

**LEWISHAM COUNCIL  
PLANNING COMMITTEE B  
TUESDAY, 12 APRIL 2022 AT 7.30 PM  
MINUTES**

**IN ATTENDANCE:** Councillor Jacq Paschoud (Vice-Chair)(In the Chair) Councillors, Jim Mallory, and John Muldoon.

**MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE JOINING THE MEETING VIRTUALLY:** None.

**APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE** Councillors Anwar Clarke Gallagher, Johnston-Franklin Lavery, Openshaw and Smith.

NB: Those Councillors listed as joining virtually were not in attendance for the purposes of the meeting being quorate, any decisions taken, or to satisfy the requirements of s85 Local Government Act 1972.

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

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

**Item  
No.**

**1      Declarations of Interest**

None.

**2      Minutes**

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of Planning Committee B held on 1 February 2022 are an accurate record.

**3      Dirty South, 162 Lee High Road, London, SE13 5PR**

3.1 This item was deferred from the last meeting, on the grounds of privacy and noise impact. The Planning Officer, gave an illustrative presentation recommending the grant planning permission for the alteration and conversion of the first and second floors of Dirty South, 162 Lee High Road SE12 into 4 two bedroom self-contained flats, together with the replacement of the existing windows and installation new windows in the south facing elevation and the provision of bin and cycle storage and to the conditions and informatives in the report:

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

- Principle of Development - impact to the operations of the public house
- Impact on Adjoining Properties – privacy impact
- Residential quality
- Urban design
- Transport impact

- Living conditions of neighbouring properties
- Sustainable development
- Natural environment

3.3 Officers were satisfied that the public house could continue to operate viably and make a full contribution to the night-time economy of the surrounding area, subject to conditions 3 and 15 which had been updated in accordance to the noise report.

3.4 The positioning and visibility through the proposed windows were also brought into question at the last meeting. The officer demonstrated that the proposed first floor windows, with achieving an appropriate standard of accommodation for the proposed residential unit while limiting the harms of the privacy of the neighbouring property, and when weighted against the planning merits of the scheme, the modest level of harm is not considered to warrant the refusal of the application.  
It was the officer recommendation to approve the application.

3.5 The agent for the application made the following points:  
He stated that sound insulation is to be installed between the ground floor pub and first floor flats. The pub is not a music venue so amplified music, live or recorded music would play. The grounds of operation would allow acoustic music, but the agent emphasised that it is not a music venue.  
Addressing privacy issues in regards to Waterside Court, the agent stated that the existing arrangement results in greater harm to privacy of the side elevation windows. The proposal sought to remove the external staircase and associated platform to include two windows on the first floor and obscured glass will be used for the one window which would also be fixed shut, therefore improving privacy.

The objector gave his presentation. He stated that his flat looks across from the pub. He expressed his concern about the privacy he would have because of the proposed windows view. He also stated his concern for noise.  
He asked for assurance regarding the potential opening of a pub garden which will cause further nuisance for himself and other neighbours. The Planning Officer stated that the noise impact consideration was for the flats that are in the same dwelling as the pub i.e. the upper floor flats above the pub.

3.6 The Committee considered the submissions made at the meeting and

**RESOLVED** that planning permission be **GRANTED**, for the alteration and conversion of the first and second floors of Dirty South, 162 Lee High Road SE12 into 4 two bedroom self-contained flats, together with the replacement of the existing windows and installation of new windows in the south facing elevation and the provision of bin and cycle storage subject to a S106 Legal Agreement and to the conditions 1-15 and informatives in the report.

#### 4 **52 Loampit Hill, London, SE13 7SW**

- 4.1 The Planning Officer gave an illustrative presentation recommending the grant planning permission for the demolition of the existing rear conservatory and construction of a two storey extension to the rear of 52 Loampit Hill, SE13, together with alterations to the roof of the existing rear outrigger and side addition in connection with the formation of a rear and side roof terrace at second floor level subject to the conditions and informatives in the report. The property was a 3 storey Victorian property.
- 4.2 The Committee noted the report and that the main issues were:
- Principle of Development
  - Urban Design
  - Impact on Adjoining Properties
- 4.3 The proposed construction was said to be made of high quality, contemporary materials. It was the officer recommendation to approve the application
- 4.4 The applicant then gave his presentation. He stated that the proposed construction will improve living space, address a damp conservatory that was built in the early 90s and has poor drainage and 3 roofing spaces that do not interconnect well and had resulted in a number of maintenance issues. The proposal would also seek to improve the outdoor living space.

There were no questions from Members.

- 4.5 The objector then spoke to the application. She addressed her objections to the use of the outrigger of the terrace under the local authority planning documentation, which she said stated that the removal of roofing is not recommended. She stated that some of the planning decisions contravene what Lewisham policy appears to disprove of.

It was asked of the objector if there were any adjustments to modifications to provide more privacy. She responded that it appeared that adjustments had already been made, which seem to cause different issues- the original proposals puts the terrace above the neighbours bedrooms. The adjusted proposal puts the terrace two-thirds of the way up from the bedroom so their party wall would be aligned with the floor of the terrace, which can create inconvenience i.e. with noise.

- 4.6 The Planning Officer stated that the application was submitted a year prior. Initially, there were 3 objections, some of which had merit so some changes to the design and proposal were requested. The position of the terrace had not changed, in terms of its height and position next to the party wall. He stated that that may have been in the initial application that was withdrawn. He also stated that the 0.5m set between the properties, plus a fence, would minimise the noise impact. The urban design of the area also does not allow any impactful noise in this instance.
- 4.7 The Committee considered the submissions made at the meeting and

RESOLVED that planning permission be **GRANTED** for the demolition of the existing rear conservatory and construction of a two storey extension to the rear of 52 Loampit Hill, SE13, together with alterations to the roof of the existing rear outrigger and side addition in connection with the formation of a rear and side roof terrace at second floor level be GRANTED subject to the conditions and informatives in the report.

## **5 144 HITHER GREEN LANE, LONDON, SE13 6QA**

- 5.1 The Planning Officer, gave an illustrative presentation recommending the grant planning permission for the change of use of 144 Hither Green Lane SE13 from C3 (dwelling house) to C2 (residential institutions), comprising supported living care rooms for 8 individuals., subject to conditions and informatives in the report.

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

- Principle of Development
- Residential Quality
- Specialist residential uses
- Urban Design
- Impact on Adjoining Properties
- Transport

- 5.3 The property included the provision of 12 bicycle spaces and storage space acceptable for the number of residents. The change of use to a community service meant that it would meet an identified local need. There were no proposed external changes to the building and officers were satisfied and raised no objections to the appearance of the proposed bicycle and refuse store. Officers were also satisfied there would be no impact on privacy for neighbours. Officers recommended a condition which restricted the use of the outbuilding to just 4 people at a time and also restricting the hours of use between 8am and 10pm.

Members asked about the number of care staff that would be on site, but the Planning officer confirmed that this would be up to the operator and that it was not a material consideration.

The Chair asked about the size of the communal/living area, being the size of and smaller than some of the bedrooms. The officer responded that there was no policy to determine how much communal space was to be provided for the c2 dwellings, however, the size is around 19m and for Lewisham's licensable standard (for HMOs but used as a benchmark example) which is 11m for up to 10 people, which greatly exceeds the standard. There is also cooking space in their individual rooms.

- 5.6 The applicant gave his presentation. In addition to the officer's points, he added that the proposal was for Excelcare to lease the facility to limited company, Dinardo, who will provide the day-to-day running of the facility. The management plan, submitted with the application, set out how the property will be managed. The supported housing pathways manager had written a letter of support to the

proposal. In response to the previously refused application, the communal area had been proposed to be moved to the ground floor of the main building.

There was no objector for this item.

5.7 The Committee considered the submissions made at the meeting and

**RESOLVED** that planning permission be **GRANTED** for the change of use of 144 Hither Green Lane SE13 from C3 (dwellinghouse) to C2 (residential institutions), comprising supported living care rooms for 8 individuals subject to conditions and informatives in the report., subject to conditions and informatives in the report.

## 6. 1 PERRY RISE, LONDON, SE23 2QX

6.1 The Planning Officer, gave an illustrative presentation recommending the grant of planning permission for the Construction of a two bedroom single storey, partially subterranean dwelling house to the side of 1 Perry Rise SE23, associated landscaping work and new boundary treatment, 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
  - Housing and Standard of Accommodation
  - Urban Design and Impact on heritage assets
  - Impact on Adjoining Properties
  - Highway and Transportation
  - Sustainable Development
  - Natural Environment

6.3 Officers were satisfied that the application did not cause harm to any of these issues and therefore recommended Members to grant the application.

6.4 The architect and agent then gave his presentation. The main points of discussion were that it was their goal to be as sustainable as possible and increase biodiversity which was why the green wall and green roof were introduced to the proposal. The trees that would be lost were category C and tall trees would be planted. The agent also stated that the building was sustainable and low-carbon.

