



COMMUNITY COUNCILS
A voice for your community



DULWICH COMMUNITY COUNCIL PLANNING MEETING

MINUTES of the Dulwich Community Council Planning meeting held on Thursday 18 March 2010 at 7.00 pm at Dulwich Grove United Reform Church, East Dulwich Grove, London SE22 8RH

PRESENT: Councillor Nick Vineall (Chair)
Councillor James Barber
Councillor Toby Eckersley
Councillor Robin Crookshank Hilton
Councillor Michelle Holford
Councillor Jonathan Mitchell
Councillor Richard Thomas

OFFICER SUPPORT: Sonia Watson, planning officer
Gavin Blackburn, legal officer
Beverley Olamijulo, constitutional officer (community councils)

1. INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME [CHAIR]

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

2. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Cllrs, Kim Humphreys and Lewis Robinson. An apology for lateness was given on behalf of Cllr Richard Thomas.

3. DISCLOSURE OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

None were disclosed.

4. ITEMS OF BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR DEEMS URGENT

There were no urgent items of business.

5. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS

The Minutes of the planning meetings held on 3 December 2009 and 7 January 2010, 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 ITEMS (SEE PAGES 1 - 61)

RESOLVED:

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.

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.

That where reasons for the decision or condition are not included in the report relating to an individual item, that they be clearly specified.

Item 6/1 – Recommendation: Grant – Land adjoining 114 Woodland Road, London, SE19 1PA (see pages 14 – 38)

Proposal: Construction of a three /four storey block consisting of twelve new homes (5 x 4 bedroom houses, 1 x 4 bedroom maisonette, 5 x 2 bedroom flats and 1 x 1 bedroom) with associated landscaping and cycle parking.

The planning officer introduced the report, circulated plans of the scheme and responded to Members' questions.

The Chair read out a letter received from Councillor Lewis Robinson in his capacity as local ward councillor who was unable to attend the meeting. Cllr Robinson's letter states whilst not against the principle of developing the site for housing he has concerns about the proposal and did not think that these could be dealt at the meeting. He suggested that given the site was enclosed – a site visit should be undertaken so Members could make a more informed decision.

Representations were heard from the spokesperson representing the objectors, who is Chair of the Crystal Palace Community Association and Cllr Gibson, a Member for Gipsy Hill in Lambeth.

The objectors stated the area is fast changing and the scheme would affect views into and out of the conservation area and the site is smaller than led to believe on the plans. In addition to the objection a petition containing over 100 signatures was submitted at the meeting.

The applicant from the Metropolitan Housing Association addressed the meeting emphasizing that his preference would be for the scheme to be considered at this meeting.

There were some concerns from Members about the risk of an appeal from the applicants if the application was not determined. The advice given by the legal officer was the applicants could lodge an appeal in which case the decision would be taken out of the Council's hands.

The objectors were asked about the possibility of further consultations taking place, as some residents were only recently made aware of the application. The Chair advised that if people still wanted to write to comment on the scheme they could do but no further letters would be sent out. The Chair also advised that when the item was to be considered all parties would be informed beforehand.

RESOLVED: That the planning application be deferred.

Item 6/2 – Recommendation: Grant – 40A Lacon Road, London SE22 9HE (see pages 39 – 49)

Proposal: Single storey side/rear extension to ground floor flat, providing additional residential accommodation.

Cllr Barber made a request on behalf of the objector at no. 38 to defer the item because he was abroad and wanted to personally address Members at the meeting.

Members felt the planning application should be determined at the meeting because the objector at no. 38 arranged for a representative to be present to make representations.

The planning officer introduced the report, circulated plans of the scheme and responded to Members' questions. The officer advised that whilst these types of infill extensions can be difficult, the impacts to the neighbour at 38 were not so significant to warrant a refusal of the application.

The representative acting on behalf of the objector at no 38 read out a letter citing the following concerns:

- Unacceptable sense of enclosure
- Loss of privacy to rooms and garden
- Existing extension is already in excess of 3 metres at 4.4metres which was 1.6 metres longer than the extension at no 38 and contradicted the Council's own Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)
- It would set a precedent, result in loss of daylight and sunlight to the breakfast dining room
- Loss of security, loss of amenity through the outlook from the rear window and loss of greenery

The applicant addressed the meeting advising that they had taken into account the neighbours concerns by keeping the extension as low as possible and setting it slightly off the boundary. In respect of the rear extension which was constructed 20 years ago the applicants offered to replant the pyracantha once the extension had been constructed or replace it should it not survive.

Member further debated on this application.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted subject to additional condition preventing use of flat roof as a roof terrace.

Item 6/3 – Recommendation: Grant – 7A Melbourne Grove, London SE22 8RG (See pages 50 – 61)

Proposal: Proposed parapet wall and railings (retrospective) (Use Class C3).

The planning officer introduced the report, circulated plans of the scheme and responded to Members' questions.

Representations were heard from an objector who was representing the occupants of the flats at 5 Melbourne Grove. It was noted the objectors were not against the physical works themselves but that the area was too readily available to the occupants as an external space. They observed the area being used as an amenity space in the past. The objector stated the issue could be resolved with the installation of a juliette balcony or lockable gate across the doors.

It was noted from the circulated photographs that the first floor flat of the property had plants on the flat roof and appeared to use the roof as an informal garden space.

The applicant then addressed the meeting stating that the property is being improved to allow it to provide accommodation for a large family and was not proposed to use it as a recreational space and were aware of the consequences to them as the owners if the tenants misused the space.

Members raised general dissatisfaction with the 2003 decision which permitted the doors opening onto a space which looked as if it should be used as a roof terrace.

Notwithstanding this decision they did not feel that in the assessment of this case they could refuse the retention of the works which were relatively minor.

Cllr Crookshank Hilton did not agree and thought the proposal should be refused.

Members further debated on this item.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted.

Item 6/4– Recommendation: Grant – 35 Woodwarde Road, London SE22 8UN (See pages 62 – 69)

Proposal: Single storey ground floor rear extension and loft conversion with rear dormer window extension and rooflights to side and rear, providing additional residential accommodation.

The planning officer introduced the report, circulated plans of the scheme and responded to Members' questions.

No objectors were present at the meeting.

The applicant's agent was present to address the meeting. The agent stated during his presentation that his clients had tried to come up with a scheme which could address the concerns of their neighbour at no 37 however everything they had done had been met with opposition. They met with the Dulwich Estate and decided to set the extension slightly off the neighbours boundary, although the neighbour did not support this either the application was made. The agent visited the neighbours and could not see how the proposed extension would not compromise the amenity.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted.

The meeting ended at 8.50 pm.

CHAIR:

DATED: