



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 Monday October 10 2005 in Room A2 of Southwark Town Hall, Peckham
Road, SE5 8UB

The meeting opened at **6.07pm**

PRESENT

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

Officers: Louise Shah (CCDO), Nagla Sheik (Legal) and Alison Brittain
(Planning).

1. INTRODUCTION

Councillor Smeath welcomed attendees and asked Members and Officers to introduce themselves.

2. APOLOGIES

Absence: Councillors Thorncroft and Glover sent their apologies.

3. NOTIFICATION OF ANY OTHER ITEMS THE CHAIR DEEMS URGENT

The Planning Officer brought Members attention to the addendum report.

4. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

Cllr Simmons said that he would be speaking in his ward councillor capacity.

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 15 OF AGENDA plus addendum)

ITEM 1/1: 50 Copleston Road, SE15 – Full Planning Permission

Proposal: (04-AP-0077)

Erection of a rear extension to existing place of worship (Class D1) to provide additional accommodation.

Recommendation: Grant

The Planning Officer (PO) introduced the item, describing the proposal, site and feedback from consultation. She explained that the item had come before the committee twice before in different guises. This version has a reduced rear, a maximum depth of 5 metres, but for the most part if a little over 4 metres deep. The gallery does not require planning permission, it can allow more seating but this is not for members to consider. In it's current format the proposals do not increase seating but as the proposals were always intended to make the space 'work better' rather than provide extra seating this is not an issue. The PO said that the proposed extension is modest and within the new religious building's policy; it also has a spacious garden and is not close to neighbours.

Cllr Barnard asked the PO who signed the petition. The PO said she would check the file.

The Objector (representing two other residents of Copleston Road Residents Group) then spoke for up to three minutes. He stated that the adjoining neighbours (numbers 48 and 52) were both present. He questioned the disability provisions since the applicant repeatedly mentioned these in the media but the plans made no mention of them.

He also commented on the level of soundproofing stating that what the report requires (page 13, point 47) is insufficient. He said no serious provisions had been made and played two sound samples taken from outside the patio and also upstairs bedroom of the neighbouring property. He also asked members to note Luisa Villar's letter of 13/02/04 requesting soundproofing. He did say the plans have significantly improved since first submitted however.

Members asked the Objectors whether they would be happy with the application if these issues were addressed (yes, but not for matters reserved) and also why out of 80 plus residents only 17 responded (as people are now fed up of deferrals and are happy for those directly affected to deal with the case.)

The Applicant (Reverend Green of the Church) then spoke for three minutes, his main points of which were:

- Have been on the site for 20 years without complaint, until this refurbishment was proposed



- Had never heard of the residents groups before, but still, through discussions have addressed the concerns they previously raised, hence the revised plans
- When the application was first submitted disability access was not a law; as he understood it the application would need to be resubmitted in order to address these fully. They had planned on getting the initial permission so that they could start work, then applying for access adaptations afterwards.
- If noise has been a problem why have the noise team not been contacted?

Members asked the Applicant questions regarding who was to blame for stalling the process (Rev. Green said they did not consider it negatively as they have worked with residents in order to come to a compromise), about disability access and also soundproofing.

A supporter of the application (who runs community groups in the church) then spoke for up to three minutes stating that the application has been lingering for three years and also that the noise samples could have come from anywhere, inside the church perhaps.

Cllr Simmons then spoke in his capacity as Ward Councillor for up to three minutes. His main points were that many people have concerns, dialogue has not always been free flowing which has hindered the process (which should be a lesson for the future), people have made complaints to the noise team in the summer when windows have been opened, so air conditioning should be installed. Also, insulation should be placed appropriately. Finally Cllr Simmons requested a limit on the capacity of the building so that if there is a new congregation they are clear on this.

Councillors then asked the PO questions regarding disabled access (advised it would be better for remedial work to come as a separate application and as this is an existing building they may not be immediate) and also soundproofing (the extension has no bearing on what the building is used for, it was purpose built and conditioning this would be an over-use of a condition to compensate for an existing problem and therefore not proper). Councillors also asked the PO about conditioning the extension, air conditioning chiller units and glazing in the extension (2 areas of glazed brick and a V-lux window). The PO advised that a limit on the congregation could not be conditioned.

Councillors then made their decision as follows:

Decision: **AGREED to GRANT** the application with the following conditions:

- i) To check soundproofing requirements before approving (including requirements for the glazed bricks)
- ii) To fix shut the window in the extension

Plus the following informative: That the committee would encourage DDA compliance

The meeting ended at **6.42pm**

CHAIR:

DATE: