

Committee	PLANNING COMMITTEE (C)	
Report Title	MINUTES	
Ward		
Contributors		
Class	PART 1	Date 15 DECEMBER 2016

## MINUTES

To approve the minutes of the meeting of Planning Committee (C) held on the 03 November 2016.

### LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

MINUTES of the meeting of the PLANNING COMMITTEE (C) held in Council Chambers, CIVIC SUITE, LEWISHAM TOWN HALL, CATFORD SE6 on THURSDAY 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2016 at 7.30pm.

PRESENT:	Paul Bell (Chair), Simon Hook (Vice-Chair), Brenda Dacres, Sue Hordijkenko, Suzannah Clarke, Peter Bernards; Hellen Klier, John Paschoud
OFFICERS:	Hellen Milner - Planning Service, Paula Young- Legal Services, Joshua Ogunleye - Committee Coordinator
APOLOGIES:	Jamie Milne, Liam Curran

#### 1. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

There were no declarations of interest.

#### 2. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of Planning Committee (C) held on 11 August 2016 were agreed by Members to be a true and accurate record. The minutes were signed by the Chair at the end of the meeting.

Member Pashoud noted he was not present at the previous Planning Committee (C) held on 11 August 2016 as such he could not vote.

#### 3. 172 MANOR LANE SE12 8LP (Item 3 on the agenda)

The Planning Officer Hellen Milner outlined details of the proposal and addressed questions from Councillors Clark and Paschoud, Bell regarding the level number of tattoo parlours already in the Lee High Road area. Asked for clarity on the D1 Class as well as Sui Generis. Would it be possible to change the within the Sui Generis Class to another Sui Generis Class i.e. changing to a betting shop, without planning permission? Hellen Milner explained changes across Sui Generis would require planning permission.

The committee received verbal representation from applicants Deborah and Max Stephens. Mr Stephens gave an overview of the proposal that includes no external building works are proposed and the internal layout would remain as existing. The proposed opening hours of the studio are 10.00 to 19.00, Monday to Sunday (including

public holidays). It is proposed that the studio would also sell associated products such as artwork and clothing. The proposed Sui Generis space would arise from the subdivision of an existing D1 shop.

The applicant addressed questions from Councillors Dacre and Clarke, why was the specified opening hours sought? Who will be the clientele and main users the shop hopes to attract? The business would be located around a school route what mitigations are in place not to impact impressionable children?

The Committee received verbal representation from Steve Brandl a local resident, objecting to the proposal on the basis that the development would not be suitable for the local area due to the close proximity to nearby school as well as the development being out of character with the local area. There are already existing tattoo parlours in the local area this would be an unwanted addition.

Following deliberation by Members, Councillor Bell moved a motion to accept the officer's recommendation and grant planning permission. It was seconded by Councillor Paschoud.

FOR: Councillors Bell, Hooks, Dacres, Bernards, Paschoud, Clarke; Hordijkeno

Motion was passed unanimously.

4. 68 MANOR AVENUE , SE4 (Item 4 on the agenda)

The Planning Officer Hellen Milner outlined details of the proposal and addressed questions from Councillor Clarke, Paschoud regarding clarification of DM Policy 33 and its impact on controlling outback developments, of this size and scale on within the garden space of main house. Can any restriction be put on the development preventing its use as a separate property for residential use in the future? What impact would the property have on neighbouring properties in the future?

Legal Services Paula Young – any use of the proposed development that is not incidental to the host building is a matter for enforcement.

The Council received verbal representation from the applicant John Morgan. Mr Morgan gave an overview of the proposal to be a grannie annex and explains he has no intention of selling the proposed grannie annex. Answered questions from Councillor Paschoud regarding the impact the proposed development would have on properties on the boundary wall.

No objector representation was received.

The Planning Officer addressed further questions from Councillors Clarke and Hordijkeno is it possible for the applicant to later installing a mezzanine floor without planning permission? What are the amenities impact of the development?

Following deliberation by Members, Councillor Paschoud moved a motion to accept the officer's recommendation and grant planning permission. It was seconded by Councillor Dacre.

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Councillors Bell, Hooks, Dacres, Bernards, Paschoud, Clarke; Hordijkeno

RESOLVED: Motion was passed unanimously.

Councillor Clarke expressed concern over the lack of clarity on Policy 33 with the construction of outbuildings in rear garden area.

Councillor Obajimi Adefiranye sent a letter to Councillor Bell expressing his support for the application.

5. 5 BEVERLEY COURT, SE4 (Item 5 on the agenda)

The Planning Officer Hellen Milner outlined details of the proposal and addressed questions from Councillors Clark and Paschoud, regarding how visible would the development be from the surrounding conservation area? Has there been any other case of a dormer of a similar size and scale on the within the court?

The Committee received verbal representation from Marie Pier Jones, the applicant's agent. Ms Jones gave an overview of the proposal and explained it would be constructed of high quality design and materials that are sympathetic to the character of the conservation area.

The Committee received verbal representation from Lawrence Beale Collins a neighbour and an objector. The objector explained the development would be out of character with the conservation area's character, as well as subsequently reducing access to light for neighbouring properties. Due to its siting the proposal would have an over dominant impact on the visual character of the conservation area. Small rooflights are used in the conservation area however the dormers bulk and design would be out of character with the area.

Following deliberation by Members, Councillor Paschoud moved a motion to reject the Officer's recommendation and refuse planning permission, it was seconded by Councillor Dacre.

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Dacres, Paschoud, Clarke; Hordijenko

Against: Hooks, Bell; Bernards

RESOLVED: That planning permission be refused in respect of application No. DC/16/096965. Due to proposed dormer being viewed as having an overbearing scale and mass together with the mass of the front elevation Velux Window. The proposed rear elevation dormer would not preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area.

6. 58 ARRAN ROAD, (Item 6 on the agenda)

The Planning Officer Hellen Milner outlined details of the proposal Planning permission is sought for the construction of a single storey extension to the rear of the ground floor flat at 58 Arran Road. The proposed extension would be 3.5m deep at the boundary with 60 Arran Road, but would step out to 4.3m deep from the western elevation. The roof would be pitched with a total height of 3.7m and an eave height of 2.4m. The wall and roof material would match the existing building.

Addressed questions from Councillor Hordijenko regarding the number of objections received and if it was visible from the public realm.

Following deliberation by Members, Councillor Bell moved a motion to accept the officer's recommendation and grant planning permission. It was seconded by Councillor Paschoud.

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Councillors Bell, Hooks, Dacres, Bernards, Paschoud, Clarke; Hordijenko

Motion was passed unanimously.

The meeting ended at 21:36pm. Chair

3 November 2016