



COMMUNITY COUNCILS
A voice for your community



Draft copy – minutes to be formally agreed at the next meeting if accurate

Dulwich Community Council Planning Meeting

Minutes of Dulwich Community Council Planning meeting held on Thursday May 8, 2008 at 7.00pm held at Dulwich Library, 368 Lordship Lane, London SE22 8NB

Present

Councillor Michelle Holford (vice chair) In the Chair
Councillors, James Barber, Toby Eckersley, Robin Crookshank Hilton, Kim Humphreys, Jonathan Mitchell and Richard Thomas.

1. Introduction and welcome by the Chair

At the start of the meeting and in the absence of the chair and vice chair Councillor Toby Eckersley presided over as chair and welcomed those present.

2. Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Cllrs, Lewis Robinson and Nick Vineall. Apologies for lateness were received on behalf of Cllrs, Michelle Holford, Kim Humphreys and Richard Thomas.

3. Disclosure of Members' interests and dispensations

Cllr Robin Crookshank Hilton declared a personal and non prejudicial interest in item 6/4, Outside 83 Norwood Road, London SE24 9AA and made representations as a ward councillor.

4. Urgent Items

There were no urgent items.

Minutes of meeting on April 3 2008 (pages 6 – 9)

Minutes of the planning meeting held on April 3 2008 were approved as an accurate record of the proceedings. 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 10 – 46)

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.

5. Development Control Items:

The chair agreed to vary the order of agenda items in the following order:

Item 7 – Consultation for proposed designation of the Sunray Estate Conservation Area (see pages 47 – 32)

The conservation & design officer was present to brief Members on the report and to explain that this item would be considered at the main planning committee. This includes comments from the Dulwich and Camberwell community councils.

- RESOLVED:**
1. That the Members agreed that the proposal to designate Sunray Estate as a Conservation Area be considered and also approved a recommendation that consultation to be carried out with local residents.

2. That Members considered the proposal to carry out public consultation with local residents and businesses to obtain a view on the designation of the Sunray Conversation Area.
3. That the Dulwich community council comment on the draft Conservation Area Appraisal and map of proposed boundary should be considered in that consultation.

At 7.20 pm the community council meeting adjourned for ten minutes. Councillor Holford then took over as chair when the meeting reconvened.

Item 6/3 – Recommendation: refuse planning permission – 77 Beckwith Road, London, SE24 9LQ (see pages 34 – 40)

Proposal: Basement alteration and the creation of a lightwell to the front of a dwellinghouse. (Further alterations detailed in plans consist of 'construction of rear dormer over outrigger altering roof to rear bay window, and single storey rear extension' this is apart of a separate application 08-AP-0235).

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

Representations were heard from an objector (resident at no. 75, Beckwith Rd). The main objections highlighted were the tendency to flooding within the basement of the application site and the problems experienced to the adjoining house as a result of work commenced. He said the development is out of character with the area specifically referring to the railings which would be highly visible from the street.

RESOLVED: That Members agreed with the officer's recommendation to refuse planning permission.

Item 6/1 – Recommendation: grant – Heber Primary School, Heber Road, London SE22 9LA (see pages 16 - 22)

Proposal: New pedestrian entrance off Heber Road, new single storey building to act as a contact centre, accessed off Jennings Road and internal alterations to form new accessible w.c. within main building.

The planning officer introduced the report, circulated site plans and responded to

questions from Members.

It was noted that one written letter of objection was received from a neighbouring property who raised concerns about loss of light and privacy.

Susan Fuller (applicant) from Southwark Children's Services was present to respond to questions from Members.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted.

Item 6/2 – Recommendation: refuse – 2A Bawdale Road, London SE22 9DN
(see pages 23 – 33)

Proposal: Retrospective application for retention of additional second storey extension to be used as ancillary to existing office, with associated rear window and solar panels on side.

The officer (Christine Zacharia) from regeneration and neighbourhoods presented the report.

Members noted that a number of objections concerning the 2nd floor extension were received regarding loss of light.

During questions, Members referred to the 1st floor extension that was granted permission in 2003. The applicant recently reduced its height unfortunately the elevation plans before Members did not represent this change.

An objector addressed the meeting whose main concern with the development was overlooking.

The applicant was present and the agent addressed the meeting.

Members asked questions of the agent in respect of:

- Type of brick work
- Demolition of second floor storey
- Whether it's a mixed used site
- Reducing height of development
- Plans before Members did not reflect the construction

The officer advised Members that officers did a site visit a month ago and were denied access.

The ward councillor (Cllr Jonathan Mitchell) addressed the meeting in support of the application.

Ward Councillor (Cllr Richard Thomas) also addressed the meeting against the proposed development.

Cllr Thomas stated that due to enforcement issues it would not be advisable for the committee to approve this scheme and drew Members attention to paragraphs 67 and 68 of the officer's report.

The proposed development will result in the loss of light and create a sense of enclosure as well as issues with the design. The photos also show some overlooking.

A member advised the applicant to resubmit plans after expressed concerns about the rear elevation.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be refused for reasons set out in the officer's report and draft decision notice. In addition that enforcement action be pursued for the unauthorised works.

Item 6/4 – Recommendation: approve – Outside 83 Norwood Road, London SE24 9AA (see pages 41 – 46)

Proposal: To resite one KX100 style telephone kiosk.

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

An objector addressed the meeting. Ward councillor (Cllr Crookshank Hilton) spoke against the proposal and advised Members that she had been in discussion with BT about alternative location and asked them to look at the level of usage from the kiosk to determine whether it was required at all.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be refused on the grounds that the siting of a phone box in this location would add to the clutter on the street detrimental to the visual amenity of the area generally, as such the proposal would be contrary to Policy 3.2 Protection of Amenity of the Southwark Plan 2007.

The meeting closed at 9.40pm

CHAIR:

DATE: