

overshadowing. The officer stated that Highways had no issues regarding this proposal, having reviewed the construction management plan as fit for purpose. The officer also advised that she was aware that there are enforcement cases relating to Mount Ash Road, but did not know the details.

With regards to possible overshadowing, Cllr Walsh asked for clarification on the orientation of the properties rear gardens, to which the officer replied north-west. The councillor asked the officer if the Article 4 Direction specifically mentioned the jigsaw pattern of the original water closet at the rear of these properties. The officer confirmed that the Article 4 Direction makes no specific mention of this feature.

As members had no further questions, Councillor De Ryk moved a motion to accept the officer's recommendation and grant planning permission. It was seconded by Councillor Walsh.

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Councillors Amrani (Chair), Bourne (Vice-Chair), Adefiranye, Hilton, Jeffrey and Till.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted in respect of application No. DC/16/98020 subject to the conditions outlined in the report.

5. 274 Brockley Road SE4 2SF (Item 5 on the agenda)

The Planning Officer outlined details of the proposal regarding demolition of the existing property, retention of the front façade and the construction of a new building behind to incorporate 4 self-contained flats. The officer mentioned that the proposal retains the original London roofline and brought members attention to a previous application for five flats which had been refused and subsequently dismissed on appeal. The officer outlined the arrangement of the units, cycle and bin storage and spoke of amendments made to the application including separate access for the two lower flats and the provision of a courtyard space.

Cllr Walsh and Cllr Jeffrey noted that the windows seemed disproportionately large for a corner unit. The officer replied that discussions had taken place with the applicant and the windows were thought to be acceptable. Members thought the principle good but overall the design was not worthy or sympathetic enough for a site opposite a conservation area.

The Committee received verbal representation against the proposal from Will Duggan a long term resident and near neighbour. Mr Duggan stated that there were restrictive covenants regarding building beyond the existing building line. The planning officer stated that although she was unaware of them, any covenants would not restrict the planning process and would be dealt with as a civil matter. Mr Duggan spoke of the development leaving minimal space to the rear. Disruption and inconvenience to neighbours and members of the public was also highlighted. Mr Duggan opined that the existing property could be converted into three flats and that demolition of a Victorian property to secure one further flat was ridiculous. Mr Duggan stated that the proposal would not be a high quality contribution to the street and questioned the number of bins required for the proposed units, stating that a minimum of 8 bins rather than the proposed 5 would be needed. The planning officer conceded that there

would be limited and temporary impact on the public regarding closure of the pavement, but that a condition could be imposed regarding a construction management plan.

Cllr Hilton asked if the development would remain within the existing footprint. The planning officer stated that the development would extend to the flank wall with a terrace above, leaving a courtyard garden. Cllr De Ryk asked if it was feasible to demolish all but the façade and was informed it was and that the Inspectorate had raised no objection to this part of the previous proposal.

Cllr Walsh expressed concern regarding rooms with a single aspect and reiterated his concern with the design of the windows, citing policy DM 30 and 32. Members agreed that the windows are too large and that a more sympathetic design rather than tweaking details was needed.

Suzanne White sought clarification from members that the fenestration was the only concern and advised that if Members were minded to defer the application, further discussions could be had with the applicant to redesign this element within the scope of the current application.

The Chair asked if members were minded to defer the matter so that negotiations on design and consequent reconsultation could take place.

Councillor Walsh motioned to defer. It was seconded by Councillor Hilton.

Members voted as follows:

DEFER: Councillors Amrani (Chair), Bourne (Vice-Chair), Adefiranye, Jeffrey, De Ryk and Till

RESOLVED: To defer a decision on the application to allow officers to negotiate amendments to the fenestration design on Brockley Road.

6. 76 Lock Chase, SE3 9HA (Item 6 on the agenda)

The Planning Officer outlined details of the proposal regarding a single-storey rear extension. Following on from objections from the Blackheath Society, a number of changes were made to the application including removal of a proposed side extension; deletion of the proposed alterations to the front boundary crossover and the removal of the proposed roof light within the front roof slope including reductions to the quantum glazing within the rear elevation.

The Blackheath Society maintain their objection to the aluminium glazed doors on the south elevation.

The Committee received verbal representation from Geoff Watkins the Architect. He stated that he was not involved in past refusals linked to the site. The proposal, he said, was simple and modest and would maximise use of the garden space whilst providing large open plan living accommodation. Further reduction of the glazed area would fail to achieve this goal. The roof dormers give the option to subdivide internal space.

Cllr Walsh asked why the proposal included aluminium windows on such a high quality site. The architect replied that the original small, leaded casements were of no historic worth. Cllr Bourne asked if there were any similar developments in the area, the architect was unaware of any. Cllr De Ryk addressed members confirming that there were similar developments in