

Committee	PLANNING COMMITTEE (B)	
Report Title	MINUTES	
Ward		
Contributors		
Class	PART 1	Date: 17TH AUGUST 1017

MINUTES

To approve the minutes of the meeting of Planning Committee (B) held on the 6th July 2017.

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

MINUTES of the meeting of the PLANNING COMMITTEE (B) held in THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, LEWISHAM TOWN HALL, CATFORD SE6 on 6th April 2017 at 7:30PM.

PRESENT:

Councillors: Reid (Chair), Ogunbadewa (Vice-Chair), Mallory, Moore, Muldoon, Siddorn, Wise, McGeevor

OFFICERS: Max Smith - Planning Service, Paula Young - Legal Services, Andrew Harris - Committee Co-ordinator.

APOLOGIES: Ingleby, Hilton

1. MINUTES

Councillor Reid (Chair), asked if Members agreed that the Minutes of the Planning Committee (B) meeting held on 25th May 2017 were a true and accurate record. Councillor Siddorn noted that his apologies had not been recorded.

2. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

There were no Declaration of Interests at the start of the meeting.

During the meeting Councillor McGeevor stated that she lived close to 101 Manor Avenue and that she would abstain from voting for this reason.

3. 1 Dacre Place

The Planning Officer Max Smith outlined the details of the case to Members, who sought clarification over the height and massing of the proposed new building. The Planning Officer Max Smith directed members to paragraph 6.15 of the Officer's report which showed a comparison diagram.

Councillor McGeevor arrived at 19:40.

The committee received verbal representation from Mr Simon Boobyer (agent). Mr Boobyer outlined to Members that the application had been previously submitted, but was withdrawn and had been amended multiple times through pre-application advice with Officers. He stated that the current application was now in line with council policy and had addressed issues of overlooking. He went on to state that there would be no overshadowing as a result of the development and that there would be no negative impact on the street scene.

The committee received verbal representation from Mrs E S Palmer of 121 Dacre Park and Ms Katherine Hardcastle of 117 Dacre Park. Mrs Palmer outlined concerns regarding loss of privacy, loss of light, as well as inaccuracies and omissions within the Officer's report. Ms Hardcastle then raised concerns regarding overlooking, loss of light, and impacts on 117 Dacre Place which is a listed building. She went on to state that the application had already been rejected once and that the previous issues had not been addressed.

Members then sought clarification regarding the extent of overlooking and loss of light. The Planning Officer Max Smith outlined to members that there is existing overlooking on the site and that obscured windows had been incorporated to lessen the impact. He also confirmed the distances from the objector's windows and that the overlooking would be to the rear of the neighbouring garden. He went on to state that the listed building at 117 Dacre Place was a significant distance away from the proposed development and would therefore be unaffected by its construction. He continued that the existing building did not contribute to the streetscene and that the proposed was an improvement.

Members sought further clarification over the proposed distances, with Councillor Mallory stating that the wording of the report was misleading.

Councillor Wise stated that while the objection from 117 raised loss of light as a concern, she could not see how this would occur. The Planning Officer Max Smith confirmed that as the application site was to the North of No.117, there would be no overshadowing to the neighbouring site as a result of the development.

Councillor Reid (Chair) and Siddorn then discussed the definition of overlooking and whether it had been accurately reflected in the Officer's report. The Planning Officer Max Smith clarified and stated that the report was accurate while showing pictures of the site.

Councillor Mallory added that a clarification of 'overhang' within the report would have been made it clearer.

Councillor Ogunbadewa moved a motion to accept the Officer's recommendation, subject to conditions. It was seconded by Councillor Wise.

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Councillors Reid (Chair), Ogunbadewa (Vice-Chair), Siddorn, Moore, Wise, Mallory and Muldoon.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted in respect of application No. DC/16/095938, subject to the conditions outlined in the report.

4. Flat 2, 42 Cranfield Road

The Planning Officer Max Smith then outlined the details of the case.

The committee received verbal representation from Mr Simon Boobyer (agent). Mr Boobyer outlined to Members that the application had been previously submitted, but was withdrawn and had been amended multiple times through pre-application advice with Officers. He stated that the current application was now in line with council policy and had addressed issues of overlooking. He went on to state that there would be no overshadowing as a result of the development and that there would be no negative impact on the street scene.

Ms Beatrice Garnett (applicant).

The committee received verbal representation from Ms Beatrice Garnett (applicant). Ms Garnett outlined to members that the changes to the front elevation were traditional in style and would have little to no impact on the streetscene. The changes to the rear, while not traditional in nature, would not be more appropriate for use and would not be visible from the rear. She also highlighted other examples of similar developments within the rear.

No objectors were present. It was noted that the Brockley Society had withdrawn their objection.

Councillor Wise stated that the Article (4) was very confusing and that she was happy to support the application.

Councillor Reid (Chair) moved a motion to accept the Officer's recommendation, subject to conditions. It was seconded by Councillor Ogunbadewa (Vice-Chair).

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Councillors Reid (Chair), Ogunbadewa (Vice-Chair), Siddorn, Moore, Wise, Mallory, Muldoon and McGeevor.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted in respect of application No. DC/17/100686, subject to the conditions outlined in the report.

5. Flat 5, 101 Manor Avenue

Councillor McGeevor stated that she lived close to the application site and as such would abstain from the vote.

The Planning Officer Max Smith outlined details of the application to members. He stated that there had been two objections from the Brockley Society, both of which had been withdrawn.

No applicant or objectors were present at the meeting.

Councillor Muldoon moved a motion to accept the Officer's recommendation, subject to conditions. It was seconded by Councillor Moore.

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Councillors Reid (Chair), Ogunbadewa (Vice-Chair), Siddorn, Moore, Wise, Mallory and Muldoon.

ABSTAINED: McGeevor

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted in respect of application No. DC/16/98755, subject to the conditions outlined in the report.

6. 82A Upper Brockley Road

The Planning Officer Max Smith outlined details of the application to members. Councillor Reid (Chair) sought clarification over the principle of rooflights within conservation areas. The Planning Officer Max Smith stated that where they were resisted where there is an unaltered streetscene, or where they would impact the historic fabric of the host dwelling or those surrounding it. He added that they were more acceptable to the rear of properties and in this case the proposed would not be visible.

The committee received verbal representation from Ms Emma Bockhop (applicant) and Mr Bertino Ramirez. Ms Bockhop outlined to members that pre-application advice had been undertaken and subsequent changes made to the scheme as a result. She went on to state that she had met with the freeholders and neighbours, who had not objected to the scheme. Mr Bertino then stated to members that the applicant was the freeholder of the property. He then added that there was no legal internal daylight/sunlight requirement for residential extensions, and that the internal layout complied with the government's internal standards requirements. Finally he added that proposed treatments were due to site constraints and that it was similar to developments at other sites.

The committee received verbal representation from Ms Claire Cowan speaking on behalf of the Brockley Society. She stated that the proposed extension was not laid out well and that the daylight which would be provided was not adequate. She added that she wanted to enter into positive discussions with the applicant regarding the layout of the extension.

Following further deliberation between Members, Councillor Muldoon moved a motion to accept the Officer's recommendation, subject to conditions. It was seconded by Councillor Siddorn.

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Councillors Reid (Chair), Ogunbadewa (Vice-Chair), Siddorn, Moore, Wise, Mallory, Muldoon and McGeevor.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted in respect of application No. DC/16/100481, subject to the conditions outlined in the report.

7. 10A Wickham Road

The Planning Officer Max Smith outlined details of the application to members.

The committee received verbal representation from Mr Rahul Taheem (Agent). Mr Taheem outlined to members that several of the concerns which had been raised were not planning considerations and should be addressed at a later stage. He stated that the development would have an acceptable impact on design and neighbouring amenity, and that the

development complied with council policy. He added that the extension had a lowered boundary height and that the green roof improved the view for the flat above.

The committee received verbal representation from Mr Rob Pearson who has representing his daughter who lives at 10B Wickham Road and Mr Chris Johnson of 12 Wickham Road. Mr Pearson outlined concerns regarding loss of outlook, light spillage, freeholder objections and loss of amenity to the existing balcony. Mr Johnson outlined concerns regarding security and fire safety.

Councillor Reid (Chair) confirmed that only planning matters could be considered in the determination of the application, which in this instance were the impact in light and fire safety.

Councillor Mallory asked for confirmation that Building Control would conduct a site visit to inspect the structure. Paula Young (Legal Services) confirmed that the scheme would have to be approved by Building Control.

Councillor Wise sought clarification regarding the proposed green roof, to which the Planning Officer Max Smith confirmed that it would be a seeded roof.

Councillor Reid (Chair) commented that at 1m from the neighbouring window, the proposed rooflight was very close. The Planning Officer Max Smith stated that obscure glazing could be incorporated to lessen the impact of this. He added that the impact of the rooflight along was not considered adequate justification to refuse the application. Further discussion took place regarding the positioning of the proposed rooflight and ways in which the impact of light spillage could be mitigated.

Councillor Reid (Chair) sought clarification as to whether the existing balcony serving 10B would be removed as stated by the objector. The Planning Officer Max Smith confirmed that the balcony would remain unchanged as part of the development.

Following further deliberations between members, Councillor Ogunbadewa (Vice-Chair) moved a motion to approve the application but to add a condition to address light spillage. It was seconded by Councillor Muldoon.

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Councillors Reid (Chair), Ogunbadewa (Vice-Chair), Siddorn, Moore, Wise, Mallory and Muldoon.

ABSTAINED: McGeevor

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted in respect of application No. DC/17/100532, but with the addition of the following condition:

Prior to the commencement of development, details of measures to reduce light spillage from the rooflights (for instance, tinted glazing), shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The approved measures shall be implemented in full prior to the beneficial occupation of the extension hereby approved and retained as such in perpetuity.

Reason: To prevent light spillage from the rooflights from harming the amenities of residents of the flat above in accordance with DM Policy 31 (Alterations and extensions to existing

buildings including residential extensions) of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).

8. 2 Radlet Avenue

The Planning Officer Max Smith outlined details of the application to members.

The committee received verbal representation from Mr James Taylor (Applicant).

No objectors were present at the meeting.

Councillor Muldoon moved a motion to accept the Officer's recommendation, subject to conditions. It was seconded by Councillor Ogunbadewa (Vice-Chair).

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Councillors Reid (Chair), Ogunbadewa (Vice-Chair), Siddorn, Moore, Wise, Mallory, Muldoon and McGeevor.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted in respect of application No. DC/17/099905, subject to the conditions outlined in the report.