

Committee	PLANNING COMMITTEE (C)	
Report Title	MINUTES	
Ward		
Contributors		
Class	PART 1	Date: 20 July 2017

MINUTES

To approve the minutes of the meeting of Planning Committee (C) held on the 27 April 2017.

LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

MINUTES of the meeting of the PLANNING COMMITTEE (C) held in ROOMS 1 & 2, CIVIC SUITE, LEWISHAM TOWN HALL, CATFORD, SE6 4RU on 27th April 2017 at 19:30.

PRESENT: Councillors Clarke (Chair), Hooks (Vice Chair), Bernards, Paschoud, Hordijenko, Sorba and Jacca

OFFICERS: Michael Forrester – Planning Service, Suki Montague – Legal Services and Amanda Ghani – Committee Co-ordinator

APOLOGIES: Councillors Dacres, Curran and Klier.

1. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

None

2. MINUTES

Members approved minutes for 16th March 2017. Minutes for 2nd February to be approved at next committee meeting.

3. Councillors Hordijenko and Bernards arrived after the start of the committee meeting and so did not take part in proceedings or voting on Item 3 on the agenda.

4. 7 Firs Close, SE23 1BB (Item 3 on the agenda)

This item was deferred by members at the last meeting (16th March). Members required comparison drawings to illustrate the scale of the proposed extension and its impact on neighbour amenity along with provision of an overshadowing study showing impact on 21st March 2017.

The Planning Officer Michael Forrester explained that since the deferral, two new objections have been received; they include parking stress and health and safety of children at Seeding Day Nursery.

The Planning Officer outlined details of the proposal for the construction of a rear extension at first floor. Members were shown the new drawings. Clarification on what is deemed acceptable overshadowing was given by the Planning officer as Councillor Sorba's request.

The Committee received verbal representation and photographs from the objector, Lisa Etherington who spoke about her right to light. A letter from Shirley Ellis, Ms Etherington's right of light consultant was passed to members for their consideration. Ms Etherington highlighted anomalies on the new drawings which failed to show a window and a set of French doors on the rear elevation of her property whilst incorrectly showing a window rather than a front door. She stated that the proposal would overshadow her property with light only being available between 12-3pm and that a vertical light study should have been carried out.

Council's legal officer Suki Montague, reminded members that they should consider loss of sunlight and overshadowing rather than right of light. The concept of right to light is dealt with under a different legal regime.

Councillors Paschoud and Hooks agreed that they were satisfied with the new submitted details and the officer's recommendation. Councillors Sorba and Clarke asked for clarification on how and when the rooms were used. Using the submitted drawings, the Planning Officer showed members how the sun moves across the site.

After deliberation, Councillor Paschoud moved a motion to accept officer's recommendation. It was seconded by Councillor Hooks.

Members voted as follows:

AGAINST: Councillors Clarke, Sorba and Jacca.

Councillor Sorba then moved a motion to reject officer's recommendation. It was seconded by Councillor Jacca.

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Councillor Clarke

AGAINST: Councillors Paschoud and Hooks.

RESOLVED: That the application DC/16/098073 be refused due to significant overshadowing having a detrimental impact on neighbouring residential amenity.

4. 25 Southbrook Road, SE12. (Item 4 on the agenda)

New conditions for an approval were tabled.

The planning officer Michael Forrester outlined details of the application for the construction of an infill two-storey extension to the rear, with associated roof lights, sash windows, glazed sliding doors and rear decking and sited three similar extensions that exist on the road. Objections received were concerned with scale, design and loss of light. The council's conservation officer had no objection to the proposal.

Members sought clarification on the width of the gap between the subject property and its neighbour and the angle of the roof slope with regards light to the upper window.

Councillor Hooks noted anomalies in the officer's report which should refer to Lee Green Councillors and the Lee Green Conservation Area rather than Lee Manor.

The committee received verbal representation from James Kay the Architect, who spoke about character, design and materials. He pointed out that the roofline had been designed with consideration to neighbours windows.

There were no questions from members and so the committee received verbal representation from Ms Hadfield, her daughter Mia and Charles Batchelor who was representing the Lee Manor Society. Mia Hadfield pointed out that submitted pictures failed to show her bedroom on the ground floor of the property. She outlined to members the room uses of the rooms that had windows on the side elevation and indicated where there would be loss of sunlight.

Charles Batchelor noted the railway line running behind the properties and the view passengers would have from the passing trains. He said that historically there was a reluctance to grant two storey rear extensions to these properties. He stated that the design would be better if it stood apart from the original house rather than trying to blend in with existing design features.

The Planning Officer explained to members that there is no ban on two storey rear extensions and confirmed new guidance is being updated in line with the number of planning legislation changes that have taken place over the last few years.

The proposal was further considered by members. Councillor Clarke said that impact on loss of light to rooms maybe greater if the property is in flats rather than as a single dwelling.

The Legal Officer reminded members that when considering the proposal, they would need to decide how much weight to give to the loss of light to a bedroom.

Councillor Sorba moved a motion to reject the Officers recommendation to approve the proposal. The motion was not seconded.

Councillor Jacca moved a motion to accept the Officers recommendation. It was seconded by Councillor Paschoud.

Members voted as follows:

FOR: Councillors Bernards and Hordijenko

AGAINST: Councillors Clarke and Sorba.

ABSTAINED: Councillor Hooks.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted in respect of application No. DC/17/099901.

The meeting ended at 8.30pm. Chair

27th April 2017