



**COMMUNITY COUNCILS**  
A voice for your community



## **Dulwich Community Council Planning Meeting**

Minutes of Dulwich Community Council Planning meeting held on Monday February 25, 2008 at 7.00pm held at Christ Church, 263 Barry Road, London SE22

---

### **Present**

Councillor Michelle Holford (Vice Chair), In the Chair  
Councillors, Toby Eckersley, Robin Crookshank Hilton, Kim Humphreys, Jonathan Mitchell, Lewis Robinson and Richard Thomas.

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

Councillor Michelle Holford welcomed those that were present at the meeting.

### **2. Apologies for absence**

Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Cllrs, Nick Vineall and James Barber.

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

Cllr Jonathan Mitchell declared a personal and non prejudicial interest in item 6/5, 3B Matham Grove, SE22 and made representations as a ward member.

Cllr Lewis Robinson declared a personal and prejudicial interest in item 6/6, 37 & 38 Seeley Drive, London SE21 as member of the applicant's Board of Trustees. Cllr Robinson excluded himself from the meeting for this item.

### **4. Urgent Items**

The chair agreed to accept the addendum report as late and urgent.

Following officer's advice Members also agreed to defer item 6/7, 21 Lordship Lane SE22 so a more extensive consultation takes place with residential properties. In addition a further sound report in respect of the extension should be carried out by the Council's acoustic officer before Members make a decision on this application.

## **5. Minutes of meeting on January 15 2008 (see pages 6 – 10)**

The minutes of the planning meeting held on January 15 2008 were approved as a accurate record of the proceedings subject to a few minor amendments. - Cllr Crookshank Hilton declared a personal and non prejudicial interest in item 6/2, and observed as a ward resident. The chair signed the minutes.

### **Recording of Members' votes**

Council Procedure Rule 1.9 (4) 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 Community Council 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.

## **6. DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (see pages 11 – 74)**

### **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.

### **6. Development Control Items:**

*The chair agreed to consider the planning items in the following order:*

**Item 6/1 – Recommendation: grant – 171 – 173 Crystal Palace Road, London SE22 9EP (see pages 17 – 25)**

**Proposal:** Three new single floor extensions on the west, north and east elevations with a pitched roof to match existing including a new

entrance, additional play areas, an office, a staff room and secondary rooms. Interventions in the existing building 8 new roof lights, demolition and new building of some interior walls. All in connection with increased accommodation for existing nursery.

The planning officer briefly outlined that the application was deferred from November 29/ 2007 planning meeting for design comments detailed in the report.

No objectors were present.

Officers from Southwark Children's Services made representations at the meeting and responded to questions.

The following was noted:

- Members felt that the design was still poor and it would be preferable to redesign the entire nursery
- The applicant advised that a rebuild would be too costly and that the proposal would provide care for babies for which there was a shortage.
- Members' concern about the parking and congestion resulting from the intensification of the use and that the objection on this ground was probably justified
- Officers had not received an objection from Highways to the proposal

**RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to conditions.

**Item 6/2 – Recommendation: grant – 78 Alleyn Road, London SE21 8AH**  
(see pages 26 – 33)

**Proposal:** Construction of basement, with lightwell to front elevation and associated windows to front and side; rear lower and upper ground floor extension and reconstruction of existing conservatory; single side storey infill extension; and insertion of new rooflights within rear roofslope of main dwelling. All ancillary to the creation of additional residential accommodation.

The planning officer drew Members attention to the addendum report. Members were advised that the previous application was now subject of an appeal.

The objectors made representations at the meeting and outlined that although the application had partially overcome one of the reasons for refusal it would still

infringe on the adjoining property at no. 80 and still be excessive in terms of the amount of extension to the property.

The applicant's agent addressed the meeting and responded to questions.

Members noted that the extension would not extend past the first floor window on the flank elevation of no. 80 and that the stair from the conservatory would be turned away from no. 76 offering more privacy.

**RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted.

**Item 6/3 – Recommendation: grant – 182 Overhill Road, London, SE22 0PS**  
(see pages 34 – 44)

**Proposal:** Demolition of existing two storey house and erection of a part three and part four storey building to accommodate 6no. 2 bed, 1no. 1 bed and 1no. 3 bedroom flats on ground, first, second and third floor levels, incorporating 6 no. car parking spaces, 10 bicycle spaces and associated refuse, recycling storage areas at ground floor below.

The planning officer introduced the report, circulated site plans and responded to questions from Members.

There were two objectors who made representations at the meeting. The objectors felt the building was too big and would be out of character with the size and style of properties currently in the area. They also expressed concerns at the level of development proposed on a site currently occupied by one house.

The applicant was present to address the meeting.

Members also noted the officer's advice on issues detailed below:

- The additional storey would increase by only 2.5 metres and set back from the edge of the building thus its impact would be limited.
- Location of the new balcony - it was confirmed that this would overlook land at the rear of the gardens on Mount Adon Park.
- Amount of recommended play space available for children - the officer could not confirm this but felt that given the scheme had a valid consent and the 3bed unit had a large balcony it would be hard to justify refusal on these grounds.

- Issue of parking in respect of the increase of units – there was no highway objection to the 6 spaces for the 8 units given one of the units was a 1 bedroom.

**RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to an additional condition in respect of water harvesting and reuse.

**Item 6/5 – Recommendation: refuse – 3B Matham Grove, London SE22 8PN**  
(see pages 52 – 57)

**Proposal:** Loft conversion comprising dormer window extension to rear roofslope and 3 rooflights in front roofslope, to provide additional residential accommodation to top floor flat.

The planning officer introduced the report, circulated site plans and responded to questions from Members.

No objectors were present.

The applicant made representations at the meeting. A letter in support of the application was received from a ward member (Cllr Mitchell) who also addressed the meeting.

The size and bulk of the dormer extension was discussed at length. Members felt that the proposed dormer although large could be mitigated by the use of matching materials and that its location behind Somerfield further mitigated the impact when viewed from the street.

**RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted.

**Item 6/4 – Recommendation: grant – 14 North Cross Road London SE22 9EU**  
(see pages 45 – 51)

**Proposal:** Alterations during the course of construction to roof form and rooflight at rear of property (amendments to application ref 04-AP-0165).

The planning officer introduced the report and circulated the site plans.

The applicant was present to address the meeting.

**RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted.

**Item 6/6 – Recommendation: grant – 37 & 38 Seeley Drive, London SE21 8QR** (see pages 58 – 66)

Cllr Robinson declared an interest at the start of the meeting and therefore took no part in the consideration of this item.

**Proposal:** Change of use of ground floors to a community facility (Class D1) with installation of shop front and external alterations to the rear including single storey rear extension.

The planning officer introduced the report, circulated site plans and responded to questions from members .

The officer explained that concern had been raised by objectors around the need for additional facilities potential nuisance from loitering, potential to access private balconies from the proposed extensions to the rear of the shops and problems of parking.

Officers felt that given restrictions on the opening hours, the non duplication of facilities and the units were for use by local people there should be no additional parking associated with the use.

**RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to an additional condition:

The walls of the rear extension shall be treated with anti-climbing paint to prevent unauthorised access to the flat roof above.

The meeting closed at 9.45pm

**CHAIR:**

**DATE:**