



**COMMUNITY COUNCILS**  
A voice for your community



## **Dulwich Community Council Planning Meeting**

*(Minutes to be formally agreed at the next meeting)*

Minutes of Dulwich Community Council Planning meeting held on Wednesday October 8, 2008 at 7.00pm held at Christ Church, 263 Barry Road, London SE22 0JT

---

### **Present**

Councillor Nick Vineall (Chair)  
Councillors, Robin Crookshank Hilton (Vice Chair), Michelle Holford,  
Jonathan Mitchell and Richard Thomas.

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

Councillor Vineall introduced himself and welcomed those present at the meeting and asked officers and members to introduce themselves.

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

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Cllrs, James Barber, Toby Eckersley, Kim Humphreys and Lewis Robinson.

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

Councillor Jonathan Mitchell declared a personal interest in respect of item 6/3 - he helps run football activities at East Dulwich Community Centre. Cllr Mitchell withdrew from the meeting when the item was considered.

Cllr Michelle Holford also declared a personal interest in relation to item 6/3 - as a committee member which considers capital projects for the Borough's community centres. The legal advice given was that this is not prejudicial and therefore Cllr Holford took part in the debate and decision of this item.

### **4. Urgent Items**

There were no urgent items.

## **Supplemental agenda – Sunray Estate Conservation Area**

The report was withdrawn to allow further consultation to take place with residents and other interested parties.

### **5. Minutes of the previous meetings (see pages 5 – 16)**

The Minutes of the planning meetings held on August 19 and September 9 2008 were agreed as accurate records of the proceedings which the chair signed.

### **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 24 – 54)**

#### **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.

*The chair agreed to vary the order of business on the agenda.*

**Item 6/2 – Recommendation: grant – Land adjacent to 48 Barry Road, London, SE22 0HP** (see pages 29 – 39)

**Proposal:** Erection of a 3/4 storey detached 3 bed dwelling house fronting Barry Road.

The planning officer introduced the report and advised that this was one of a number of applications made for the redevelopment of the site all of which had failed, two of which were also dismissed following planning appeals. This application was considered an improvement.

A spokesperson for the objectors present made representations at the meeting.

The applicants produced a model which was reviewed by Members prior to further discussion.

A spokesperson for the objectors spoke against the application - highlighted these concerns:

- The land had been allowed to become unsightly where previously there had been a number of fruit trees, a hoarding had been erected
- Overdevelopment
- Loss of light to the ground floor flat 48a (which was confirmed as being the only available light to the kitchen and bathroom) contrary to the information provided in the applicants daylight and sunlight report
- Loss of light to the first floor flat and to the garden of 46a Upland Road
- Referred to the building as over dominating in respect to its relationship with his property at no. 50 in particular the lack of a gap between the two buildings and the extent of the single storey element at the rear
- Bulk of the design interrupted the rhythm of the street scene, and felt the lack of parking as an issue in an area where there was already a huge parking demand for on street parking spaces

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

The applicant's agent, advised that the assessment did not include the windows referred to by the objector but one was a bathroom window which had no requirement under the guidelines for light and the other was a door which was partially obscure glazed and an assessment could only be carried out on clear

glazing. He added he felt confident that the proposal would be able to meet the requirements although these were only guidelines.

During debate Members expressed concerns over the issue of light to the ground floor flat and felt that the principle of development of the land formerly used as gardens was not acceptable. Other Members felt the design to be acceptable but did not feel that it overcame the concerns of the impact of the development upon the adjoining property. The Chair agreed that the design and size of the scheme did not sit well within the plot and appeared to be bursting out of the site.

Members also questioned whether it was possible to provide off street parking by condition – the officer advised that this was not possible.

**RESOLVED:** That the planning application be refused on the following grounds:

The proposed new dwelling, by reason of its mass, bulk and detailed design, would fail to respond positively to its surroundings. The inappropriate scale and design of the building would be an incongruous feature within the street scene, which would be unsympathetic to the aesthetic quality of the adjoining properties and interrupt the rhythm and pattern of development along Barry Road. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policies 3.2 Protection of Amenity, 3.11 Efficient Use of Land and 3.12 Quality in Design of the Southwark Plan (UDP) 2007 and Residential Design Standards Supplementary Planning Document 2008

In the absence of any evidence to the contrary the proposed new dwelling is considered to result in an unacceptable loss of daylight and sunlight to the openings on the ground floor of the adjoining property at no. 48. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to Policies 3.2 Protection of Amenity, 3.11 Efficient use of land, 3.12 Quality in Design of the Southwark Plan (UDP) 2007 and Residential Design Standards Supplementary Planning Document 2008

**Item 6/1 – Recommendation: grant – 86 Underhill Road, London, SE22 0QU**  
(see pages 23 – 28)

**Proposal:** Single storey rear extension replacing existing single storey rear conservatory which will be demolished; to provide additional residential accommodation.

The planning officer introduced the report and circulated plans of the scheme.

Officers explained that the proposal was to extend an existing semi detached house with a single storey rear extension. The proposed extension would replace an existing conservatory that would be marginally larger in height and

depth. Members noted that the proposed extension would not be significantly detrimental to the adjoining properties.

No objectors were present.

The applicant made representations at the meeting.

Members reviewed the plans and asked questions of the applicant's agent regarding materials.

**RESOLVED:** That the planning permission subject to conditions.

**Item 6/3 – Recommendation: grant – East Dulwich Community Centre, 46 – 64 Darrell Road, London SE22 9NL** (see pages 40 – 45)

Cllr Mitchell withdrew from the meeting.

**Proposal:** Installation of five road lighting type lanterns with 140 watt white lamps mounted on 5.0m high hinged columns on community centre building. Lighting to be switched off at 9.30pm.

The planning officer introduced the report and circulated plans of the scheme.

Members asked if the proposed lighting met the Council's standards in respect of light pollution and if this was a matter that could be conditioned.

No objectors were present.

Members reviewed the objector's comments and referred to the location of the objector to the application site, it was noted that the objection did not come from the closest residential property.

The applicant was present to make representations and advised the meeting that the lamps would use 140 watt lamps and backlit to prevent light spillage.

Officers advised that the lighting was of a similar level to car park and would be switched off by 9.30 pm either manually or automatically.

During debate Members expressed some concern over the time the lights were to be switched off. It was agreed that the lights would be switched off at 9:15 pm.

**RESOLVED:** That planning permission be granted subject to an amendment 2 to as follows:

The lighting hereby permitted shall be switched off by 21:15 hours every day.

**Reason**

In the interest of the amenity of neighbouring properties and in accordance with Policy 3.2 Protection of amenity of the Southwark Plan July 2007.

**Item 6/4 – Recommendation: grant – 8 – 10 Lordship Lane, SE22 8HN** (see pages 47 – 54)

**Proposal:** Erection of two fascia and one projecting sign (projecting sign and one fascia illuminated)

The planning officer advised that following the deferral of this item in August the requests made by Members from the last meeting had been progressed and were reported at the front of the report. Whilst fascia lighting was left on beyond 11.00pm along Lordship Lane the applicant has now agreed to a condition requiring the fascia lighting to be switched off at 11.00pm daily.

No objectors were present.

**RESOLVED:** That the illuminated fascia and projecting signage be approved and planning permission be granted subject to a additional condition that fascia lighting to be switched off at 11.00pm.

**7. Planning enforcement update report from 01 July 2008 until 30 September 2008** (see pages 55 – 58)

The enforcement manager presented the report and reported on the current staffing arrangements within the enforcement teams. The officer provided an update on cases referring to the listed wall on Red Post hill adjoining 19 Village Way London, SE21 and 549 Lordship Lane London SE22 and major changes to the permitted development rights to dwelling houses (explained on pages 56 -57 of the agenda).

**RESOLVED:** Members welcomed the report and are very keen for swift action to be taken concerning 549 Lordship Lane and that officers look at options in relation to taking immediate action regarding the whole of the site.

The meeting closed at 9.40 p.m.

**CHAIR:**

**DATE:**