

Dulwich Community Council

Monday 4 July 2011

7.00 pm

Dulwich Library, 368 Lordship Lane, London SE22 8NB

Supplemental Agenda

List of Contents

Item No.	Title	Page No.
5.	Minutes from the previous meeting To confirm as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 11 May 2011.	1 - 4
7.	The proposed Traffic Calming and 20 mph speed limits in East Dulwich.	5 - 18

Executive Function

That Members consider the objections received to the statutory notice for the proposed implementation of traffic calming and 20 mph speed limits in East Dulwich. Also, to instruct officers to make the necessary traffic management order under the relevant powers as detailed in the report.



DULWICH COMMUNITY COUNCIL
- Planning -

MINUTES of the Dulwich Community Council Planning meeting held on Wednesday 11 May 2011 at 7.00 pm at Christ Church, 263 Barry Road, London SE22 0JT

PRESENT: Councillor James Barber (Chair)
Councillor Helen Hayes (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Robin Crookshank Hilton
Councillor Toby Eckersley
Councillor Jonathan Mitchell
Councillor Michael Mitchell
Councillor Lewis Robinson
Councillor Andy Simmons

OFFICER SUPPORT: Sonia Watson, Planning Officer
Gavin Blackburn, Legal Officer
Christian Loveday, Transport Officer
Beverley Olamijulo, Constitutional Officer

1. INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME

The chair welcomed members of the public, councillors and officers to the community council meeting.

2. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Lewis Robinson and Rosie Shimell.

3. DISCLOSURE OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

The following Members declared an interest in relation to the agenda item below:

**Item 6.2 – James Allen’s Girls School, 144 East Dulwich, London SE22 8TE
application number 10-AP-1510**

Councillor James Barber, personal and non prejudicial as his daughter and son attend JASSPA piano lessons at the School.

Councillor Helen Hayes, personal and prejudicial, as she knows the consultant who was responsible for this application. Councillor Hayes left the meeting when this was considered.

Councillor Jonathan Mitchell, personal and non prejudicial as his daughter previously attended the School.

Councillor Michael Mitchell, personal and non prejudicial as one of the consultees.

Councillor Robin Crookshank Hilton, personal and non prejudicial because she addressed the meeting as a ward member.

4. ITEMS OF BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR DEEMS URGENT

No late items were received at the meeting other than the addendum report which contained late observations, consultation responses and information in respect of item 6.2, James Allen's Girls School, 144 East Dulwich, London SE22 8TE application number 10-AP-1510.

5. MINUTES FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the meeting held on the 13 April 2011 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the chair.

6. DEVELOPMENT CONTROL ITEMS

6.1 17 BURBAGE ROAD, LONDON SE24 9HJ

Planning application reference number 10-AP-0287

PROPOSAL

Partial demolition of existing rear extension, erection of new rear extension, and roof conversion with new roof light to rear roof slope and new roof lights to the side and the enlargement of existing basement to provide additional residential accommodation.

The planning officer introduced the report and circulated the site plans. The officer also drew Members' attention to the addendum report which contained late comments with regard to this application.

Councillors asked questions of the planning officer.

There were no objectors present.

The applicant was not present

There were no supporters present at the meeting

Members discussed the application.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission for application 10-AP-0287 be granted subject to conditions as outlined in the report.

6.2 JAMES ALLEN'S GIRLS SCHOOL, 144 EAST DULWICH GROVE, LONDON, SE22 8TE

Planning application reference number 10-AP-1510

PROPOSAL

Erection of 3-storey plus basement building to provide community music centre for use by school and local community (Use Class D1).

The planning officer introduced the report and circulated the site plans. The officer also drew Members' attention to the addendum report which contained legal information and alterations to the conditions in regard to this application.

Councillors asked questions of the planning officer.

The objectors that were present addressed the meeting.

The applicant and applicant's agent made representations at the meeting and responded to Members' questions.

There were no supporters present.

Councillor Robin Crookshank Hilton addressed the meeting as a ward councillor.

Members discussed the application and asked questions of the transport officer present at the meeting.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission for application 10-AP-1510 be granted subject to the conditions and those amended conditions set out below:

Condition 7. The building hereby permitted shall not be open other than to staff and pupils outside of the hours 07:30-22:00 Monday to Friday, 07:30 to 22:00 Saturdays and 12:00 - 22:00 on Sundays or Public Holidays.

Condition 10. Prior to the commencement of development a parking strategy for all staff parking, which shall include staff being allocated specific spaces in which to park by marshalls on a daily basis and micro car parking bays, shall be submitted to etc.

Condition 11. An additional bullet point to read:

A travel plan for all construction workers and all construction traffic including car use shall be contained within the site.

Condition 14. The windows to the East Dulwich Grove elevation shall not be used for the display of advertisements or other displays and shall remain transparent and free from any obstruction at all times. (as per addendum)

Condition 22. Notwithstanding the submitted event management plan a further document shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for its written approval prior to the commencement of works on site. which shall include details of the following:

1. The endeavours made to coordinate timetables and school calendars with Alleyns and the Charter Schools to ensure events at this development and Alleyns performing arts centre and The Charter School, likely to attract upward of 300 visitors at both schools are not held simultaneously.
2. A strategy to engage and liaise with local residents and provide a point of contact for any complaints arising from the use of the proposed building and an undertaking to carry out that strategy and no later than six months after its implementation identify appropriate action to take to address any complaints received.
3. A system of Marshalling to prevent unnecessary on street parking and maximise use of the on site parking spaces (including those used by JAGS sports centre), to be employed when the development hosts an event controlled by tickets, or for which upward of 300 people might be reasonably anticipated to attend.
4. Details of amendments to the School travel plan to incorporate this development, to include the promotion of cycling facilities public transport and car sharing

Condition 23. No more than 4 major events shall take place within one calendar year, (a major event, is considered to be not ancillary to the existing school, (D1 use) as operated by the occupying school and consisting of an audience of 400 people outside of normal school hours, (Monday - Friday 9am to 5pm).

The meeting ended at 10.00pm.

CHAIR:

DATED:

Item No. 7.	Classification: Open	Date: 4 July 2011	Meeting Name: Dulwich Community Council
Report title:		Consideration of objections to the proposed Traffic Calming and 20 mph speed limits in East Dulwich	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		East Dulwich	
From:		Head of Public Realm	

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the objections received to the statutory notice for the proposed implementation of traffic calming and 20 mph speed limits in East Dulwich are considered and rejected.
2. To Instruct officers to make the necessary traffic management order under the relevant powers contained in section 6 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and to implement the scheme as soon as possible.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

3. Dulwich Community Council approved traffic calming proposals in Matham Grove, Ashbourne Grove and Chesterfield Grove and to implement of 20 mph speed limits in 17 streets from the Cleaner Greener Safer programme.
4. The primary objective of the scheme is to improve safety by reducing the traffic speeds in the area.
5. Public consultation was undertaken in September 2010 for proposed traffic calming and speed limits in Matham Grove, Ashbourne Grove, Chesterfield Grove, Bassano Street and Blackwater Street. The results of the consultation were analysed and reported to the Dulwich Community Council, highlighting a shortfall in funding.
6. The public consultation undertaken for East Dulwich 20 mph speed limit area, bounded by Barry Road, Lordship Lane and Whately Road, lasted 3 weeks from the 19th February to the 12th March 2010.
7. A Traffic Management Order for the new speed limits in streets outlined in paragraphs 5 and 6 above, and the notice for the speed humps in Matham Grove, Ashbourne Grove and Chesterfield Grove only, were advertised in local papers and a number of notices were displayed in the street in accordance with the statutory procedure.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

8. Objections to the proposed works were received in response to the Public Notice published in accordance with the statutory procedure. (see Appendix 1 and 2)
9. The results of Public consultation are shown in Appendix 3.

10. The responses to the public consultation indicates that there was a majority in favour of the proposed speed humps in Matham Grove, Chesterfield Grove and Ashbourne Grove
11. There was a majority in favour of 20 mph speed limit in Matham Grove, Ashbourne Grove, Chesterfield Grove, Bassano Street and Blackwater Street.
12. There was a majority in favour of 20 mph speed limit on roads bounded by Barry Road, Lordship Lane and Whately Road.
13. The road humps and the 20 mph speed limits have been designed in accordance with the current DfT recommendations.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

14. The recommendations contained within this report are consistent with the council's Local Implementation Plan (LIP).
15. The proposals to introduce 20 mph speed limit is also consistent with the council's policy to impose 20 mph limit on all roads for which Southwark Council is the Highway Authority.

COMMUNITY IMPACT STATEMENT

16. The proposed traffic calming scheme in East Dulwich will impact the local community by improving the general road safety.

RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

17. The £52,000 required to complete the works will be funded from the existing Cleaner Greener Safer capital budget for this scheme. Additional funding of £25k was agreed by the Dulwich Community Council on 24 January 2011.

REASONS FOR URGENCY/LATENESS

18. The legal advice received stated that the scheme cannot be considered 'strategic' as it is funded by Cleaner Greener Safer funding which is devolved spending and therefore any determining of statutory objections from traffic management orders must be by the community council. This advice has only just been received.
19. Because of the summer break, it would be unreasonable to delay implementation of the scheme until after September meeting since the initial public consultation was completed in September 2010.

APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	Objections summary with officers responses
Appendix 2	Objections received
Appendix 3	Summary of public consultation result

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Consultation designs	Public Realm 160 Tooley Street London SE1P 5LX	Anil Apte, Senior Engineer 020 7525 2132
Dulwich Community Council Minutes on 24 January 2011	Communities Law and Governance, 160 Tooley Street, PO Box 64529 Southwark Council London SE1P 5LX	Beverley Olamijulo Constitutional Officer 020 7525 7234

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Des Walker, Head of Public Realm	
Report Authors	Anil Apte and Matthew Hill, Public Realm Programme Managers	
Version	Final	
Dated	21 June 2011	
Key Decision?	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Strategic Director for Legal and Democratic Services	No	No
Finance Director	No	No
Cabinet Member	No	No
Date final report sent Community Council Team	4 July 2011	

APPENDIX 1

Date	Name, Address	Objection	Officers Response
25/05/2011 Landells Road	Why no humps are proposed in Landells Road	If further CGS funds are available an application will be considered.
25/05/2011 Matham Grove, London	Object to hump being placed out side their house. This is waste of Public money at the time of financial difficulties. Object on grounds of noise Object on grounds of increased pollution	The funds were approved bu Dulwich Community Council The humps will be constructed in accordance with the Dft guidelines. It is not expected to increase noise or pollution.
25/05/2011 Upland Road London	Object to the extent of the proposals and the method of traffic calming	Traffic calming will be achieved with sinusoidal humps in accordance with the DfT recommendations. It is Council's policy to reduce speeds to 20 mph on all of its roads.
26/05/2011 Matham Grove	Matham Grove has no speeding problems. This would be wasteful of funds, be disruptive and increase parking problems for residents.	There was a CGS Application for Matham Grove component, followed after a 30 person Matham Grove resident petition. There was a majority in favour of the traffic calming 53.33% supported the humps and 86.66% supported the speed limit. The humps will not reduce any parking for the residents.

APPENDIX 2

East Dulwich Area - Proposed 20 mph speed limits.Ref. No: PR/ND/RDH/TMO1112-0125th May 2011**previously sent my objections to this proposal to sharada.kalakhetti@southwark.gov.uk on the 25th September 2010.**

We signed in favour of Road Humps when Gregor, a neighbour, came to the door with his petition but have now had time to reconsider and we now oppose the idea.

I object to a hump being placed outside my house on the grounds that it is an outrageous waste of public money at a time when the country has financial difficulties:-

I've lived at this address for 27 years and the only accidents I know of are the two relating to vehicle damage claimed by Gregor, the organizer of the hump petition. Humps are not necessary. Speed isn't an issue in this street. The installation would be an outrageous waste of public money!

I object to a hump being placed outside my house on the grounds of noise:-

Although the residents of Derwent Grove are not unduly bothered by the humps, their gardens are deeper and they don't have as many delivery lorries and vans etc as we do servicing the shops of Lordship Lane. (The No Right Turn at the junction of East Dulwich Grove and Lordship Lane forces traffic down our street heading towards Forest Hill) My front window is just over 3m from the curb. I know for a fact that heavier vehicles shake/vibrate the windows of my house and the contents of delivery vehicles cause rattle and general noise. My evidence for this is the fact that we have had to put up with pot-holes outside number 8 and 10 for many years. The noise was so annoying that I reported them for repair over 5 or 6 times in the last 3-4 years.

Recently our street has been resurfaced and the difference is enormous. I don't want the risk of being returned to the constant rattle and noise from vehicles caused by the humps.

I object to a hump being placed outside my house on the grounds of increased pollution:-

When driving, one generally accelerates away from a hump. Watch others or analyze your own driving. This will undoubtedly cause more pollution directly outside and inside my house. Having the original sash windows I know that the pollution caused by car exhaust and even shopkeepers who used to smoke outside my house can be detected in the house.

Finally, if you insist on placing humps in Matham Grove please place the last hump, currently at the boundary of 6 and 8, outside the house of someone who supports the idea.

.....
 Matham Grove

From: [mailto:.....@talktalk.net]
Sent: 25 May 2011 20:21
To: traffic orders
Subject: Ref PR/ND/RDH/TM01112-001

Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like to register both my support and my concerns re: building speed bumps and the proposed use of 20mph speed limits in the East Dulwich area. I live at Landells Road and have lived in this house for the last 5-6 years. I whole heartedly support the proposals regarding the enforcement of the 20 mph speed limit on Landells Road. Cars travel at great speed up and down our road causing a great deal of noise and pollution and put pedestrians at an increased risk of fatal accident as a result of their speed. The speed that some cars reach on our road is truly astounding. We have two children who are 2 and 3.5 and I am very worried for their safety. Although I support your proposals I am also concerned that the limit will not be enforced. How do you propose to enforce the limit because without speed cameras or a police man standing guard on the street there is NO WAY cars will slow down.

I note that you are proposing to put in speed humps on 3 roads Ashbourne, Matham and Chesterfield. Why just 3 roads? Why those roads? And why not Landells Road? Landells Road is very long and gives cars the opportunity to gather great speed in a way which is not seen on the other roads. Landells is used as a rat run and cut through from Lordship Lane to The Rye in a way that the other three roads are not. Additionally, because Crystal Palace Road has speed bumps, car users dash up Landells road (which runs parallel) to avoid the bumps on Crystal Palace Road.

Please, please, please re-consider and build speed humps along the entire length of Landells Road.

Many Thanks

.....

PS On a positive note – the re-surfacing of the road last year has been a great plus. Thanks!
 Now, what about the pavements!!

Upland Road
 East Dulwich
 London SE22 0DG

25th May 2011

PO Box 64529
 SE1P 5LX

Dear Sirs

Your Ref: PR/ND/RDH/TMO 1112-001 (East Dulwich No. 2)

I wish to formally object to the proposals advertised for one or more of the following reasons:

I do not object to the provision of 20mph limits in some streets where appropriate. However the extent of the proposals and the methods of traffic calming are not appropriate for the area.

1. The use of road humps causes noise, vibration, pollution and possible property damage, particularly with heavy vehicles.
2. Road humps cause drivers to go slow-fast-slow thereby increasing noise and fuel consumption increasing pollution.
3. It is not necessary to have traffic calming measures in any street shorter than 50 metres as drivers cannot accelerate in this length.
4. Traffic calming should be limited to only those streets where there is a measured and proven speed problem. Such measurements are not available.
5. It is not necessary to have a reduction in speed limit to 20mph if traffic calming is introduced in the problem roads.
6. Road humps are unsightly and downgrade the visual environment. The Council should rather be seeking to improve the environment of East Dulwich.
7. More environmentally acceptable alternatives to road humps are available. For example: tables at road junctions; chicanes; strategically placed parking bays; strategically placed shrub planting. Although more costly this would be the same total cost if some of the reductions suggested above are undertaken.
8. There has been no carbon impact assessment of the proposal. This is likely to be high due to the speed reductions and increased fuel consumptions in the area. It would make a negative contribution to the government's declared target of halving carbon emissions by 2025.
9. Some boroughs (eg Croydon, Barnet, Sheffield) have removed humps due to waning public support. The reasons for this should be investigated and made known to residents before any further humps are introduced.

Please note this is a substantive objection and can only be withdrawn by me in writing. It cannot be considered to be withdrawn simply after any phone conversation.

Ref: PR/ND/RDH/TMO1112-001

MATHAM GROVE TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES**Help us to help you!**

Please complete this questionnaire and tick the boxes as appropriate.

Give us your views!

1. Do you support the proposal for speed humps in Matham Grove? Yes No No opinion
2. Would you support a 20 mph speed limit in Matham Grove? Yes No No opinion
3. Are you a resident or business? Resident Business

4. **Additional comments and suggestions**—As Matham Grove has no speeding problems this would be wasteful of funds, be disruptive, increase parking problems for residents. A residue of 6 hours, I can reassure you the road itself acts as a speed limiter. The two sections joined by the corner bend are too short in length to accommodate speed. Cars are slow moving upon entry having stopped or slowed down to enter, only to then need to carefully negotiate the corner bend as they turn to park or continue at no increase in speed to junction. I often walk in the road as I know vehicles are few and the speed is limited by the design of the road.

Name Date Address Postcode

(PTO)

Should you require any further information regarding the proposed scheme please do not hesitate to contact Sharada Kalakheti on 0207 525 5556. Alternatively you can email to: sharada.kalakheti@southwark.gov.uk.

APPENDIX 3

The tables below report the level of response and the general level of support for the measures outlined in the consultation exercise. Only the responses received on completed questionnaires and emails from residents and businesses of the project area have been considered. Responses received from Southwark in-house and statutory consultees have not been considered for statistical calculations. Their particular queries, if applicable, were responded separately.

Matham Grove

Total number of letters sent to residents	65
Total number of letters sent to statutory consultees (not considered for statistical calculations)	16
Total number of letters sent to Southwark in-house statutory consultees (not considered for statistical calculations)	22
Number of completed questionnaires returned	14 (21.54 %)
Number of responses received by email and letters	1 (1.54 %)
Number of responses from residents	14 (21.54 %)
Number of responses from businesses	1 (1.54 %)
Number in support to the proposal of the speed humps	8 (53.33 %)
Number in opposition to the proposal of speed humps	7(46.67 %)
Number with no opinion to the proposal of speed humps	0 (0.00 %)
Number in support to the proposal of 20 mph speed limit	13(86.66 %)
Number in opposition to the proposal of 20 mph speed limit	1 (6.67 %)
Number with no opinion to the proposal of 20 mph speed limit	1 (6.67 %)

Consultation responses were returned from 15 residents and businesses, of which 53.33% have supported the proposal of implementation of speed humps and 86.66% have supported the proposal of implementation of 20 mph speed limit.

Ashbourne Grove

Total number of letters sent to residents	99
Total number of letters sent to statutory consultees (not considered for statistical calculations)	16
Total number of letters sent to Southwark in-house statutory consultees (not considered for statistical calculations)	22
Number of completed questionnaires returned	21 (21.21 %)
Number of responses received by email and letters	1 (1.01 %)
Number of responses from residents	21(95.45 %)
Number of responses from businesses	1 (4.55 %)
Number in support to the proposal of the speed humps	13 (59.09 %)
Number in opposition to the proposal of speed humps	8(36.36 %)
Number with no opinion to the proposal of speed humps	1 (4.55 %)
Number in support to the proposal of 20 mph speed limit	19(86.36 %)
Number in opposition to the proposal of 20 mph speed limit	2 (9.09 %)
Number with no opinion to the proposal of 20 mph speed limit	1 (4.55 %)

Consultation responses were returned from 22 residents and businesses, of which 59.09% have supported the proposal of implementation of speed humps and 86.36% have supported the proposal of implementation of 20 mph speed limit.

Chesterfield Grove

Total number of letters sent to residents	81
Total number of letters sent to statutory consultees (not considered for statistical calculations)	16
Total number of letters sent to Southwark in-house statutory consultees (not considered for statistical calculations)	22
Number of completed questionnaires returned	28 (34.57 %)
Number of responses received by email and letters	0 (0.00 %)
Number of responses from residents	27(96.43 %)
Number of responses from businesses	1 (3.57 %)
Number in support to the proposal of the speed humps	16 (57.14 %)
Number in opposition to the proposal of speed humps	12(42.86 %)
Number with no opinion to the proposal of speed humps	0 (0.00 %)
Number in support to the proposal of 20 mph speed limit	24(85.71 %)
Number in opposition to the proposal of 20 mph speed limit	4 (14.29 %)
Number with no opinion to the proposal of 20 mph speed limit	0 (0.00 %)

Consultation responses were returned from 28 residents and businesses, of which 57.14% have supported the proposal of implementation of speed humps and 85.71% have supported the proposal of implementation of 20 mph speed limit.

Bassano Street and Blackwater Street

Total number of letters sent to residents	131
Total number of letters sent to statutory consultees (not considered for statistical calculations)	16
Total number of letters sent to Southwark in-house statutory consultees (not considered for statistical calculations)	22
Number of completed questionnaires returned	23 (21.21 %)
Number of responses received by email and letters	2 (1.01 %)
Number of responses from residents	21(84.00 %)
Number of responses from businesses	4 (16.00 %)
Number in support to the proposal of the speed humps	10 (40.00 %)
Number in opposition to the proposal of speed humps	14(56.00 %)
Number with no opinion to the proposal of speed humps	1 (4.00 %)
Number in support to the proposal of 20 mph speed limit	21(84.00 %)
Number in opposition to the proposal of 20 mph speed limit	3 (12.00 %)
Number with no opinion to the proposal of 20 mph speed limit	1 (4.00 %)

Consultation responses were returned from 25 residents and businesses, of which only 40.00% have supported the proposal of implementation of speed humps and 84.00% have supported the proposal of implementation of 20 mph speed limit.

East Dulwich 20 mph speed limit

Number of questionnaires returned	100	-
No. of responses from residents	95	(95 %)
No. of responses from businesses	3	(3 %)
No. in support of the scheme	82	(82%)
No. in opposition to the scheme	16	(16 %)
No opinion	2	(2 %)

Consultation responses were returned from 100 of the residents and businesses out of 3057 (3.3% response rate), of which 82% supported the scheme and 16% opposed the proposals.

DISTRIBUTION LIST

MUNICIPAL YEAR 2011/12

COUNCIL: DULWICH COMMUNITY COUNCIL

NOTE: Original held by Constitutional Support Unit; amendments to Beverley Olamijulo
(Tel: 020 7525 7234)

OPEN	COPIES	OPEN	COPIES
To all Members of the Dulwich Community Council:			
Copies sent to members by email and tabled at the meeting		TOTAL DISTRIBUTION	32
Libraries: (Dulwich)	1		
Local History Library	1		
Press:			
Southwark News	1	Dated:	4 July 2011
South London Press	1		
Members of Parliament			
Tessa Jowell M.P.	1		
Constitutional Officer	15		
Others			
Shahida Nasim			
LBS Audit Manager			
Ground Floor			
Tooley Street			
SE1	1		