

**LEWISHAM COUNCIL
PLANNING COMMITTEE A
THURSDAY, 5 JANUARY 2023 AT 7.30 PM
MINUTES**

IN ATTENDANCE: Councillor Peter Bernards (Chair) Councillor Oona Olaru (Vice Chair) Councillors, Liam Curran, Ayesha Lahai-Taylor, Hilary Moore, John Muldoon, John Paschoud, James Rathbone and Rudi Schmidt

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE JOINING THE MEETING VIRTUALLY None.

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE None

OFFICERS: Service Group Manager, (SGM) Planning Officers and Committee Officer.

ALSO PRESENT: Joy Ukadike (Legal Representative) (Virtual)

**Item
No.**

1 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Muldoon declared that he had been lobbied with regard to item 3 but did not have any personal interest in the application and could make a decision with an open mind.

The Chair declared that he lived in the same road as the application site in item 8 but did not have any personal interest in the application and could make a decision with an open mind.

2 Minutes

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of Planning Committee A held on 20 October 2022 be confirmed and signed as an accurate record.

3 LAND ADJACENT TO 8 SOUTH PARK CRESCENT, SE6 1JW

3.1 The Planning Officer said that since the agenda had been published, one of the 3 objectors had resubmitted their objection, but it did not raise any additional concerns to the ones already made. She gave an illustrative presentation recommending the grant of planning permission for the construction of 2, two storey, two-bedroom, semi-detached dwelling houses adjacent to 8 South Park Crescent SE6 subject to the conditions and informatives in the report:

3.2. The Committee noted the report and that the main issues were:

- Principle of Development
- Housing

- Urban Design
- Impact on Adjoining Properties
- Transport
- Sustainable Development
- Natural Environment

3.3 A presentation was made on behalf of the applicant in support of the application.

3.4 Objectors were not present.

3.5 Members did not have any questions.

3.6 The Committee considered the submissions made at the meeting and

RESOLVED that planning permission be **GRANTED**, for the construction of 2, two storey, two-bedroom, semi-detached dwelling houses adjacent to 8 South Park Crescent SE6 and to the conditions and informatives in the report.

4 CHALSEY LODGE, CHALSEY ROAD, LONDON, SE4 1YW

4.1 The Planning Officer gave an illustrative presentation recommending the grant of planning permission for the construction of a single-storey rear extension together with raising of the ridge line and the installation of roof lights in the rear roof slope for the properties at Chalsey Lodge, Chalsey Road, SE4, and associated soft landscaping and refuse storage to the front elevation, subject to the conditions and informatives in the report.

4.2 The Committee noted the report and that the main issues were:

- Principle of Development
- Urban Design
- Impact on Adjoining Properties

Applicant

4.3 A presentation was made on behalf of the applicant in support of the application. He drew members' attention to an error on page 58 of the agenda. The proposed extension would be 11m from the boundary with Bridge House on Montague not 1.1m as stated in the agenda.

4.4 In response to a question, members were advised that the maisonettes at the rear would not have any additional bedrooms. Maisonettes at the front would have an additional bedroom, and it was expected that there could be an increase of two people occupying the building with 8 people over the whole site.

4.5 Objectors were not present.

4.6 The Committee considered the submissions made at the meeting and

RESOLVED that planning permission be **GRANTED** for the construction of a single-storey rear extension together with raising of the ridge line and the installation of roof lights in the rear roof slope for the properties at Chalsey Lodge, Chalsey Road, SE4, and associated soft landscaping and refuse storage to the front elevation, subject to the conditions and informatives in the report.

5 156 ERLANGER ROAD, LONDON, SE14 5TJ

5.1 The Planning Officer, gave an illustrative presentation recommending the grant planning permission for the construction of a single storey rear and side extension, installation of replacement windows at the front and rear elevations and hard and soft landscaping works to the front garden including installation of cycle and refuse stores at 156 Erlanger Road SE14.

5.2 The Committee noted the report and that the main issues were:

- Principle of Development;
- Urban Design and Impact on Heritage Assets;
- Impact on Adjoining Properties;

Applicant

5.3 The Architect for the application, said that the 156 Erlanger Road was in a poor state and would be restored to an excellent condition. Several of the original features had been lost and would be restored to enhance and preserve the character of the Conservation Area. The energy efficiency of the premises would be enhanced.

5.4 The key driver behind the design for the proposed extension was to keep a visual distinction between the original property and the proposed new addition. This would be achieved by using glazed elements between the two and use of cladding material that were sustainable and visually different to the original property. The Architect outlined the suitability of the cladding.

5.5 The new party wall and rear wall to the proposed extension would be insulated to current building regulations and new windows would be triple glazed. Modern residential extensions, like this application, were common in Victorian houses; there were several similar extensions in the same road and surrounding streets.

5.6 The boundary wall would be 2 metres high. Although the land at 154 Erlanger Road was slightly higher and at 158 Erlanger Road slightly lower, the wall would not exceed the maximum height allowed under permitted development.

5.7 Members were advised that the dining room would be in the kitchen rather than having two separate rooms, and the application did not breach the maximum height and depth allowed under the 25 and 35 degree rule which had been tested. Resident's privacy at 154 Erlanger Road would not be compromised and residents at 158 would gain more privacy because the

extension would protrude 1.2 metres further than the lean-to shed. There would not be any loss of sunlight at either of the properties.

- 5.8 In conclusion, the Architect said that there were similar extensions in the area, the poor condition of the property would be improved, and energy efficiency increased. The restoration of the original features, along with the extension, would ensure that the property could be enjoyed long into the future.

Representation

- 5.9 The objector, the Chairman of the Telegraph Hill Society, addressed the Committee. The Society did not have any objection to the proposals for the front of the property. The objection related to the rear and the destruction of the original features. Extensions to existing properties should not be permitted if incompatible with the special characteristics of the area. The SPD stated that extensions should respect the original design and architectural feature of the existing building. It stated that a modern high-quality design could be successful, but it also stated that a traditional approach could be a more sensitive response. This property was part of a number of buildings built by Haberdashers Livery Company and uniformity was important.
- 5.10 There was precedence in the area, where extensions had not been built with a traditional approach as preferred by the Telegraph Hill Society. The objector said that members could not take precedence into account when making their decision. In the opinion of the Telegraph Hill Society, the more properties that lose their original features, the worse the problem becomes. He said that members should consider whether the cumulative effect of these alterations was destroying the area as a whole.
- 5.11 In the report, the objections contained an overall theme, which was the special characteristics of the area. In conclusion, the objector asked whether the facades to the rear of the properties in the Telegraph Hill area would continue to be changed. This would not be in keeping with the area.
- 5.12 The objector was asked whether the officer had given due consideration and presented an accurate report on that which was visible/ not visible from the public realm. The objector said that given that the SPD specifically states that the original design and architectural feature of the existing building should be respected, the traditional approach had not been addressed.
- 5.13 In response to a question from a member, the Architect confirmed that there was a lean-to adjacent to the building which was an external W.C at the rear of the neighbouring property.
- 5.14 Although the Telegraph Hill Society preferred a more traditional design, a high quality, modern design was also acceptable and was not in contravention to the National Planning Policy or adopted policies and guidance.

5.15 The Committee considered the submissions made at the meeting and

RESOLVED that planning permission be **GRANTED** for the construction of a single storey rear and side extension, installation of replacement windows at the front and rear elevations and hard and soft landscaping works to the front garden including installation of cycle and refuse stores at 156 Erlanger Road SE14., subject to conditions and informatives in the report.

6. 70 Jerningham Road SE14

6.1 The Planning Officer gave an illustrative presentation recommending the grant of planning permission for the construction of a single storey rear extension, single storey side extension, and the replacement of windows on the front, side and rear elevations with matching double-glazed timber painted window at 70 Jerningham Road, SE14 subject to the conditions and informatives in the report.

6.2 The Committee noted the report and that the main issues were:

- :
- Principle of Development.
 - Urban Design and Impact on Heritage Assets;
 - Impact on Adjoining Properties.

6.3 Members raised questions and officers' responses were as follows:

- The picture of the rear extension was an accurate representation. There were large patio doors onto the garden and the room would be a kitchen/living room.
- The proposed extension would protrude 1 metre into the garden from the rear existing wall. This protrusion was permitted within regulations and could be up to 3 metres. This proposal was also acceptable within a Conservation Area particularly since the design and materials to be used were of high quality.
- There was a distinction between changes to buildings that were visible to the public realm and those that were not. Members were advised that within the National Policy Planning Framework, there was a reference to the significance of heritage assets. An extension was not considered acceptable simply because it could not be seen from the public realm. Officers must consider the significance of the heritage asset and the extent to which proposed works would affect that significance.

Applicant

6.4 The agent, on behalf of the applicant, attended the meeting. He outlined the services offered by his company with regard to residential architecture, particularly extensions of period properties. The applicant wanted to redesign aspects of the property. They understood and respected the unique character of the area. They intended to be responsible custodians of

the property; they would repair and re-instate original features and make it more energy efficient.

6.5 The agent outlined the following:

- Two key design strategies for the rear extension; a modest scale and appearance and a clear differential between extension and host dwelling.
- Details of the materials to be used in the extension were outlined.
- Side and rear extensions would be significantly glazed to increase natural daylight.
- Objections of light pollution were addressed.
- This was not an uncommon extension in a Conservation Area and similar applications had been granted in the area. The extension was not visible from the public realm.
- A letter of support was submitted for the roof extension and the rear extension.

6.6 Members questions were answered as follows:

- Timber would be used rather than London brick because the brick on the host building was weathered and new bricks were yellow and would not age in the same way. It was considered more appropriate to use timber which was natural and textured so there would be a subtle difference in the materials
- In the report it stated that there was 'potential' for high quality materials. One of the conditions stated that all the materials would be submitted to the council prior to the commencement of the works. The agent would be on site during construction and would ensure that the materials were of a high quality.

Representation

6.7 The Chair of the Telegraph Hill Society addressed the Committee. He raised the following points.

- The report stated that the visibility of the extension to the public realm was limited. The view was restricted due to boundary fencing and planting. There was no guarantee that the current fencing or trees would remain.
- The Conservation Area appraisal referred to the rear of properties and stated that they should be as uniform as the front. The rear was as significant to the character of the property as the front.

6.8 In the report it stated that there were no grounds to object to the application. The objector did not agree for the following reasons:

- The bay window at the rear had been demolished with an extension only a few centimetres larger than the existing window. This was, therefore, an additional large window rather than an extension.

- The rear extension was incongruous with the neighbouring bay window.
 - The materials were not considered compatible for the area. The property was constructed with London brick. The proposed materials were aluminium and timber.
- 6.9 The SPD stated that high quality design could be successful in creating a differential between host buildings and the extension, but it also stated that traditional designs could be more successful to the character of the building. The SPD stated that extensions in a conservation area should respect the design of the original building. The objector said that the extension did not respect the design or the character of the original building.
- 6.10 A member expressed concern about the aesthetic appearance of the building if the application was granted. Officers were asked for assurance that the materials used would be of high quality, not simply have the potential. Members were advised that the use of the word 'potential' was used for cautionary reasons. When the applicant submitted details of the materials to be used, officers could judge the quality.
- 6.11 There was discussion about extensions in a conservation area. The report referenced that if an extension could not be seen from the public realm, then it would not damage the conservation area. The representative from the Telegraph Hill Society did not agree with this view. One member questioned what was acceptable in a conservation area and expressed concern at the demolition of the bay window at the rear of the property that had previously mirrored the adjoining property.
- 6.12 One member referenced that policy compliance and lawfulness should be the main consideration, not personal preference.

The Committee considered the submissions made at the meeting, and

RESOLVED that planning permission be **GRANTED** for the construction of a single storey rear extension, single storey side extension, and the replacement of windows on the front, side and rear elevations with matching double-glazed timber painted window at 70 Jerningham Road, SE14.

7. 34 ERLANGER ROAD, LONDON, SE14 5TG

- 7.1 The Planning Officer said that the only objection to the application, which had been received from the Telegraph Hill Society, had been withdrawn. Due to the late stage of this withdrawal, the agenda had been published.
- 7.2 The Planning Officer gave an illustrative presentation recommending the grant of planning permission for the construction of a single storey extension to the rear elevation and the installation of timber windows to the front elevation of the basement at 34 Erlanger Road, SE14 subject of the conditions and informatives in the report.
- 7.3 The Committee noted the report and that the main issues were:

- Principle of Development
- Urban Design and Impact on Heritage Assets
- Impact on Adjoining Properties

7.4 The applicant did not attend the meeting and members did not have any questions. There were no objectors.

7.5 The Committee:

RESOLVED that planning permission be **GRANTED** for the construction of a single storey extension to the rear elevation and the installation of timber windows to the front elevation of the basement at 34 Erlanger Road, SE14 subject to the conditions and informatives in the report.

8 41 DRAKEFELL ROAD, LONDON, SE14 5SL

8.1 The Planning Officer, gave an illustrative presentation recommending the grant planning permission for the construction of a single storey rear and side extension at 41 Drakefell Road, SE14.subject of the conditions and informatives in the report.

8.2 The Committee noted the report and that the main issues were:

- Principle of Development
- Urban Design
- Impact on Adjoining Properties

8.3 Members were advised that the foliage masking the extension was in the park and therefore the responsibility of the Council to maintain. Officers did not consider that the applicant needed extra planting on their property because the foliage in the park was of a good quality.

Application

8.4 The agent addressed the Committee. He said that the applicant was conscious of the sensitive location of the site and would ensure that the extension would not have a harmful impact on the Telegraph Hill Conservation Area. The proposed extension would retain the existing side bay window and would use high quality materials.

8.5 The proposed roof extension would be fully compliant with the Council's local policy and there would be a clear distinction between the traditional host building and the contemporary extension.

8.6 The existing vegetation on the boundary with the park would provide sufficient screening for the extension and the impact on the character of the Conservation Area would be negligible. Planning permission had been granted for a contemporary extension in a property opposite the application site and had less vegetation screening in place.

Representation

- 8.7 The Chair of the Telegraph Hill Society addressed the Committee. He was opposed to the application which would be very visible to the public realm if granted. He reminded those present, of his previous statement that a traditional design could be a more sensitive response to an historic building.
- 8.8 The Chair of the Society said that in a conservation area, uniformity of style was important. This application did not satisfy two local policy conditions. The extension was not in keeping with the character of the area nor did it respect the original design and architectural feature. These were legal considerations and grounds for objection.
- 8.9 The following points were raised by members.
- This application failed the test of being visible from the public realm.
 - The non-traditional nature of the extension was not in keeping with the character of the conservation area
 - The report was inconsistent regarding the impact the extension would have on the Conservation Area. Just because an incongruous extension had been built on the other side of the entrance to the park, this should not be a relevant factor for members when considering this application.
- 8.10 The Presiding Officer addressed some of the issues that had been made. He said that officers did not intend to give members the impression that if an extension could not be seen from the public realm, then it did not matter. Significance tended to diminish as a structure became less visible but was still an important consideration. Officers required high quality design and materials in Conservation Areas. A contemporary scheme was not necessarily harmful if visible. It depended on the extent to which the significance of the heritage asset was affected.
- 8.11 The Service Group Manager explained the Council's Article 4 direction which removes permitted development rights if the structure was visible from the public realm.
- 8.12 Precedent was explained by the officer. He said that precedent did not exist in planning but there was material consideration. If there was an extension nearby that was relevant, it was a material planning consideration and members should give this the weight they considered appropriate when making their decision.
- 8.13 Contrasting architectural styles in a conservation area was discussed as well as the appropriate materials used in traditional and modern approaches. The Presiding Officer explained that officers had considered the significant components of the host building and extension. He said that the application was for a small scheme and the applicant had adopted a modest approach to the architecture which was a sufficient contrast for it to be acceptable.

- 8.14 A member said that 41 Drakefell Road was located at the entrance to the park and was a significant site. It was a gateway and the buildings either side of the park were of significant historic interest. The vegetation was not permanent and could be removed at any time so there would not be any screening.
- 8.15 It was suggested that consideration of this application be deferred, and further clarification requested because a picture of the extension was required before a decision could be made, but other members agreed that a picture could present an unrealistically positive image. A member requested that in future, a CGI mock up in scale should be provided as a matter of course. There was a comment that an architectural drawing was enough to imagine how the extension and its surroundings would look. The design was not distinctly modern, nor was it a restoration in similar material to the host building. Although visibility from the public realm was not an absolute, a judgement needed to be made. On the basis that the extension would cause a detrimental level of harm to the character of the conservation area, it was suggested that the application be refused.
- 8.16 The following issues were given as a reason to refuse the application:
- The proposed extension by virtue of its siting, scale, form, and design, would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the host property in the Telegraph Hill Conservation Area causing the loss of a prominent historical architectural feature.
 - The siting of the property was significant because it was a gateway to Telegraph Hill Park with original buildings either side of the entrance. Despite the harm caused to the character of the property on the other side of the entrance, this should not be compounded by the grant of the application at 41 Erlanger Road.
 - The side extension was particularly problematic because of the visibility from the public realm. The existing natural vegetation on the boundary wall with the park was not considered sufficient screening to ensure that the extension was not significantly visible. The screening relied on ephemeral poor vegetation screening.
 - The style of the windows on the side extension and the roof was incongruous with the rest of the windows at the property. The application was one large window; the original windows were multi paned.
- 8.17 The Committee considered the submissions made at the meeting and
- RESOLVED that planning permission be **REFUSED** for the construction of a single storey rear and side extension at 41 Drakefell Road, SE14 for the following reason, with the precise wording delegated to Officers:
- The proposed extension by virtue of its siting, scale, form, and design, would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the host property in the Telegraph Hill Conservation Area causing the loss of a

prominent historical architectural feature, having particular regard to its important and visible gateway location to Telegraph Hill Park and the incongruity of its fenestration.

The meeting closed at 9.50 pm.

Chair