6.5 Members had no questions for the agent. There was no objectors for the application.

The Committee considered the submissions made at the meeting, and

**RESOLVED** that planning permission be **GRANTED** for the construction of a two bedroom single storey, partially subterranean dwelling house to the side of 1 Perry

Rise SE23, associated landscaping work and new boundary treatment be GRANTED subject to the conditions and informatives in the report.

**7. 153 SYDENHAM PARK ROAD, LONDON, SE26 4LP.**

- 7.1 The Planning Officer, gave an illustrative presentation recommending the grant planning permission for the construction of a hip to gable extension and roof extension in the rear roof slope incorporating a Juliet balcony at 153 Sydenham Park Road SE26, together with the installation of 3 roof lights in the front roof slope subject of the conditions and informatives in the report.
- 7.2 The Committee noted the report and that the main issues were:
- Principle of Development
  - Urban Design
  - Impact on Adjoining Properties
- 7.3 Officers were satisfied that there was no material impact on these issues. There were no questions for the officer.
- 7.4 The applicant then gave their presentation. They had lived on the property for over 10 years. Their property is an end-of-terrace house, so the hip to gable extension takes half of the 40m<sup>2</sup> allowance that they have, therefore they sought to make the planning application as opposed to permitted development. They proposed to use slate under the advice of their engineer who recommended the material. The neighbour at 155 had done a loft conversion 2 years prior and used the exact same material. Addressing the objection that they would be overlooking the garden of the neighbour and will have an impact of shade, the applicant stated that this was not true and because of the slope the properties were built on, this would make overlooking difficult and there is no impact of their dormer to the neighbouring properties.

There were no questions for the applicant.

The objector then gave her presentation. She stated that two adjoining hip to gable extensions would diminish the sense of openness afforded by the hipped roofs closing off the views of the tops of trees in the conservation area, as well as sky views and sunlight in her back garden. She also stated that none of the examples of the hip to gable dormer extensions that were cited by officers, most of them could be confirmed as permitted development, with one exception of a modified gable and another was not recorded as it was built in the 90s. She stated that this proposal was for an unusually large dormer. She stated that the position of the Juliette balcony meant that no corner of her garden would not be overlooked.

The Chair asked the objector if her garden was not already being overlooked by other windows in surrounding properties due to its positioning. She responded that yes it was but she believed that a Juliette balcony would be considerably higher.

The officer added that a Juliette balcony could go on their permitted development right and the impact on the neighbouring property would be accepted under that permitted right. It was not considered that would be additional overlooking.

7.5 The Committee considered the submissions made at the meeting, and

RESOLVED that planning permission be **GRANTED** for the construction of a hip to gable extension and roof extension in the rear roof slope incorporating a Juliet balcony at 153 Sydenham Park Road SE26, together with the installation of 3 roof lights in the front roof slope subject to the conditions and informatives in the report.

## **8 21 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, construction of a rear roof dormer, insertion of two rooflights to the hipped roof slope and replacement of the existing windows at all elevations of 21 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 The Planning officers were satisfied that there was no material impact on these issues and therefore recommended the approval of the application

8.4 The Architect/Applicant then gave his presentation. He spoke on what he thought was the only contentious element, being the dormer. It was in his view that the proposed dormer was substantially smaller than other approved dormers at similar paired houses on the same street. It was reduced from 4.5m<sup>2</sup> to 3m<sup>2</sup>. The approved dormer of the immediately adjacent property is 7.5m<sup>2</sup>

The Chair asked if the rear extension was visible from the street, to which the applicant said it was not- they are semi-detached houses but there is an existing timber gate which is 3m high in between the two properties.

8.5 The objector spoke on behalf of the Telegraph Hill Society. He stated that they have been seeking clarity on the way council policy is being interpreted by planning officers. He stated that the report states that extensions must respect the original design and architectural features of the existing building. DNP 36 specifically states that applications will be refused where they are incompatible with the special characteristics of the area, materials etc.

8.6 There were no questions to the objector. The Planning Officer came back on the objectors point. He stated that the SPD, under the alterations and extensions, gives examples of modern extensions which are cited as high quality and that

there is certainly scope from the SPD for the proposed extension. Officers were satisfied that this had been achieved within this proposal

8.7 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, construction of a rear roof dormer, insertion or two rooflights to the hipped roof slope and replacement of the existing windows at all elevations of 21 Drakefell Road, SE14 subject to the conditions and informatives in the report.

The meeting closed at 9.30 pm.

Chair

---