



DULWICH COMMUNITY COUNCIL PLANNING

MINUTES of the Dulwich Community Council planning meeting held on Thursday 10 June 2010 at 7.00 pm at Dulwich Grove United Reformed Church, East Dulwich Grove, London SE22 8RH

PRESENT: Councillor James Barber (Chair)
Councillor Helen Hayes (Vice Chair)
Councillor Toby Eckersley
Councillor Michael Mitchell
Councillor Lewis Robinson
Councillor Andy Simmons

OFFICER SUPPORT: Sonia Watson, planning officer
Gavin Blackburn, legal officer
Tim Gould, highways officer (transport)
Norman Brockie, conservation and design officer
Beverley Olamijulo, constitutional officer

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, Eckersley (present only at the start) Jonathan Mitchell, Robin Crookshank Hilton and Rosie Shimell.

3. DISCLOSURE OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS AND DISPENSATIONS

Cllr Simmons declared a personal interest concerning this item in that a colleague of his lives within close proximity of the site and therefore stood down from the committee and took no part in the debate or decision of this item.

An adjournment took place at 7.12pm for 3 minutes to allow Cllr Eckersley to take advice

from the legal officer in respect of his participation in the meeting.

At 7.15pm the meeting reconvened.

At this juncture, Cllr Toby Eckersley decided not to take part in the consideration of item 6.1, land adjoining 114 Woodland Road, SE19 1PA.

Cllr Eckersley explained to the meeting that he had been the executive member for resources and present at the executive meeting when a decision was taken to sell the site. That sale is conditional on the grant of planning permission. Councillor Eckersley did not want to give rise to a claim of predetermination, in that the same decision maker was deciding whether to sell the land and then whether that sale would complete by granting planning permission for the same area of land.

Cllr Eckersley was aware that central government had set regulations separating the functions as to how the Council manages its land and deals with development control issues relating to it. In this instance Cllr Eckersley decided in the interests of good governance to excuse himself from the meeting and not take part in the debate nor the decision of this item

4. ITEMS OF BUSINESS THAT THE CHAIR DEEMS URGENT

Addendum Report – Development Management Reports

There were no urgent items however the planning officer drew Members' attention to the addendum report which had not been circulated five clear days in advance of the meeting, nor had it been available for public inspection during that time. The chair agreed to accept the item as urgent to enable members to be aware of late observations, consultation responses, additional information and revisions.

5. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (PAGES 3 - 7)

The Minutes of the planning meeting held on 14 April 2010 were agreed as an accurate record of the proceedings which the Chair signed.

6. DEVELOPMENT CONTROL ITEM(S) (PAGES 13 - 40)

RESOLVED:

1. 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.
2. 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 and

draft decision notices unless otherwise stated.

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

6.1 LAND AJOINING 114 WOODLAND ROAD, LONDON SE19 1PA (see pages 13 – 40)

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 flat) with associated landscaping and cycle parking.

The planning officer introduced the report, providing Members with a general description of the site, the most recent development scheme refused on the site, the density and proposed – the lack of any off-street parking.

Officers also referred to the addendum for the item which included confirmation that the planning obligation had been agreed and that the land was in the ownership of the Council with a contract for sale agreed with the applicant.

Officers advised Members that contrary to the previous notification received from LB Lambeth raising no objection to the proposal that an e-mail had been received which stated that they now wish to raise objection not to the design, content or parking but specifically around education impacts on Lambeth schools. A request was made for a monetary contribution towards this.

A response was made to Lambeth directly on this matter from Metropolitan Housing Trust stating that no money would be forthcoming for Lambeth as it was not supported in policy terms as the scheme was wholly affordable social rented and Lambeth had not for the same reason sought payment from the Cawnpore Road development in respect of education, and further the scheme did not support financial payments of any kind.

Additional information received from the Council

- A further letter of objection from the CPCA/CPTPG in response to the applicants letter dated 24 May.
- Further letters were received from Lambeth Cllrs Braithwaite and Lightfoot raising objections on the grounds of lack of parking and increased pressure on schools in Lambeth as a result of a high child yield resulting from the development.

The planning officer also advised Members on the following:

- That the scheme was for 100% affordable housing and although a viability study had been provided with the application demonstrating the inability of the scheme to include a Section 106 contribution, a planning contribution of £30k was offered in the form of a unilateral undertaking in respect of Public Open Space and Health mitigation

- Officers acknowledged the absence of wheelchair housing within the development but given the constraints of the site non provision of such housing was considered acceptable
- That the amenity space was sufficient for the dwellings and although there was no private amenity space for the site the communal area was large enough and therefore in line with the residential SPD
- That the relevant bodies had been consulted and subject to conditions no objections had been raised. Overall the scheme was considered to provide good quality affordable family housing, which was in demand within the Borough.

Representations were heard from two objectors representing the Crystal Palace Community Association /CPTPG and the Head of Local Schools Lambeth who both spoke on behalf of the objectors to the proposal. In addition a petition containing 150 signatories was presented to the Chair.

The representatives (Objectors) outlined the following:

- The failure of the Council to pass on information received from the applicant and that this was addressed in the letter sent to Members from the CPCA/CPTPG
- The lack of wheelchair housing and the poor level of amenity space provided for the 2-bedroom flats both areas being contrary to policy and that the site was smaller than stated making the density higher
- The impact of the proposal on local primary school (Paxton), which was already heavily oversubscribed. That the development would result in around 42 children, which would impact greatly on Paxton as catchment area was the criteria for admission
- The cumulative effect of this development and Cawnpore would impose increased pressure for limited primary and secondary school places in Lambeth.

The applicant (Metropolitan Housing Trust) then addressed the meeting stating that:

- The latest design to be high quality and incorporated changes to the 2007 design
- The Housing Trust had a good record of providing wheelchair housing in Southwark but the steep route up to the shops did not make the location acceptable for such housing
- Parking within the Cawnpore Street development exceeded Lambeth's parking standards and car ownership within the borough was low
- People do not currently park in front of the site, but acknowledged there are times when the area was busy

- Prospective residents of the site would already have a connection with the borough as such their children will already be in school and they would be registered with a GP.

No supporters were present.

Cllr Lewis Robinson spoke in his capacity as a Ward Councillor. The Ward Councillor raised his objection to the scheme outlining the following:

- The site had a long history and whilst no one objected to residential development of the site and this was an improvement on the other schemes, he was concerned about the design specifically the height which seemed to take reference from the taller dwellings further up the top of the hill rather than the closer 2 storey neighbours resulting in officers imposing a condition in respect of rooflines
- The size of the windows were particularly large and no attention had been paid to the side and rear elevations of the property
- Advised that the land was so overgrown it was not possible to have a clear view of the size of the land, he also sought clarification as to whether the access to the rear was owned by Network Rail or the applicant
- Clarification was also sought around the slope of the land to the rear and how this would be dealt with
- In respect of prospective tenants – the Council's letting policy meant someone could come from another part of the borough and not necessarily be local to the area
- Expressed disappointment at the planning gain from the scheme.

The Council highway officer was present to respond to questions from Members about parking.

The area had no parking control, if that existed the development would have been excluded and residents prevented from purchasing permits. It was determined that 12 units would take the parking up to its maximum capacity, however based on census information car ownership in this part of the borough was as a percentage in the high 60's low 80's, suggesting that affordable housing may produce a lower level of car ownership.

The Council design officer responded to questions from Members on design. He said there had been extensive discussions seeking to respond to the streetscape and the use of large windows on the front elevation which would improve the natural surveillance from the street. He cited improvements that had been made to the scheme such as the incorporation of pitched roofs.

Officers responded to further questions from Members.

It was noted that part of the scheme would involve changing the profile of the land at the rear as indicated in the Design & Access statement. Also that Network Rail had an easement over part of the land. A Land registry plan was provided to Members and

circulated amongst the public showing the extent of Network Rails easement.

Officers explained that the Council's GIS digital mapping had been used to produce an area calculation of the site. The objectors who were at the meeting stated they had been on site and arrived at a different figure.

Members further debated on the application.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted subject to the following amendment to Condition 12 and additional condition:

Condition 12

Prior to the commencement of work on site a detailed rear elevation plan showing the location of bat and swift bricks within the buildings shall be provided to and approved by the Local Planning Authority to encourage and provide habitats for the local bat and swift population. The plans shall be implemented as approved.

Reason

In order that the scheme encourages local swifts and bats, where it appears they may already have an existing commuting route in accordance with Policy 3.28 'Biodiversity' and 3.2 'Protection of Amenity' of the Southwark Plan 2007.

NEW CONDITION

Notwithstanding the approved plans all windows and other openings shall be set within reveals of at least 15cm, unless an alternative is agreed and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason:

In order that the Local Planning Authority may be satisfied as to the quality of the design and details in accordance with Policies: 3.12 Quality in Design; 3.13 Urban Design; of The Southwark Plan (UDP) July 2007.

The meeting ended at 8.40pm.

CHAIR:

DATED:

