

## Peckham and Nunhead Community Council

MINUTES of the Peckham and Nunhead Community Council held on Wednesday 29 June 2016 at 7.00 pm at St Mary Magdalene Church, 17 St Mary's Road, (Off Queens Road) London, SE15

---

**PRESENT:** Councillor Sunil Chopra (Chair)  
Councillor Sandra Rhule (Vice-Chair)  
Councillor Evelyn Akoto  
Councillor Fiona Colley  
Councillor Nick Dolezal  
Councillor Renata Hamvas  
Councillor Barrie Hargrove  
Councillor Richard Livingstone  
Councillor Victoria Mills  
Councillor Jamille Mohammed  
Councillor Johnson Situ  
Councillor Michael Situ  
Councillor Cleo Soanes

**OFFICER** Gill Kelly, Community Council Development Officer  
**SUPPORT:** Beverley Olamijulo, Constitutional Officer

### 1. INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME

The chair introduced himself and welcomed councillors, members of the public and officers to the meeting.

The chair thanked the previous community council chair and vice chair for their hard work on the community council during the past year.

### 2. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillors Gavin Edwards, Cleo Soanes and apologies for lateness from Councillor Renata Hamvas.

### 3. DISCLOSURE OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

There were none.

#### **4. ITEMS OF BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR DEEMS URGENT**

There were none.

#### **5. MINUTES FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

##### **RESOLVED:**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 21 March 2016 be agreed as an accurate record, and signed by the chair.

#### **6. DEPUTATIONS**

The community council received two deputation requests from residents who live in the Peckham and Nunhead area.

The first deputation was presented by residents of Co-operative House who had raised concerns about the large housing developments around the Peckham Town Centre particularly the one proposed in 269 Rye Lane, SE15.

The spokesperson, Lawrence Ampofo stated the following:

- The residents of Co-operative House expressed concerns about a recent consultation, the process and the planning proposals that were submitted by the developers to the council.
- The residents said they were seeking the support of the community council in order to arrange a public meeting with their ward councillors, and the property developers that were responsible for the proposed developments in Rye Lane.
- The residents of Co-operative House were not involved in any consultation until the door to door canvassing that took place in March 2016 and even then the residents were only shown images of a partial development. There appeared to be a lack of consideration of the wider issues and the impact it would have on the wider neighbourhood.
- There appears to be no consideration of the impact the development would have on local parking facilities, no plans for new schools, a dentist or a doctor's surgery to cope with all the new developments in Peckham including the impact it would have on transport links in the area.
- The spokesperson referred to the developer's lack of transparency and the residents of Co-operative House's views had been misrepresented giving a false interpretation of their views.

Councillor Dolezal said as their local ward councillor and chair of the planning committee it would be inappropriate for him to attend any meeting with the residents and the developers. He pointed out that the council's planning team had concerns about certain

aspects of the development which included the sunlight and overshadowing issues the deputation addressed earlier.

The chair thanked the deputation for attending the meeting. The chair urged the representatives to submit their comments to the council's planning team before the proposed scheme was presented to the planning committee.

The second deputation was presented by a representative of Peckham Planning Network and the spokesperson, Eileen Conn highlighted the following:

That recent planning applications across the town centre had impacted on the area. Residents were of the view that the consultation process was not always open or transparent during the consultation process. She explained that many of the new developments were not affordable to those living in the area and usually had a cumulative effect on the community.

Members asked questions of both deputations.

The chair thanked the deputations for their presentation.

## **7. COMMUNITY ANNOUNCEMENTS AND PRESENTATIONS**

### **Peckham Settlement**

Michael Folk from Peckham Settlement addressed the meeting. He spoke about the project which provided a frontline service to the community that was established in 1896. In August 2012 the project ran into financial difficulties and eventually went into administration. Their premises at Goldsmith Road had to be sold. Following the sale of the premises and with the surplus that was left over from the sale, the board of trustees were able to take back control of the settlement.

Peckham Settlement re-launched their project at Peckham Library. Michael explained there was funding available for local charities and voluntary organisations to apply for small grants. Michael said he would be available during the break if people wanted to speak to him.

For more information visit the Peckham Settlement website: [www.peckhamsettlement.org](http://www.peckhamsettlement.org)

### **The Friends of Camberwell Cemeteries**

The Friends of Camberwell Cemeteries (previously known as Save Southwark Woods) spoke at the meeting and outlined that they agreed with the deputation from Peckham Planning Network about consultation involvement and access to information which they said was very difficult to receive from the council.

The group said they would like the council to share information in a timely fashion and in a way that could be easily be understood by everyone. They said the council should not be cutting down trees or moving gravestones.

The group said there should be a full public consultation on this issue.

Cllr Dolezal responded to the issues that were raised and confirmed that the council did

have a burial strategy which was consulted over for a considerable period of time. He explained that there seemed to be a difference of opinion between Save Southwark Woods and the council and the rather large number of people who think the council were doing the right thing in making burial provision for Southwark residents.

Following this there was a heated discussion and some disruption from the audience.

The chair reminded people to be respectful whilst the meeting was in progress. Reverend Olu Adams from the church asked people to be respectful particularly as they were in a place of worship.

The meeting adjourned for a break.

## **8. THEME: "GETTING TO KNOW YOU ...."**

The chair addressed the meeting and outlined his vision for the year. He highlighted that he wanted to continue fostering the community spirit and help support and improve the lives and wellbeing of Southwark residents.

- Community projects: To ensure information about community projects like Peckham Station are transparent and engaging with the community.
- Traffic issues: Making processes more effective and address people's concerns about speed humps and the lack of car parking spaces.
- Healthy living in Southwark: To invite representatives from local health authorities to the community council to address health matters like diabetes and obesity.
- Senior citizens – encourage more involvement and utilise their knowledge and address topics like isolation and promote healthy living within this group.
- More involvement of young people at community council meetings. With the help of the Southwark Chamber of Commerce to fund young people so they were able to provide them with training opportunities and involve them in the apprenticeship scheme.

The chair urged people to submit their ideas and share information at the workshops.

The meeting then went into the workshops.

## **9. FEEDBACK ON WORKSHOPS AND SET PRIORITIES FOR 2016 - 2017**

Feedback from the workshops:

### **Nunhead ward**

Cllr Colley highlighted the group's discussion:

- Youth provision in the ward
- Parking problems around Nunhead Station and Evelina Road.

- Rat running, pedestrian crossing and congestion in surrounding areas – example, Ivydale Road.
- Low life expectancy and discussion on public health issues.
- Make our streets feel safer.
- Concerns were raised about poor standards of service at the rail services.
- Accessibility on their streets which was mainly due to bins being left on their streets. They wanted to know what the council were doing about this.

### **Peckham Rye ward**

Cllr Mills highlighted the group's discussion:

- Discussion on sports pavilions and housing issues.
- Cllr Mills praised the many sports groups who had attended the community council meetings and outlined what they do for young people.
- Cllr Mills mentioned that a representative from Athenlay FC was present to promote the idea of setting up a walking football group for older residents during the day. The workshop was of the view that many local sport clubs should think about sharing their facilities with the older residents during the day.

### **Livesey ward**

Cllr Livingstone highlighted the group's discussion:

- The community council should help lobby the GLA to introduce the cycle hire scheme (Boris bikes) to the Peckham area.
- Crime and safety – safety concerns to police cuts and tackling antisocial behaviour.
- Environment and green spaces, and tackling pollution in the area.
- Intergenerational work between old and young people so they could exchange experiences and share knowledge.
- Planning and Peckham regeneration issues – look at the area action plan.
- Faith groups/community groups and two way mentoring – share skills and knowledge.

### **Peckham ward**

Cllr Johnson Situ highlighted the group's discussion:

- The group spoke about issues referring to aspirations to be a greater Peckham.
- More green spaces and increased funding for green spaces, reducing emissions.

- Develop business and employment and create a transport environment.
- Intergenerational work and public safety.
- GP services – how to facilitate discussion for a wider provision of services.
- Crime and safety – working with neighbourhood watch, community groups and the police.
- Dog fouling and issues concerning pubs around residential areas.

### **The Lane ward**

Cllr Dolezal highlighted the group's discussion:

- Public realm and to ensure our area is clean and a safe place to live.
- Affordable housing and building conservation and enforcement – to make sure what was asked for was actually delivered.
- “Celebrate where you live” the group thought it was a good idea to celebrate the area by closing Rye Lane to highlight such an event. Cllr Dolezal stated that there was a convincing argument to do this subject to discussion with Transport for London (TfL) on the closure of the road. People could celebrate the architecture heritage.
- Better understanding and communication with what the council does and provides.
- Better engagement and communication with developers to residents to ensure that their concerns were addressed and could be easily understood by all.

## **10. CONTROLLED PARKING ZONE (CPZ) STUDIES IN QUEENS ROAD AND PECKHAM ROAD SOUTH**

Members considered the recommendations contained within the report.

### **RESOLVED:**

1. That the community council agreed to the proposed consultation boundary and methods to review the parking arrangements:
  - Within a network of streets to the south of Peckham Road between the existing location of controlled parking zones and to the north of the railway line.
  - Within a network of streets around Queen's Road, bounded by Meeting House Lane and Clifton Crescent to the north, Brayards Road to the south, Pomeroy Street and Lausanne Road to the east and the existing zone B CPZ to the west.
2. That the following suggestions were agreed at the meeting:
  - a. That the community council would encourage a faster timetable for the Queens

Road consultation, as it seemed unreasonable that the consultation would not happen for another seven or more months.

- b. That officers should also consider moving Harders Road and Gordon Road into the Queens Road CPZ consultation, as it might be more appropriate in the future than inclusion in the town centre CPZ, which includes restrictions on Saturday.
- c. That the community council recommend that officers should also consult residents around Nunhead Station about a CPZ for that area as well.

## **11. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

A public question was rejected under community council procedure rule 7.3.4 (f) because it raised a grievance for which there are other established processes for resolution.

The following questions were submitted at the community council meeting:

### **PQ 1:**

Brayard Road road works have been going on for months. They have expanded pavements, dug and re-dug the pavements which has reduced parking or eliminated parking for residents. The work is so bad they have put tar as an after thought near pavements to cover their mistakes for pedestrians. Local complaints go unheard. No consultation took place prior to any works or during works etc?

### **PQ 2:**

The question I would like asked is when Southwark occupational therapy work so hard to apply for grants for apparatus for disabled people that a lot of it gets ripped out by the housing associations or council properties when a new tenant moves in.

Would it not be better to put a new tenant in there that would need the same equipment i.e. hoist equipment or a lift rather than ripping it all out? This is a total waste of resources and funding. Could someone come to the meeting with a price list of how much it cost for disability equipment. Could housing associations and the council be more responsible to find the right tenants for homes already equipped?

### **PQ 3:**

Is it right that given the difficulty in the past of obtaining access to viability studies that the council has decided to make all viability studies public?

### **PQ 4:**

Some years ago we were assured the traffic problem along St Mary's road would be looked into. A traffic survey was actually done. What was the outcome of this survey? It would be appreciated if this problem could be revisited to avoid road rage incidents on St Mary's Road?

### **PQ 5:**

Artwork for walls: Rye Lane to Choumert Road car park

The artist appointed in June 2013 by Pocket Places (Sustrans) was given permission to spray paint body shapes on to the corridor walls from Rye Lane to Choumert Road, without first collecting the views from residents about which artist's design people actually preferred for this space. Pocket Places (Sustrans) is an organisation in receipt of public funds to work in Partnership with Peckham Platform, Southwark Culture and Arts team, to improve the space of the pedestrian route across Grove Park through the Corridor to Rye Lane. The said artwork has done nothing to improve this space for pedestrian users. It has been left in this poor state since June 2013 and is peeling off the walls. During this time, vandals have covered the walls in drawings, scribbles, foul offensive messages, tags and have written all over the walls and other surfaces making this space look worse than ever before and extra work and expense for the council to remove it. In April 2015 Pocket Places apologised for the outcome of this artist's trial work citing it was a result of limited funds.

Will this community council take this issue up with the relevant cabinet members who may share responsibility for the separate areas covered in my question, to do the following?

- Ensure public funds are being spent responsibly with a view to recoup any unspent funds from this organisation so the money can be used for local area food banks to buy food for families who need it, or in donation to the popular Peckham Lido Crowd funding Campaign to rebuild the Lido on Peckham Rye Common ([Spacehive.com/Peckham-Lido](http://Spacehive.com/Peckham-Lido)).
- Give this community council a full break down of the expenditure on this project so residents can be given the opportunity to scrutinise it. Also publish the amount of council public funds that were awarded to Pocket Places and Sustrans from June 2013 to this present date to show exactly how public funds have been spent or unspent.
- To invite another public/private body to take over this project and to come and address this community council about how they can deliver the said project within agreed projected timescales.
- Given the significant delays to the delivery to date it is right it is now properly scrutinised at this community council by its members and residents before it is implemented this year 2016.
- Instruct the council's relevant project management team to fully investigate whether Sustrans (Pocket Places) or any new organisation appointed to deliver the said project does have a proven track record of working with different communities, enough resources and a proven expertise in this area to do deliver it on time. Then report the investigation findings back to this community council for the relevant ward members and residents to review it.

**PQ 6:**

Is bulk rubbish being charged for example, sofas - £16 for council tenants if so why hasn't this been advised because it's causing a lot of confusion. There has been an increase of dumped items over the last couple of months. If charged how do you pay if you do not have a credit card?



## 12. COMMUNITY COUNCIL QUESTION TO COUNCIL ASSEMBLY

Members of the community council submitted a question about the regeneration in Peckham. This was submitted at the council assembly meeting on the 13 July 2016.

### **Community council question:**

Given the regeneration that is happening in the wider Peckham area could the council

- (a) set out how it will improve communication with residents through the planning portal.
- (b) explain what the plans are and how residents can get involved.
- (c) produce information for this community council area on planning permissions for private, mixed and social housing over the last three years?

### **Council assembly meeting on 13 July 2016:**

#### **Response**

The council's online planning register was recently launched where residents, developers and businesses across the borough can access information on over 5,000 new planning applications each year, as well as thousands of past applications. It is the most effective way to be kept up to date with what's going on in their area, as once registered, users can request personalised email alerts for planning applications for specific geographic areas that they are interested in, such as Peckham.

Residents and businesses who are registered on the council's My Southwark website can now opt in to receive email updates on planning policy consultations like the new Southwark Plan. The planning policy team is proactively contacting people who are currently on the planning policy mailing list and encouraging them to sign up for this new service which improves access to planning information, alongside the My Southwark consultation hub where we consult residents on all new planning policy documents.

The council's planning service is also preparing a new digital strategy that will include pilots to improve how we communicate and reach a wider audience. The planning web pages have also been redesigned and rewritten to ensure access to information is quicker and more intuitive. Our web pages will be further improved when the council moves to its new website and the department is exploring ways to further integrate the online planning register with the My Southwark website.

The Peckham and Nunhead Area Action Plan is the adopted plan for the area and shows the changes that will take place and what they will be like in the future. Peckham will change significantly following regeneration of the town centre, employment sites, shops, housing, schools and community places. Nunhead will be enhanced and improved, particularly around Evelina Road. The council will be updating the area visions and development sites for Peckham and Nunhead as the new Southwark Plan is prepared over the next year and will be asking residents and businesses to get involved.

On particular developments being taken forward by the council in Peckham, the council has

developed tailor made resident and stakeholder programmes. The development of the design pre-planning for the current developments, which include Peckham Rye Station Square, Library Square, Peckham Levels and Mountview, have allowed extensive time for detailed discussions at a local level and have piloted working with social media. The council is undertaking a review of the co-design processes undertaken during the Station Square and Library Square developments.

Residential permissions in Peckham community council area for the past three financial years are set below:

Financial Year	Intermediate	Affordable rent	Social rent	Market	Total affordable	Total
2013-14	75	0	76	377	151	528
2014-15	33	5	65	243	103	346
2015-16	0	0	7	127	7	127
<b>Total</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>747</b>	<b>261</b>	<b>1008</b>

### 13. LOCAL PARKING AND TRAFFIC AMENDMENTS

**Note:** This is an executive function for decision by the community council.

Members considered the recommendations contained within the report.

#### **RESOLVED:**

1. That the following local traffic and parking amendment, detailed in the appendices of the report, be approved for implementation subject to the outcome of any necessary statutory consultation and procedures:
  - 1.1 Cheltenham Road – install double yellow lines to prevent obstructive parking and access to bus stop for buses.
  - 1.2 Barry Road – install double yellow lines to prevent obstructive parking and access to bus stop for buses.
  - 1.3 Rye Hill Park – install double yellow lines to prevent obstructive parking and maintain access for refuse vehicles at Nos 34 to 120 Rye Hill Park.
  - 1.4 Tappesfield Road – install double yellow lines to prevent obstructive parking and maintain access for refuse vehicles.
  - 1.5 Scylla Road – install double yellow lines to prevent obstructive parking and to provide a turning area for vehicles to manoeuvre.
2. That the objections received against the following non-strategic traffic management matter be rejected and the traffic order be implemented:
  - The Lane Ward – install new double yellow lines on unrestricted junctions

and upgrade junctions with existing single yellow lines to double yellow lines to improve inter-visibility and road safety for all road users.

Meeting ended at 9.35 pm

**CHAIR:**

**DATED:**