



COMMUNITY COUNCILS
A voice for your community



Nunhead and Peckham Rye Community Council

Planning Meeting

Minutes of the Nunhead and Peckham Rye Community Council Planning Meeting held on
Thursday 3 February 2005 at Southwark Town Hall, Peckham Road, SE5 8UB.

The meeting opened at **6.08am**

PRESENT

Councillors: Robert Smeath (*Chair*), Fiona Colley (*Vice Chair*), Mick Barnard and Andy Simmons.

Officers: Louise Shah (CCDO), Ellen Fitzgerald (Legal), Chris Colville (Design) and Tim King (Planning).

1. INTRODUCTION

Councillor Smeath welcomed attendees.

2. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were sent from Councillors Thorncroft, Hayes, Banya and Graham.

3. NOTIFICATION OF ANY OTHER ITEMS THE CHAIR DEEMS URGENT

There were none.

4. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

Cllr Barnard said that he would be speaking in a Ward Councillor capacity for Item 1/3.

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.

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (SEE PAGES 1 TO 36)

ITEM 1/1: 160 Queens Road, SE15 – Full Planning Permission

Proposal: (04-AP-1235)

Redevelopment of site to provide a four storey building to provide 20 flats and 8 car parking spaces with access from St Mary's Road.

Recommendation: Grant

The Planning Officer introduced the item, describing the proposal, site and feedback from consultation. He stated that the application came before Community Council previously in September 2004.

The Design Officer said that all concerns were worked through with the architects and in his view the materials complement the existing buildings. The scale would be in keeping with the surrounding area and the application is conditioned tightly in terms of supplying details and samples. He said he was satisfied the application as it stood.

Members had no questions for either the Planning or Design Officers.

The Objector (resident of 164 Queens Road) then spoke for three minutes. The main points were:

- i) The report says the development would only overlook a single storey windowless garage. This is not true. 164A is not a garage and has windows
- ii) The development would be amongst listed buildings
- iii) The designs were changed without giving locals the opportunity to view them
- iv) Everyone would like to see a better use of the area but they resent the inaccuracies in the report
- v) There would be a loss of light at 164A
- vi) TfL said they did not have concerns but the Objectors cannot see how they could not as it only allows 8 spaces for 20 flats. There are also a lot of car break ins currently
- vii) There are not enough amenities currently; 20 extra flats will be an extra burden on those existing.

Members asked the Objector questions about the windows and also whether they were written to about the revised plans by the Council, given that they were initial objectors (no) and/ or the developer (no).

The Applicant spoke for a minute and a half giving a history of the application and describing how the scheme had been reduced significantly. It was also stated that all the flat occupiers were written to in October (a copy of the letter was produced) offering a meeting but no replies were received.

The Agent then spoke for a minute and a half saying that he agreed with planning officers that there would be minimal overshadowing; it has full disabled access and the amenity space is sufficient. The trees are also safe.

Cllr Barnard asked how many letters had been sent out and how many returned (Cllr Smeath also asked if the letters requested a response); the Applicant responded that all flats in the vicinity were sent letters, they did request responses but none were received. The same was asked of the Planning Officer who responded that details of correspondence were on page twelve of the agenda.

There were no supporters present.

Members took a vote, the results of which were as follows:
Cllrs Colley, Barnard and Glover were in favour; Cllr Smeath abstained and Cllr Simmons was against the development on design grounds.

Decision: **GRANT** the application as recommended.

ITEM 1/2: **Land to rear of 159, 161 and 163 Peckham Rye, SE15 – Full Planning Permission**

Proposal: (04-AP-1475)

Conversion of rear part of existing factory building along Soloman's Passage and existing warehouse/ workshop buildings located to the rear of numbers 45-55 Waveney Avenue to provide 12 dwellings.

Recommendation: Refuse

Cllr Simmons declared that he lives near the site but has no interests – personal or prejudicial – as he cannot see the site from his home.

The Planning Officer introduced the item, describing the proposal, site and feedback from consultation (which included both letters of support and objection). He alerted Members to an email received from Cllr Banya, and also a letter from the Applicants. He said that it was being recommended for refusal for three reasons as stated in the draft decision notice (**NOTE:** The decision notice had several type errors; it should have read recommended for refusal plus the ‘conditions’ were in fact reasons for refusal.)

Members asked the Planning Officer the questions about density, the old and emerging UDPs, and loss of privacy. They were satisfied with the responses.

The Objector spoke for three minutes stating that the plans still looked cramped and enclosed and the distance between the courtyards looked small. She had concerns about potential noise problems due to the close proximity and also felt that replacing the apex roof with a flat one will increase the sense of claustrophobia. Spiral staircases also seemed impractical for furniture removal, deliveries, disabled visitors and dealing with fires. She also felt parking would be a problem and aesthetically it was not pleasing.

Members asked the Objector questions regarding density.

The Applicant's Agent then spoke for up to three minutes stating that further papers were to be circulated to inform his presentation. He then addressed the three points for refusal:

- i) It was made clear in October that 25% affordable housing would be offered. This has since been revised at whilst only 35% is required, 40% is being offered.
- ii) With regards car parking, the Traffic Group were happy and there have been no objections about this. There is also no basis for refusal on these grounds in relation to the emerging UDP.
- iii) In relation to cramping, the development is compliant with regulations and again there is no basis for refusal on design grounds.

Members asked the Applicant questions about cramping, consultation, the roof and staircases and asked where similar schemes had been done elsewhere in London.

A Supporter of the application then spoke for up to three minutes. He said he was one of two people most likely to be affected by the development but felt that it would visually enhance the area, decrease noise levels and when factory workers leave their cars also do so car parking shouldn't be an issue.

Cllr Barnard asked for clarification of where the supporter lived then entered into debate.

Decision: **REFUSE** on the grounds outlined in the draft decision notice.

ITEM 1/3: Land at Water Mews, SE15 – Full Planning Permission

Proposal: (04-AP-1776)

RE-SUBMISSION

Recommendation: Refuse

NOTE this application is in Peckham Rye ward not Nunhead as the report states.

The Planning Officer introduced the item, describing the proposal and site. He added that developing this site would prevent current developers from fulfilling their commitments and thus the application was being recommended for refusal.

Cllr Colley queried whether the development would actually be on Metropolitan Open Land. There appeared to be a discrepancy between Cllr Colley's map and the Planning Officer's. It was decided that it would be best to defer the decision until further clarification had been received.

Decision: **DEFER**

The meeting ended at **7.07pm**.

CHAIR:

DATE: