Peckham Community Council Planning Meeting

Minutes of Meeting
12 November 2003

Unity Building, 37 Peckham High Street, London SE15

COUNCILLORS PRESENT

1. Councillor Graham Neale – Chair
   Councillor Barrie Hargrove
   Councillor Jonathon Hunt
   Councillor Billy Kayada
   Councillor Tayo Situ

OFFICERS PRESENT

2. Alison Brittain (Planning Officer)
   Glen Egan (Legal Adviser)
   Carina Kane (Community Council Development Officer)

INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME

3. The meeting began at 9:20pm.

4. The Chair welcomed the public to the Peckham Community Council Planning Meeting and outlined housekeeping matters relating to the venue. He explained the process to be followed at planning meetings, as these were more structured than general Community Council meetings.

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

5. Apologies were given for Councillor Porter.

NOTIFICATION OF ANY ITEMS OF BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIR DEEMS URGENT

6. None were received.
DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

7. Councillor Hargrove said that he had written in to oppose the planning application for 58 Peckham Hill Street. He would be speaking as a Ward Councillor about this application.

8. The Chair said that he had visited one of the public houses the previous night. This was non-prejudicial.

ITEM 1: 61 ASYLUM ROAD

9. Alison Brittain (Planning) gave the background to the application for 61 Asylum Road. This involved the conversion of the Queen Elizabeth public house into five flats and the erection of a four storey building comprising of six flats.

10. The main reasons for objection were the loss of the public house, parking and traffic, design and impact on amenities. Despite the objections it was considered that the required policies and standards were complied with, and the officer recommendation was to grant planning permission.

11. In addition, Alison said that an additional late letter of objection had been received from 67A Asylum Road.

12. There was discussion about the role of the SPG and the UDP in planning applications. This was relation to whether the public house should have been on the market for at least two years. The main Planning Committee had turned down applications on this basis - based on the draft SPG. The adopted UDP had no policy to protect public houses. The planning officer took both the UCP and the SPG into account in planning applications.

13. Paul McParland, a consultant to the developer, spoke on behalf of the applicant. He said that the owners of the public house had approached him as income problems warranted consideration of change. Lowering the rental had allowed pub to stay active and overcome risk of vagrants taking over the premises. The developers were looking to enhance the quality of the zone, to attract quality people and would ensure that high standards were met. They would ensure the development maintained the character of the street scheme.

14. In response to the Councillor’s questioning, Mr McParland said that the building was about 120 to 130 years old, and the location was tied into very good public transport links – highway experts believed that the extra flats were unlikely to generate much more traffic around the Asylum Road area.

15. Councillor Kayada suggested that the market the developer was looking to attract would be more likely to have access to cars, therefore there would be an increased need for parking. Mr McParland said that the developer had received advice that this type of scheme would be appropriate without carparking. He referred to an offer to contribute to costs for a parking scheme.
16. Alison Brittain said that she was not aware of any offer of section 106 money. This would need to be in writing to be binding. Mr McParland said that a letter had been sent to Highways, and had been agreed.

17. Glen Egan (Legal) said that the section 106 issue needed to be resolved prior to decision. Specialist advice would be required. This was a material consideration. In response to questions from the Chair, Alison said that section 106 money was not suitable as a planning condition, and that there should be a move for deferral.

18. Mr McParland asked the Chair to look into why this issue was not part of the application. The Chair agreed to this.

19. The Chair moved to defer the application, this was seconded by Councillors Hunt and Kayada.

20. The meeting was interrupted from members of the public who wanted to raise objections to the application. Legal advised that objections should be heard formally to ensure all sides would be treated equally. The Chair asked that the objectors sign in so that they could be informed of the next meeting where they could formally raise their objections.

ITEM 2: THE GLOBE PUBLIC HOUSE, 58 PECKHAM HILL STREET, SE15

21. Alison Brittain provided information about the application to convert the Globe Public House into seven self-contained flats. In this case, the public house had not been operating for some time.

22. The main planning issues were the impact on nearby properties from proposed extensions and lack of off-street parking provisions. There had been limited response from the public – objections related to loss of the public house, site overdevelopment and construction noise. Construction noise was not a material consideration. The case officer had recommended the application be granted.

23. Councillor Hargrove interjected (from the floor) saying that there had been a petition about the loss of the pub prior to the public house closure and this had not been considered in the report. Alison Brittain said that this would not have been a consideration if it was prior to the application being put forward. No such petition had been received in connection with the application.

24. Glen Taylor (Architect) then came forward on behalf of the applicants. He said that the report spoke for itself and that he was there to answer questions. In response to questioning, Mr Taylor made the following points:

- The proposal was to remodel the back of the building, not to create a new building.
• He was not aware of any daylight effects on the surrounding area – the building would be open at the back
• There were no heritage issues to be considered from an architectural view
• There were no proposals to open up access from Bonar Street, however Mr Taylor suggested that if there was a concern, the Council could consider this as a condition of granting the application.
• There would be no collection of rainwater/grey water etc

25. Objectors were then invited to speak. Representatives from the Southwark Heritage Association (Mr Alen and Ms Alden), and a local resident came forward.

26. The resident raised concerns that the pub was part of the culture and heritage, and was taking away her friends. The Southwark Heritage made the following points:

• There was an implication that the application concerned regenerating a derelict building – however the previous tenants were asked to leave
• Heritage aspect: the building backed on to the canal. The moorings needed to be preserved
• Request for section 106 money for the Museum of London to do an archeological dig because the building had been there for over 100 years
• There had been a petition on this issue in the past, Southwark Heritage had made a representation, and it was in Southwark News.

27. Alison Brittain advised that would be little point in an archeological dig as very few groundworks were involved in the conversion. It would not be appropriate to seek section 106 money in this case. Glen Egan (Legal) advised that government policy was that archeological investigation was only required where there was a significant chance of finds of archeological importance, which was not the case here.

28. The applicant was given the opportunity to comment on the retention of fixtures and fittings. Mr Taylor replied that there appeared to be a move to look to refuse planning permission, and that he was willing to consider any reasonable conditions.

29. Councillor Hargrove was then invited to speak as a ward councillor. He said that the report was slanted, and outlined a number of points to back up his contention. For example, the report claimed that the main issue was the principal of residential use, and did not discuss the loss of a community facility. He questioned the statement that there had been a considerable amount of time for marketing, and whether there were six other public houses within a 400 metres radius from the Globe. He asked the Council to reject the application.

30. Councillor Hunt asked Councillor Hargrove if there were other planning considerations apart from loss of amenity. Councillor Hargrove replied that
the extension created potential loss to neighbours, there were no parking facilities, and the issue of archeological heritage had been underestimated by the officer.

31. Following legal advice, the Chair asked Alison Brittain if she wished to revise any part of the planning report. Alison said that the extensions were within the policy of allowing 3 metre deep extensions. Council policies protected habitual rooms, windows and gardens, the planning application would only affect the neighbours bathroom and door. There was no advice contained in the report that Alison wanted to withdraw.

32. There were no supporters who wanted to speak.

33. The Chair then noted that he was not convinced there were good reasons to refuse permission. Councillor Hunt agreed that the reasons for opposing were limited, the only key planning issue was loss of amenity. The applicant had said that he was happy for no vehicle access from Bonar Road and to talk to Southwark Heritage regarding the best way of retaining/preserving items of historical interest.

34. Alison Brittain said that there could be a condition prohibiting vehicle access from the rear. She suggested an informative regarding encouraging Southwark Heritage and the developers to work together.

35. Councillor Hunt then moved that planning permission be granted. This was seconded by the Chair. Councillors Situ, Hunt and Kayada agreed that this was sensible on balance, but that the heritage preservation could only be where practical.

OTHER BUSINESS

36. The Chair thanked everybody for coming.

37. The meeting closed at 10:35pm.

Chair:

Dated: