



COMMUNITY COUNCILS
A voice for your community



Peckham Community Council

Planning Meeting

Minutes of the Peckham Community Council Planning Meeting held on Thursday 1 September 2005 at Peckham Park Baptist Church, 121 Peckham Park Road, SE15 6SX

The meeting opened at **7.12pm**

PRESENT

Councillors: Graham Neale (Chair), Jonathon Hunt and Billy Kayada.

Officers: Louise Shah (CCDO), David Berger (Legal) and Alison Brittain (Planning).

1. INTRODUCTION

Councillor Neale welcomed attendees and asked Members and Officer to introduce themselves.

2. APOLOGIES

Absence: Cllrs Porter, Situ and Hargrove sent their apologies.

3. NOTIFICATION OF ANY OTHER ITEMS THE CHAIR DEEMS URGENT

Councillors were made aware of an addendum report.

4. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

None.

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 16 OF AGENDA)

ITEM 1/1: 4, 5 & 6 Acorn Parade, Meeting House Lane SE15 – Full Planning Permission

Proposal: (05-AP-0396)

Change of use of Unit 4 from a pharmacy (A1 Use Class) to a betting office (A2 Use Class) in conjunction with existing betting office at Units 5 & 6 Acorn Parade and installation of new shop fronts.

Recommendation: Grant

The Planning Officer introduced the item, describing the proposal, site and feedback from consultation (adding that the Peckham Programme and Police had not been consulted on this occasion). She stated that the main issue for objectors was the impact of the scheme on the wider environment (particularly anti-social behaviour (ASB) and the effects on the amenity of the area). The Planning Officer also asked councillors to consider that the Pharmacy is intending on leaving soon and the premises may be left vacant or boarded up, which officers consider would be more detrimental to the area than granting an extension to an existing use as a betting office. Officers also felt that the extension would be unlikely to cause any significant change in the current situation and so the item was recommended for approval.

Councillors asked the Planning Officer questions clarifying the change of use categories (A1 to A2); what, if any ASB assessments had been done in the area (none through planning other than the responses to consultation letters); and where the nearest betting office is (top of Meeting House Lane near police station and also on Commercial Way)

There were two objectors so the allocated time was divided equally between the two:

Objector 1: Bob Flynn (Proprietor of the video shop at 1 Acorn Parade)

Mr Flynn said that the area was obviously deteriorating year after year and an extension to the betting office would encourage even more people to loiter in the street, drinking and fighting. He added that there are no vacant shops and as far as he is aware the area is still sought after commercially, so a vacant pharmacy would not be a problem. He also asked the committee to note Article 8.11 of the Human Rights Act stating that his life had been made a misery in recent years because of the state of the area. He said that whilst the betting shop may not directly cause this deterioration, an extension certainly would not make the situation better for residents and locals.



Cllr Hunt clarified whether Objector 1 felt that the loitering outside the betting shop was affecting his business, he responded that it was as people are scared to walk past loiterers to enter his shop (again he repeated that he could not be sure those loitering were actual customers of the betting shop, they just stand outside it).

Objector 2: Russell Profitt (Council employee responsible for co-ordinating links with agencies in Peckham to improve the life of residents)

Mr Profitt said that he had no objection to William Hill per se but that residents currently feel that agencies in the area are not protecting them. He said that larger premises could attract more people and that he and the police have concerns that the levels of crime in the area will increase with larger premises. He added that the rights of residents had to be protected and as a priority neighbourhood, schemes (including tackling the shops on Meeting House Lane) are being worked up to improve the area. He asked that the application be refused in order for the Peckham Programme and the police to continue to work together constructively to improve the area and standard of living and quality of life of local residents.

Councillors asked Objector 2 questions about his understanding of the premises vacancy situation in the area (still in demand); whether the Bellenden area had betting shops (yes); whether larger premises would necessarily cause an increase in customers/ loiterers (not qualified to answer; better to ask Applicant); and stated that they would have preferred the police and Applicant to be present to answer some key questions.

The Applicant was not present, nor any application supporters.

No Councillor spoke in a ward councillor capacity.

Councillors then made their decision as follows (proposed by Cllr Hunt; seconded by Cllr Neale):

Decision: DEFER to allow consultation with the Peckham Programme, the Housing Department and the Police, and also to request the attendance of the Applicant.

The meeting ended at **7.35pm**

CHAIR:

DATE:

--