



**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  
Tuesday 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2004 at the Cossall TRA Hall, 48 Mortlock Close, SE15.

The meeting opened at **9.20pm**

### **PRESENT**

Councillors: Robert Smeath (*Chair*), Fiona Colley (*Vice Chair*), Alfred Banya, Mick Barnard, Aubyn Graham, Mark Glover, Andy Simmons and Dominic Thorncroft.

Officers: Louise Shah (CCDO), Rachel Prosser (Legal) and Tim King (Planning).

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

Councillor Smeath welcomed attendees.

### **2. APOLOGIES**

Councillor Hayes sent apologies for absence.

### **3. NOTIFICATION OF ANY OTHER ITEMS THE CHAIR DEEMS URGENT**

There were none. (Chair decided to change the running order though.)

### **4. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS**

Cllr Barnard said that he would be representing objectors for Item 1/1 (heard last). Cllr Simmons said he would be representing both supporters and objectors for Item 1/2 (heard first). Both councillors would therefore refrain from voting on the items respectively mentioned.

### **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 36 TO 54 OF MAIN AGENDA; 1 TO 23 OF ADDENDUM)**

**ITEM 1/2:** 50 Copleston Road, SE15 – Full Planning Permission

**Proposal:** (04-AP-0077)

Erection of a single storey extension to existing building in use as a place of worship together with external staircase

**Recommendation:** Refuse

The Planning Officer introduced the item, describing the proposal, site and feedback from consultation (a 7 signatory petition attached to the agenda), adding that the application was previously recommended for approval but since he took it over it has been recommended for refusal. The reasons for recommending refusal were: loss of daylight (particularly to number 48, as well as 52), and the negative effect on the characteristics of the church. The elevation height was also unclear.

Members had no questions for the Planning Officer.

There were no Objectors.

The Applicant then spoke for a total of three minutes. Her main points were that the extension would:

- i) Allow a consistent seating arrangement
- ii) Allow baptismal facilities to be introduced
- iii) Provide sufficient space for disabled members of the congregation.

The Applicant added that the extension would face a railway line and no other houses except numbers 48 and 52 would be affected. She also showed a diagram demonstrating the extent of shadow lines. Finally, the Applicant stated that a three-storey building for that site had previously been granted planning permission.

There was one Supporter present. He then spoke for up to three minutes stating the importance of this extension for the congregation and future of the church, especially in terms of baptisms and disabled users' access. He said that it seems that churches often make applications that are not dealt with in an appropriate length of time, which amounts to gross negligence.

The Ward Councillor – Cllr Simmons – chose to make a presentation based on information from both parties. He stated that the Applicant has made a proposal to construct a wood and tarpaulin frame to demonstrate the loss of light to residents. Parking on a Sunday is already bad and some residents claim this is due to the church; an extension may worsen this predicament. Other residents say that if the church is struggling to survive it should be given

a chance to regenerate with this extension. Finally, it seems objectors did not get the committee papers on time.

Members asked the Planning Officer about the previous application and the reason for the inertia. Cllr Graham then asked the Applicant if she would be prepared to negotiate a compromise with the residents. The response was affirmative and as such councillors agreed to defer the decision so as to allow consultation to take place.

**Decision:** Agreed to **DEFER** the application to allow negotiation between the Applicant and Objectors to take place.  
**NOTED** that this should be dealt with as soon as possible, subject to statutory consultation.

**ITEM 1/3:** St Silas Church Hall, Merttins Road, SE15 – Full Planning Permission

**Proposal:** (04-AP-0600)

Demolition of existing church hall and erection of a 3 storey residential building of 9 flats with amenity space - RE-SUBMISSION

**Recommendation:** Refuse

The Planning Officer introduced the item, describing the proposal, site and feedback from consultation. He said that it was recommended for refusal mainly on design grounds and that other problems sited by objectors were density, loss of a valuable community facility, scale and parking provision (none is provided but this has been declared acceptable by the Traffic Group.)

There were no Objectors present.

The Applicant's Agent then spoke for a total of three minutes. His main points were that:

- i) The Planning department had clearly worked out density differently to him
- ii) Up until last week two planning officers had recommended the application for approval
- iii) He understood that the new interim manager was looking at design and density specifically but that this perspective could not be applied retrospectively.

Members asked the Applicant's Agent questions about over development, what consultation had taken place, the suitability of the building in the context of its surroundings, what would happen to the trees on site, discrepancies in the drawings. They also requested clarification from the Planning and Legal Officers over whether the change of recommendation was due to the change of officer or policy.

There were no supporters present.

The Ward Councillor did not wish to speak.

Cllr Thorncroft asked the Legal Officer whether, if the application was deferred it could be considered afresh. The response was affirmative. He also asked that it be **NOTED** that he felt that the Applicant had not consulted the community well enough but also that he had been badly served by the Planning Department and so had sympathy in that respect. Cllr Simmons felt that compromise would be unlikely so prolonging the decision may be futile.

**Decision:** Agreed to **REFUSE** planning permission as it would represent an incongruous form of development out of keeping with the two-storey Edwardian dwellings, typical of the immediate area, and would thereby be harmful to the general character and appearance of the streetscene. Also, the proposed residential scheme has been designed to a density considerably over and above the contemporary standards stipulated for the Suburban Zone, within which the site falls.

**ITEM 1/1:** Land at Honor Oak Rise, SE23

**Proposal:** (03-AP-1517)

Erection of 4 No. 2-storey houses with front and rear dormers at second floor level and 4 car parking spaces including two access-egress openings and railings in the existing boundary wall

**Recommendation:** Grant

The Planning Officer introduced the item describing the proposal, site and feedback from consultation, adding that Friends of the Earth submitted a late objection. The application was deferred from 7<sup>th</sup> October meeting as a site visit had been requested. He said that the front dormers had been removed and suggested that the proposed gardens may enhance wildlife, although the public would not be allowed to access the land.

The Objectors' representative then spoke for up to three minutes. The main points of her presentation were as follows:

- i) That the tests for development in conservation areas had not been met
- ii) Over development (three substantial developments within a year)
- iii) Loss of trees (their analysis suggests five rather than two trees will be removed)
- iv) Traffic and parking issues.

The Friends of the Earth objection letter was provided to councillors along with the section of the UDP dealing with open spaces.

Cllr Banya asked for clarification regarding the loss of trees; the Objectors said it would be five in total, the Applicant's Architect said a full tree survey had been done and the application would stand as is before the councillors.

The Applicant's Architect then spoke for up to three minutes stating that the application was proposed well over 12 months ago; this had been an advantage in that the community had greater involvement and significant changes were made, but the development is modest in Council terms. The tree survey was considered correct.

There were no supporters present.

The Ward Councillor spoke for up to three minutes stating that he had concerns about mature trees being removed and its affect on property values; the proposed gates; the fact that the applicant could appeal a refusal but residents would not have the same right to appeal the application being granted. He also questioned why the highways related alteration was an informative rather than condition. If approved the Ward Councillor asked that there be further screening and the dormer windows should not be allowed.

Members asked the Objector and Planning Officer questions to clarify the situation, the result of which led to the below decision.

**Decision:** Agreed to **REFUSE** planning permission due to the resultant loss of open aspect and various trees therein, and the consequent removal of a section of the original feature boundary wall, compound so as to be unduly harmful to the character and appearance of the Honour Oak Rise Conservation Area of which the application site forms part.

The meeting ended at **11.15pm**

**CHAIR:**

**DATE:**