

Committee	PLANNING COMMITTEE (A)	
Report Title	MINUTES	
Ward		
Contributors		
Class	PART 1	Date: 12 APRIL 2018

MINUTES

To approve the minutes of the meeting of Planning Committee (A) held on the 1st March 2018.

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

MINUTES of the meeting of the PLANNING COMMITTEE (A) held in ROOMS 1 & 2, CIVIC SUITE, LEWISHAM TOWN HALL, CATFORD, SE6 4RU on 1ST March 2018 at 19:30.

PRESENT: Councillors Amrani (Chair), Paschoud (Vice Chair), Adefiranye, Bourne, Jeffrey, Till, Kennedy and Walsh.

OFFICERS: Suzanne White – Planning Service, Paula Young – Legal Services, Samuel James – Committee Co-ordinator

APOLOGIES: Councillor De Ryk, Councillor Raven

1. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

There were no declaration of interests.

2. MINUTES

Members approved the minutes for Committee A, which was held on 17th January 2018.

3. Three Garages Rear of 60 Breakspears Road, SE4 1TS (DC/17/102243) (Item 3 on the agenda)

The presenting Planning Officer Suzanne White explained the details of the existing site which is currently occupied by three garages, on a piece of land which originally formed part of the rear garden of 60 Breakspears Road, accessed from Cranfield Road. The site is within the Brockley Conservation Area, and subject to an Article 4 Direction.

The presenting officer outlined the details of the proposal for the demolition of the three garages and the construction of a two storey plus basement, two bedroom house with roof terrace. They went on to mention that there had been 24 letters of objection against the proposal and 5 in support of it; in addition to objections from the Brockley Society and the Conservation officer. They stated that the proposal had been recommended for refusal by officers for 3 reasons relating to: 1. The detrimental impact of its design upon the streetscene and wider conservation area; 2. Its detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers; 3. The unsatisfactory living conditions of the proposed dwelling, specifically with regard to outlook and natural lighting to habitable rooms.

A question from Councillor Paschoud sought clarity on the levels of obscure glazing that were proposed, and the impact of this on outlook. The presenting officer, Suzanne White, stated that 1 of the bedrooms had proposed satisfactory outlook as its window would be clear glazed, whilst the other bedroom and living spaces would have poor levels of outlook and natural lighting due to the level of obscured glazing.

Next the committee received verbal representation from Brian Kavannagh, the agent for the application who had tabled a model of the proposal and surrounding area for members' consideration. He outlined the arguments for the case, including that this was a good opportunity to add to the housing stock by utilising an underused site. In rebuttal against the scheme's objections he stated that the proposal was of a modest size, had been designed sensitively so as to have little impact on neighbours' amenity, and to ensure future residents would be provided with a good standard of accommodation. He claimed that the current proposal had been designed in response to Officer's pre-app advice, which he felt was now being retreated from.

The applicant Samuel Confino then gave his personal reasons for wanting to build his own home in Brockley, including that he grew up in the area, and his wife is pregnant.

Questions from members followed including from Councillor Paschoud, who asked about the 'odd' bathroom arrangements, whereby there is one on each floor, directly below each other. The agent responded that it makes construction easier if the bathrooms are stacked, and that the property would require planning permission if it were to be converted into separate flats – and that this was not the applicant's intention.

Councillor Amrani asked why there was a need for such a high volume of obscure glazing, and whether the scheme should be designed differently to negate the need for it. The agent responded that the site is surrounded by existing residential properties, and that the proposal had already been creatively designed by skilled architects in order to minimise the impact on neighbours.

Councillor Till asked why no parking survey had been completed, to which the agent responded they had not been asked to do one at the pre-application stage. When they were asked to do a survey during the application, they undertook it themselves by taking photographs, which was carried out in December 2017.

Karla Barnacle, a neighbouring homeowner, spoke on behalf of the scheme's objectors.

Firstly she stated that although the Brockley Society had given some support to the scheme, they were in no way representative of the application area and did not necessarily speak on behalf of residents.

She also claimed that some objections had not been logged, and also complained that only 1 objection per household could be logged, because in her household and others there were multiple objections to the scheme.

They then proceeded to outline the objections against the scheme, including the close proximity of the building to existing properties, the damage to the existing open vista views through the site, and the multiple impacts of the proposal upon existing residents' amenity, specifically with regard to the overbearing impact of the property and the disturbance cause by use of the roof terrace. Concern was also raised that the applicant intended to turn the property into self-contained flats. They also claimed that the applicant's claim that the

existing garages are unsightly is subjective and that many residents prefer them to the prospect of the current proposal.

Councillor Amrani sought clarification on the claim that the garages are more unsightly than the proposal would be, to which the objector made clear that was their view, due to the loss of the view and outlook that would be experienced.

The presenting officer, Suzanne White, rebutted the applicant's argument that there would be a minimal impact on neighbouring residential amenity, and stated that there would be impact on outlook and views through neighbouring rear gardens which would have a material impact.

Councillor Till requested clarification on whether conservation area status still applied to infill sites within those areas. The presenting officer clarified that it would still be classified as within the conservation area, and due to this the impacts on the street scene and on amenity needed to be carefully considered as such.

Councillor Jeffrey moved a motion to accept the officer's recommendation and refuse the application, this was seconded by Councillor Walsh.

Members voted as follows:

FOR RECOMMENDATION: Councillors Amrani (Chair), Paschoud (Vice-Chair), Adefiranye, Jeffrey, Kennedy and Walsh.

AGAINST RECOMMENDATION: Councillors Bourne, Till

ABSTAINED: None

RESOLVED: Refuse application DC/17/102243.

4. 12 & 16 Baring Close, SE12 0UN (DC/15/094376) (item 5 on the agenda)

Due to IT technical issues, the Powerpoint presentation for this application would not load. The presenting officer therefore passed around physical paper copies of the plans for members' considerations.

The presenting officer outlined the proposal for the construction of a two storey extension to the side of 12 & 16 Baring Close, SE12, and explained that a report on this planning application was presented to Members on the 21st April 2016. At that meeting, members resolved to defer a determination on the application to enable the carrying out of a further Biodiversity Assessment.

The officer outlined the finding of the biodiversity report and stated that the Council's Ecological Regeneration Officer has advised that the recommendations set out in the report are acceptable and subject to a condition requiring provision of bird and bat boxes the proposal was recommended for approval.

Councillor Jeffrey sought clarification as to whether the 2.7m wide bedroom would meet the requirements of the London Plan, to which the presenting officer responded they would.

Members then heard from Ella Walker, the applicant's representative, who clarified that the biodiversity report had been completed following the requirements of the planning committee

and that the findings were now considered acceptable. She also stated that the extension was to provide larger, three-bed, family sized social housing for which there is an identified need in the area.

No questions followed.

Councillor Walsh moved to accept the officers' recommendation and grant the proposal, which was seconded by Councillor Till.

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Councillors Amrani (Chair), Paschoud (Vice-Chair), Adefiranye, Bourne, Jeffrey, Kennedy, Till, Walsh

AGAINST: NONE

RESOLVE: Unanimous decision. Planning permission should be granted in respect of application No. **DC/15/094376** subject to the conditions outlined in the report.

5. Phoebe's Garden Centre, Penerley Road, SE6 1LQ (DC/17/102292) (item 4 on the agenda)

The IT issues continued and the presentation for this application would not load.

Councillor Amrani forwarded a motion to not consider the application at this meeting and to postpone until the next committee meeting, because it was a complex case which required members to have all of the information and facts of the case in front of them.

This motion was seconded by Councillor Walsh, and was unanimously voted for by Councillors.

RESOLVE: Application was not presented or considered. It will be considered at the next committee meeting.

Meeting Closed at 20:40.