



## Planning Committee B

**Report title:** 17 Minard Road

**Date:** 01 Feb 2022

**Key decision:** No

**Class:** Part 1

**Ward(s) affected:** Lewisham Central

**Contributors:** Samuel James

### 1 ADDENDUM

- 1 This is an addendum to the planning committee agenda published 26<sup>h</sup> January 2022 in respect of Planning Committee B on 1<sup>st</sup> February 2022.
- 2 This addendum provides a response to representations from neighbours received following the agenda publication for Item 4 (17 Minard Road). These representations were received 26<sup>th</sup> – 28<sup>th</sup> January 2022.
- 3 The representations set out several concerns, which are addressed below.
  1. ***Accuracy of pre-existing drawings: in particular the location of the front bay window.***
- 4 Officers acknowledge there is an inaccuracy on the submitted 'pre-existing plans' of the house that was demolished from the site in 2017. On the 'pre-existing' elevations and plans, including the 'pre-existing front elevation' shown in the officer's presentation to committee, the now demolished bay window is shown to be built against the shared boundary with the neighbouring property, No, 15. However imagery from Google Street view shows that prior to demolition, the bay was stepped away from the boundary by approximately 2.5 brick courses.
- 5 Whilst it is imperative that accurate existing plans of a site are submitted in order to ensure officers can robustly assess the impacts of any proposal, in this case, the 'pre-existing' plans of the demolished house are submitted for reference only. As no building exists on the site, existing plans showing an empty site would have been sufficient for assessment.
- 6 Notwithstanding, the pre-existing position of the bay window has no material bearing on officer's assessment of the proposal, as set out in the main officer

report. The previous relationship is not required to be replicated in the current scheme.

**2. The proposed rear elevation on Slide 9 of the officer's presentation to committee is inaccurate due to incorrect positioning of neighbouring windows at No.15 being shown.**

7 Due to officer error when preparing the presentation slides to committee, an image from a previous application was used. Members are advised this out-of-date elevation plan was not used in assessment of the application by officers, the image was used in the presentation to committee by error. The presentation has now been updated and includes the rear elevation that was submitted and considered with the current application (Plan No.1239-PL-12 Rev.H).

**3. In making an assessment regarding daylight/sunlight issues, the 45 degree test line taken from the neighbouring glazed door should be taken from further down, due to the fanlight above the door**

8 The 45 degree test is one tool officers use when assessing the impacts on daylight and sunlight to neighbouring properties, and is applied from paragraph 170 of the committee report. The submitted rear elevation on Plan No.1239-PL-12 Rev.H shows the 45 degree line taken from the centre point of the glazed door at No.15, with the fanlight above included to calculate the centre point. Officers consider this approach to be appropriate, as the fanlight by its nature allows light through, and therefore forms part of the glazed door, and can be included when assessing the impact to daylight and sunlight.

9 Notwithstanding, if the fanlight were omitted, and the centre point of the opening section of the door were used for the 45 degree line, then the impacts would not be significantly different. Paragraph 173 of the officer's report still applies in each case: *The above suggests that whilst there may be some impact to the ground floor glazed door, that it would not be significantly harmful. Furthermore, due to the limited 2m depth of the first floor element and its set away from the boundary, together with the south-easterly orientation and large amount of glazing to the door, officers consider that the impact on levels of light would be acceptable.*

**4. Inaccuracies in officers report to committee:**

Impacts to amenity assessment

10 It was noted by an objector that Paragraph 174 of the officers report states "*The 'upwards' 45 degree tests taken from the approximate centre of the full height glazed door would clear the single storey element, however the line would touch the proposed 2-storey element, approximately 1.25m below its roofline*"

11 The objector states that this is inaccurate as the 45 degree test from the actual position of the door is 1.45m below the roofline.

12 Officers have re-measured the distance between the top of the proposed 2-storey rear projection, and the position where the 45 degree line would touch the side on Plan No.1239-PL-12 Rev.H, to check this assertion. Upon reviewing the

measurement it scales to 1.3m. This 0.05m variance does not equate to a material difference in the impacts of the proposal and the impacts are considered to be acceptable.

Standard of accommodation assessment

- 13 The objector stated that several of the values in Table 2 of the officers report (Para.71) are incorrect.
- 14 Upon officer review, and re-measurement of the plans, officers acknowledge there were several minor errors in the measurements stated in the committee report. Table 2 is corrected below, showing the minor errors that have been identified. The corrected values are given in red and bold, and the incorrect values have a strike through:

House No.	Unit type ( <i>min req. GIA</i> )	Unit size (GIA) (sqm)	Room sizes (metres squared)( <i>min req.</i> )	Floor to ceiling heights (metres)	Amenity space (m. squared)	Compliance
1	3b 5p 3-storey dwelling (99)	<del>403</del> <b>101</b>	Bed 1 (1f double) – 13.7 ( <i>11.5</i> ) Bed 2 (1f single) – 9.5 ( <i>7.5</i> ) Bed 3 (2f double) - <del>15</del> <b>13.7</b> ( <i>11.5</i> )	2.6 / 2.39	46 (8)	Yes
2	4b 7p 3-storey dwelling (121)	<del>132</del> <b>130</b>	Bed 1 (gf double) – 17.3 ( <i>11.5</i> ) Bed 2 (1f double) – 16.5 ( <i>11.5</i> ) Bed 3 (1f single) – 8 ( <i>7.5</i> ) Bed 4 (double) – <del>16.2</del> <b>16.5</b> ( <i>11.5</i> )	<del>2.7</del> <b>2.6</b> / 2.39	55 (9)	Yes

- 15 The objector suggests that House 1 may not meet the minimum space standards based upon the corrected values, and notes this is due to part of the second floor bedroom (Bed 3) having a sloping roof, which means a small area of this room, measuring less than 2m<sup>2</sup> would have a floor to ceiling height of less than 1.5m. Paragraph 74 of the officer’s report explains the policy position with regards to this, and still applies even in light of the minor corrections to the officer’s report above.
- 16 Furthermore, the other inaccuracies that have been identified are minor, and do not materially alter officers assessment of the proposed standard of amenity, as set out in the main report. Officers confirm that both dwellings meet the London Plan space standards in terms of headline unit size and individual room sizes, and represent a good quality standard of accommodation.