

Committee	PLANNING COMMITTEE (C)	
Report Title	MINUTES	
Ward		
Contributors		
Class	PART 1	Date: 27 APRIL 2017

MINUTES

To approve the minutes of the meeting of Planning Committee (C) held on the 16th March 2017.

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 16th March 2017 at 7.30pm.

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

1. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Councillor Hooks declared an interest in the Wood Stock Court application and would not be taking part in the discussion and voting on this case.

2. MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting of Planning Committee (C) held on 2nd February 2016 was not agreed as it contained errors. Councillors note the misspelling of Councillor Helen Klier's name and an incorrect date on the minutes. The minutes are to be amended and resubmitted for approval at the next Committee C dated 27th April 2017.

3. WOODSTOCK COURT, BURNT ASH HILL, LONDON, SE12 9HT (Item 3 on the agenda)

The presenting officer Suzanne White outlined details of the proposal and addressed questions from Councillors Clarke, Klier and Bell regarding the travel plans for the potential occupants? What are the existing route used by service vehicles when gaining access to the site? Would all the properties on the site be for private sale?

The Committee received verbal representation from Mr Burrell of HFBT Architects who explained the case has returned to committee on numerous occasion, due to the issues of amenity space. The current proposal has increased the amount of amenity available and has created an active communal space. Mr Burnell answered questions from

Councillors Clarke and Paschoud concerning why was a road placed so close to the entrance of a park used by children? What design strategies are in place to mitigate the risk to those using the park?

Mr Burrell informed committee that he was not given a reason for why the case was removed from the previous committee agenda on the night of the meeting.

The Committee received verbal representation from the objector David Ford a local resident. The objection was based on the development not being suitable or appropriate for the context. The loss of much well used communal space was not unacceptable and unjustified and the development's design has not given much considerations to the local community.

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

FOR: Councillors Bell, Klier, Paschoud, Bernards

AGAINST: Clarke

Motion was passed

4. 7 FIRS CLOSE, LONDON, SE23 1BB (Item 4 on the agenda)

The presenting officer Suzanne White outlined details of the proposal and addressed questions from Councillor Clarke, concerning why a light study was not carried out for the month of march?

The Committee received verbal representation from the applicant Mr Narvilas who explained the development's impact on the neighbouring property is greatly exaggerated, the design and scale of the proposed extension was considered so it wouldn't impact the neighbours' light by casting shadow. He also pointed out the neighbouring property has a similar extension.

The Committee received verbal representation from the objector Lisa Etherington the neighbour at No.5 represented by Mr Daniel Shardlow of Right of Light. The applicant's objection was based on development blocking daylight light into her bedroom and kitchen. Mr Shardlow answered question from Councillor Clarke were previous issues in relation to No.7's use as a student housing reported to the council?

Legal services explained that right to light is a planning consideration. Right to light is a legal term which has its own considerations.

Councillor's notes it was difficult to make an assessment of the potential impacts of the proposed building based on the details submitted.

Following deliberation by Members, Councillor Bell moved a motion to differ the case to enable further plans to be submitted that clearly show the scale of the extension and section details showing the relationship to the neighbouring properties dwelling. Further details of overshadowing and a light study details were also sought additional information to clarify the neighbour's concern. It was seconded by Councillor Klier.

FOR: Councillors Bell, Hooks, Bernards, Paschoud, Clarke, Klier

Motion was passed unanimously.

5. Bird In Hand, 35 Dartmouth Road, SE23 3HN (Item 5 on the agenda)

The presenting officer Suzanne White outlined details of the proposal, gave an overview of the site's history and addressed questions from Councillor Paschoud, concerning what is different between this current proposal and the previously refused scheme?

The Committee received no representation from the applicant.

The Committee received verbal representation from the objector Sharon Pain a local neighbour. The application objection was based the proposed development making the outside space more usable by visitor to the pub. 'We will be subject to noise nuisance late into the night'.

The presenting officer pointed out that the application was only concerned with the outside development as such it would not be appropriate to put a condition limiting the pub's use and opening hours.

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

FOR: Councillors Bell, Hooks, Bernards, Paschoud, Clarke, Klier

Motion was passed unanimously.

The meeting ended at 20:36pm. Chair

16th March 2017