of proceedings.

The Chair noted that the meeting was quorate.

The Chair announced a provisional timetable for the meeting in accordance with Standing Order 9.9.1.

3 13 Bondway (Oval) 20/03484/RG3

Case No. 20/03484/RG3, (agenda item three, page 29 of the agenda pack and page nine of the first addendum).

The Planning Officer stated that following publication of the agenda, there were three objections received on behalf of neighbouring occupiers of the site. Officers also advised that the item be deferred as an updated noise assessment report that Officers had used to inform their assessment had not been made publicly available and as such were recommending the deferral of the case to allow for the publication of the noise assessment report.

The Chair proposed that the item be deferred to a future meeting.

20/03484/RG3:

It was **MOVED** by Councillor O'Hara, **SECONDED** by Councillor Clark, and

RESOLVED, unanimously

To defer consideration of the application.

4 **Geoffrey Close Estate, Geoffrey Close (Herne Hill) 20/03257/FUL**

Case No. 20/03257/FUL, (agenda item 4, page 69 of the agenda pack, page 16 of the first addendum and page 11 of the second addendum).

The Planning Officer gave a presentation and explained that:

- The proposal was to demolish the existing buildings to facilitate the comprehensive redevelopment of the Geoffrey Close Estate.
- There would be six residential buildings ranging in height from 5 to 13 storeys, which would provide 441 residential dwellings and associated community facilities including community centre and gym as well as associated landscaping, public realm, car and cycle parking and infrastructure.
- There would be a headline affordable housing provision of 50.5%, with 70% of these units being socially rented units and 30% being intermediate (both London Living Rent and shared ownership).
- The existing ball court would be removed and replaced by an improved children's play area and a contribution of £25,000 for off-site play improvements. There would be a gym and community centre provided on the site, which would be available for residents of the estate.
- Officers gave details of options to address existing housing quality issues including refurbishment and infill development, as well as the proposed regeneration, with the latter being the most appropriate option. Officers explained how the proposal would be in line with the Mayor's practice for estate regeneration including obtaining support from existing residents via a ballot.
- A housing survey undertaken on the existing site indicated that 40% of properties were overcrowded and many units were undersized when compared to current space standards. The existing tenants, who would be moving into bigger units with comparable bedspaces, would not see their rent increased.
- If granted, the applicant's decant strategy would minimise disruption to residents with a single move, with the applicant to cover the moving costs for existing tenants and also provide a one-off payment to help residents settle into their new homes. Noting the overall provision of habitable rooms, there would be a significant uplift in affordable housing
- The height and massing of the proposal would be visible from Ruskin Park, a Grade II listed park located 800 metres south of the site. Officers confirmed there would not be a detrimental impact on the setting of the park or other views.
- The daylight consultant summarised internal daylight performance and noted that 86% of all rooms would satisfy the BRE recommendations for daylight and 56% would for sunlight. One of the four amenity spaces in the surrounding area of the site would meet the BRE guidelines for daylight and sunlight, the other three would not.
- The daylight and sunlight impact on the neighbouring properties were explained in detail, with 50% and 75% of neighbours meeting the vertical sky component (VSC) and no skyline contour (NSC) recommendations respectively. 84% of neighbours would achieve the sunlight requirements.
- An explanation on the daylight impacts on the neighbouring properties was given including those classified as major adverse, which included consideration of use of rooms, the number of rooms and the design of existing buildings including overhanging structures and blinkered windows.
- The applicant proposed to minimise water consumption through water efficiency measures.
- Details of the sustainable design, landscaping and transport impacts and mitigation were described. A carbon offset payment would be provided, amounting to approximately £605,925 to achieve zero carbon, which was in line with the London Plan 2021 Policy S12, minimising greenhouse gas emissions.
- There would be 15 blue badge parking spaces, and 7 general needs spaces which was a reduction of 38 parking spaces from the current site. There would be 798 long stay cycle parking spaces inclusive of 20 short stay spaces.
- The proposal would be car parking permit free with new residents not entitled to apply for

a parking permit in the CPZ. There would be an exception for existing individual residents holding estate parking permits (60 permit holders), who instead of these permits would be eligible for resident on-street permits in the CPZ (7 will be given on-site parking and there would be Blue Badge parking). Once complete the existing residents that have parking permits would need to purchase an on-street CPZ permit, with parking surveys showing adequate capacity for this.

- Two further conditions not reported in the published papers were recommended to Members relating to securing details of boundary treatment and street furniture.

The Chair noted that an objector had registered to speak but was unable to attend the meeting.

The applicant's representatives then provided the following information in support of the application:

- The application would improve and enlarge the community spaces within the vicinity of the site and was in line with Lambeth and London Plan policies.
- The existing tenants would be rehomed and would be consulted by the applicant regarding preferences of which homes they preferred.
- The applicant noted that funding had been secured from the GLA towards delivery of the scheme.
- There would be planning, and regeneration benefits of the development and it would provide net carbon reductions.
- There had been testing done to ensure that the homes regulated internal temperatures, thereby improving upon energy performance compared to the existing site.

Officers provided the following information in response to Members' questions:

- A condition had been included in the report for officers to secure a final construction and environmental management plan from the applicant. They would consult with the transport and highway team to ensure the plan included measures to mitigate impacts on the highway in relation to parking during the construction phase.
- Officers clarified the two additional conditions would require the submission of details of boundary treatment and street furniture, which may include signage.
- Every unit would have private balcony space in addition to the communal ground floor and rooftop spaces. There were a few existing properties on the site that had private gardens and officers confirmed that the proposed private amenity spaces would meet the relevant standards but could not guarantee that those with existing private gardens would be provided with a similar quantum of amenity space.
- Every roof would contribute towards biodiversity requirements, in addition to housing solar panels that sat on frames above the roof. The planted areas would have terracing at the lower shoulder level. The terraces on the top level would provide a secure private amenity space for residents.
- The upkeep of the terraces would be included in the resident management plan.
- The difference in the types of balconies were due to residents' preferences expressed during the consultation carried out by the applicant. Further to this, the balconies that were planned on being recessed were to ensure privacy of the neighbours.
- Every building would have two elevators, one for firefighting and one for evacuation, therefore they would both have individual power supplies and would allow for people to bring larger items into the building.
- The proposal had been reviewed by the Met Police who were satisfied with the measures to be put in place for residents' safety.
- The proposal would cause some adverse impacts on the surrounding dwellings in relation to their level of sunlight and daylight. Officers provided an explanation for some of the impacts and noted the public benefits, indicating that the scheme made the best use of the land.
- Following concerns raised by Members on the impact on neighbouring dwellings and residents, Officers advised that the scheme would benefit neighbouring residents and not just future occupiers of the estate. This included improvements to open space, new links through the site, a contribution to a new docking station, a healthy routes contribution and the employment and skills contribution the applicant was providing. There would also be the wider benefits of estate regeneration and affordable housing to the local area.

The Committee considered the information provided by officers in conjunction with the report before making the following observations:

- The scheme would provide quality housing with a visually pleasing design, contributions to training and development, and provide job opportunities for people in the local area.
- The introduction of the children's play area was welcomed due to the aspect of bringing the community together.
- Concerns were raised about the daylight and sunlight impacts on surrounding buildings and the impact on neighbouring residents, however the benefits brought by the proposed development outweighed the impact.

20/03257/FUL:

It was MOVED by Councillor O'Hara, SECONDED by Councillor Cllr Clark,

And

RESOLVED, unanimously

1. To GRANT conditional planning permission subject to completion of an agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) containing the planning obligations listed in the report and published addenda and subject to the following:
 - a. An additional condition to require details of boundary treatment;
 - b. Amendment to condition 34 to include the requirement for details of street furniture to be provided.
2. To agree delegated authority to the Director of Planning, Transport and Sustainability to:
 - a. Finalise the recommended conditions as set out in this report, addendums and/or PAC minutes; and
 - b. Negotiate, agree and finalise the planning obligations as set out in this report, addendums and/or PAC minutes pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
3. In the event that the Section 106 Agreement is not completed within six months of committee, delegated authority is given to the Director of Planning, Transport and Sustainability to refuse planning permission for failure to enter into a section 106 agreement for the mitigating contributions identified in the report, addendums and/or the PAC minutes.

The meeting ended at 8.44 pm

CHAIR
PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE
Tuesday 19 October 2021

Date of Despatch: Thursday 30 September 2021

Contact for Enquiries: Farah Hussain

Tel: 020 7926 4201

E-mail: fhussain1@lambeth.gov.uk

Web: www.lambeth.gov.uk