Open Agenda



# **Planning Committee**

Tuesday 6 March 2018 6.00 pm Ground Floor Meeting Room G02 - 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH

# Supplemental Agenda No.1

List of Contents

Item No.

Title

Page No.

 9. Development Management
 1 - 2

 Tabled item: addendum report
 1 - 2

**Contact:** Gerald Gohler on 020 7525 7420 or email: gerald.gohler@southwark.gov.uk Webpage: http://www.southwark.gov.uk

# Agenda Item 9

Item No 9	0:	Classification: Open	Date: 6 March 2018	Meeting Name: Planning Committee
Report title:			Addendum report Late observations, further information	consultation responses, and
Ward(s) or groups affected:			College	
From:			Director of Planning	

# PURPOSE

1. To advise members of observations, consultation responses and further information received in respect of the following planning applications on the main agenda. These were received after the preparation of the report and the matters raised may not therefore have been taken in to account in reaching the recommendation stated.

## RECOMMENDATION

2. That members note and consider the late observations, consultation responses and information received in respect of each item in reaching their decision.

# FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION

3. Late observations, consultation responses, information and revisions have been received in respect of the following planning applications on the main agenda:

# Item 9.1 – Application 17-AP-3070 for: Full Planning Application - BELTWOOD, 41 SYDENHAM HILL, LONDON, SE26 6TH

### Correction to paragraph 1b of case officer report

4. The case officer recommendation outlined that should an appropriate legal agreement not be signed by 30 May 2018, the director of planning shall be authorised to refuse the application in accordance with paragraph 115 of the case officer report. This is erroneous and should read paragraph 116.

### Additional representations received:

- 5. Additional comments have been raised by residents from the adjoining properties surrounding Beltwood House following the publication of the viability information on the Councils website a week prior to the committee.
- 6. The council's surveyor has responded to these questions and explained the workings and showing how the council have reached the conclusions on the viability of the scheme that it would provide a profit on cost of 20%, however would not viably be able to provide affordable housing. The local resident did raise two further points:
  - The garden balances the views at St Clements Heights, the extra costs of maintaining them has not been factored in and capitalised.
  - A direct comparison on floorspace has also to be justified. Much of the Beltwood development is underground, and as such cannot attract premium rates.

<u>Officer response</u>: Valuation is a largely a matter of opinion and the weight the Valuer attaches to differing factors between the subject and the comparable.

- i) This would be covered by a service charge from the Purchasers at Beltwood House and is a factor that would be taken into account when purchasing the property.
- ii) The Crest Nicolson development close to the subject is considerably denser than that proposed at Beltwood, purchasers will not enjoy near the degree of exclusivity that Beltwood provides – which has value. Officers do not agree that much of Beltwood is underground and would state that reasonable adjustment in value has been made where this is the case.
- 7. One additional objection has been received which raised concerns regarding the scale and massing of the terraced houses being excessive and that this should be a single storey plus basement only. Concerns are also raised regarding the use of the roofs for roof terraces.

<u>Officer comment</u>: The terraced houses replace two existing two storey buildings which are largely on the same footprint. The buildings would pass the 25 degree daylight tests so that no noticeable daylight impacts would be had. A condition has been proposed to limit the use of the roofs for maintenance only.

## **REASON FOR URGENCY**

8. Applications are required by statute to be considered as speedily as possible. The application has been publicised as being on the agenda for consideration at this meeting of the planning committee and applicants and objectors have been invited to attend the meeting to make their views known. Deferral would delay the processing of the applications and would inconvenience all those who attend the meeting

### **REASON FOR LATENESS**

9. The new information, comments reported and corrections to the main report and recommendation have been noted and/or received since the committee agenda was printed. They all relate to an item on the agenda and members should be aware of the objections and comments made.

### **BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Individual files	· ·	Planning enquiries telephone: 020 7525 5403