



**COMMUNITY COUNCILS**  
A voice for your community



## **Camberwell Community Council**

### **Planning Meeting**

Draft Minutes of the Camberwell Community Council Planning Meeting held on Tuesday  
25<sup>th</sup> October 2005 at 7.00PM at Southwark Town Hall, Peckham Road, London SE5  
8UB.

---

#### **Present**

Councillors: Veronica Ward (Chair), Dermot McInerney, John Friary, Ian Wingfield  
and Peter John.

Officers: Sharna Quirke (CCDO), Nagla Sheikh and Julia Barton (Legal)  
Makesa Kingston and Jane Traves (Planning)

The meeting opened at **7.00pm**

#### **1. Introduction and welcome by the Chair**

Councillor Ward began the meeting by welcoming people, introducing Members and officers. The Chair informed the public of the rules and procedures that would be followed at the meeting.

#### **2. Apologies**

There were no apologies.

#### **3. Notification of any items the Chair deems urgent**

There were none.

#### **4. Confirmation of minutes**

**RESOLVED:** With correction of one typing error, it was moved that the minutes of the Planning meeting held on 21 July 2005 be approved as a true and accurate recording of that meeting and be signed by the Chair.

#### **5. Disclosure of Members' interests and dispensations**

There were no declared interests.

## **RECORDING OF MEMBERS' VOTES**

Council Procedure Rule 1.17 (5) allows a Member to record her/his vote in respect of any motions and amendments. Such requests are detailed in the following Minutes. Should a Member's vote be recorded in respect to an amendment, a copy of the amendment may be found in the Minute File and is available for public inspection

The Committee considered the items set out on the agenda, a copy of which has been incorporated in the Minute File. Each of the following paragraphs relates to the item bearing the same number on the agenda. In every case the planning officer introduced the item to Members

## **6. DEVELOPMENT CONTROL**

### **RESOLVED:**

1. That the determination of planning applications, or formal observations and comments, the instigation of enforcement action and the receipt of the reports on the agenda be considered
2. That the decisions made on the planning applications be subject to the conditions and/or made for the reasons set out in the attached reports unless otherwise stated
3. That where reasons for the decision or condition are not included in the report relating to an individual item, that they be clearly specified

### **Item 1/1      34 Love Walk SE5 - Full Planning Permission**

Erection of a freestanding pole mounted CCTV camera to the front of 34 Love Walk

**Proposal      05-AP-1261**

**Recommended      Grant**

**Procedure** Planning Officer made presented the item and presented maps and photos to the members.

The members asked questions of the Planning Officer.

One Objector was present and made a presentation to the members. Mr Maas did not necessarily object to the camera only the need for an additional free-standing poll. Other camera's in the area have been mounted on walls and were less visually intrusive.

Members asked questions of the Objector.

The applicant was not present.

There were no supporters present.

There was no ward councillor for this item.

Members then debated the item and voted.

**Resolved      Refused**

The proposal was refused on the grounds that it is an intrusive and unsympathetic addition that will add clutter in this section of Love Walk and thereby will not positively preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Camberwell Grove Conservation Area.

The proposal is unacceptable and is contrary to Policies E.2.3 Aesthetic Control and E.4.3 Proposals Affecting Conservation Areas of the Southwark Unitary Development Plan 1995 as well as Policies 3.11 Quality in Design, 3.13 Urban Design and 3.16 Conservation Areas of the Southwark Plan [Revised Draft Including Pre-Inquiry and Final Changes] February 2005.

The CCTV camera will pose overlooking and privacy impacts to adjacent properties, detrimental to the privacy of occupiers. The proposal is unacceptable and is contrary to Policies E.3.1 Protection of Amenity of the Southwark Unitary Development Plan 1995 and 3.2 Protection of Amenity of the Southwark Plan [Revised Draft Including Pre-Inquiry and Final Changes] February 2005.

The resolution was made on a majority vote. Councillor Friary did not agree to all of the reasons behind the refusal.

**Item 1 / 2      18 Grosvenor Park SE5 ONH- Councils own development – Reg 3.**  
Retention of replacement upvc windows on the rear elevation only.

**Proposal**      05-CO-0094

**Recommended**      Grant

and

**Item 1/ 3**     **14 Grosvenor Park SE5 ONQ- Councils own development – Reg 3.**  
Retention of replacement upvc windows on the rear elevation at basement level.

**Proposal**     05-CO-0093

**Recommended**     Grant

**Procedure**     Due to the nature of these items it was agreed that Item1/ 2 and Item 1/ 3 would be discussed in conjunction but the final decision made independently. Legal advice on the evening endorsed this procedure.

Before the Planning Officer presented the item she requested that Paragraph 9 and the informative of both reported be withdrawn as these statements contradicted the recommendation and was an oversight of the case officer.

Members Agreed that paragraph 9 and the informative in both reports be withdrawn.

Planning Officer made a presentation.

The Members asked questions of the Planning Officer.

There were no objectors present.

The Applicant was not present.

There were no supporters present.

There was no ward councillor.

Members then debated the item and voted.

**Resolved**

**Refused**

**Application Item 1/ 2 18 Grosvenor Park SE5 ONH** is refused on the grounds that The UPVC windows are an unsympathetic modification to buildings that will harm the character and appearance of the Camberwell Grove

Conservation Area. The proposal is unacceptable being contrary to Policies E.2.3 Aesthetic Control, E.4.3 Proposals Affecting Conservation Areas of the Southwark Unitary Development Plan 1995 as well as Policies 3.11 Quality in design, 3.13 Urban Design, 3.15 Conservation of the Historic Environment and 3.16 Development in Conservation Areas of the Southwark Plan [revised Draft Including Pre-Inquiry and Final Changes] February 2005.

**Resolved**

**Refused**

**Application Item 1/ 3 14 Grosvenor Park SE5 ONQ** is refused on the grounds that The UPVC windows are an unsympathetic modification to buildings that will harm the character and appearance of the Camberwell Grove Conservation Area. The proposal is unacceptable being contrary to Policies E.2.3 Aesthetic Control, E.4.3 Proposals Affecting Conservation Areas of the Southwark Unitary Development Plan 1995 as well as Policies 3.11 Quality in design, 3.13 Urban Design, 3.15 Conservation of the Historic Environment and 3.16 Development in Conservation Areas of the Southwark Plan [revised Draft Including Pre-Inquiry and Final Changes] February 2005.

The Chair thanked all those present for attending the meeting

The meeting ended at **8.00 pm**

**CHAIR:**

**DATE:**