



COMMUNITY COUNCILS
A voice for your community



Dulwich Community Council Planning Meeting

(Minutes to be formally agreed at the next meeting)

Minutes of Dulwich Community Council Planning meeting on Tuesday June 16 2009 at 7.00pm held at Herne Hill Baptist Church, Half Moon Lane, London SE24 9HU

Present

Councillor Nick Vineall (Chair)
Councillors, Robin Crookshank Hilton (Vice Chair), James Barber, Richard Thomas and Lewis Robinson.

1. Introduction and welcome by the Chair

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

2. Apologies for absence

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Cllrs, Toby Eckersley, Michelle Holford, Kim Humphreys and Jonathan Mitchell.

3. Disclosure of Members' interests and dispensations

None were declared.

4. Items of business that the Chair deems urgent

There were no urgent items however the chair agreed to accept the addendum report for Members to note and consider the late observations, consultation responses information and revisions.

5. Minutes of the previous meeting

Minutes of the planning meeting held on May 7 2009 were agreed as an accurate record 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 (see pages 4 – 66)

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 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.

Item 6/1 – 120 Barry Road, London SE22 0HP (see pages 11 – 19)

Proposal: Erection of rear extension at lower ground and ground floor level (Use Class C3).

The planning officer introduced the report, addendum and circulated plans of the scheme.

Representations were heard from the objector (118 Barry Road) and the applicant's agent.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be refused on the grounds that the proposed extension due to its depth, bulk and height would result in a detrimental impact to the adjoining property at 118 Barry Road by reason of increased sense of enclosure and loss of light.

As such the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policies 3.2 Protection of amenity and 3.11 Efficient use of land of the Southwark Plan 2007 and Supplementary Planning Document Residential Design Guidance 2008.

Item 6/2 – 11A Fountain Drive, London SE19 1UW (see pages 20 – 30)

Proposal: Redevelopment of site to provide a detached dwellinghouse with access from Fountain Drive (application for outline planning permission with Access and Scale to be determined at this stage). Illustrative plans show a 3 storey building with undercroft parking for 2 cars.

The planning officer introduced the report, addendum and circulated photos /plans of the scheme.

Members heard from objectors who spoke on behalf of the residents at 11 Fountain Drive. The main concern was if permission is granted this would give the developer free reign to develop the site and that the house would be far larger than any other property in the area which are mostly 3 bed room houses.

A representative from the Dulwich Society also spoke against the scheme, stating that the 3 storeys proposed was out of character for the area and detrimental to the street scene.

The applicant's agent was present to address the meeting.

The applicant responded to questions in respect of the boundary treatment and undercroft parking.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be refused on the grounds that the proposed dwelling by reason of its height, mass, and bulk would fail to respond positively to its surroundings. The inappropriate scale the building would be an incongruous feature within the street scene having a visually detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of Fountain Drive. As such the proposal is considered contrary to Policies 3.2 Protection of Amenity, 3.11 Efficient use of Land and 3.13 Urban Design of The Southwark Plan 2007

Item 6/3 – 17 Chesterfield Grove, London SE22 8RP (see pages 31 – 37)

Proposal: Retrospective application for retention of raised ridge height to roofslope and associated rear dormer addition.

The planning officer introduced the report, addendum and circulated plans of the scheme.

The applicant's agent was present to address the meeting and in support of the

application produced a number of photographs featuring various roof forms currently in the local area.

Members discussed the application further.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be refused as stated in the officer's report. Notwithstanding of the refusal on this application the applicant/agent would be surprised and disappointed if enforcement action were to be taken in respect of this case.

Item 6/4 – 21 North Cross Road, London SE22 9ET (see pages 38 – 47)

Proposal: Continued use of ground floor as shop (Use class A1).

The planning officer introduced the report, addendum and circulated plans of the scheme.

An objector was present to address the meeting. The objector mentioned that he had no objection to the mosque but the retail unit as it is not in keeping with the surrounding area. The other concern was the garden area which the objector felt should be maintained as a garden as with other surrounding residential gardens.

The applicants were present to make representations at the meeting.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted subject to an amendment to condition 2 to delete the word 'open' so it reads:

No storage or display of goods shall take place in the garden at the rear of the unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority

Item 6/5 – Kingswood House, Seeley Drive, London SE21 8QN (see pages 48 – 56)

Proposal: Renewal of planning permission 05-CO-0193 for the erection of two portacabins, due to a condition attached to the previous consent requiring either the removal of the portacabin or renewal of permission in 2 years from the date of that permission.

The planning officer introduced the report, addendum and circulated plans of the scheme.

The addendum referred to a change to the description of the development.

Officers advised that the consent was sought for a temporary period until the service was permanently located at Lambourne School.

The applicant addressed the meeting.

No objectors were present.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted subject to change of description and policy references given in the reason for condition 3 as outlined in the officer's report.

Item 6/6 – Kingsdale School, Alleyn Park, London SE21 8SQ (see pages 57 – 66)

Proposal: Conversion of hard and soft landscaped north playground into all-weather youth football pitch and 60 metre sprint running track with limited quantity of retaining walls, grass haunchings and ramps to form level site plus surrounding mesh fence and gates to pitch.

The planning officer introduced the report, addendum and circulated plans of the scheme.

There was an objection in respect of floodlighting, which was not part of the current application and that the objection from Dulwich Preparatory had been withdrawn.

The applicant's agent was present to give an overview of the site – which is to provide new sporting facilities on the site.

Members asked about the drainage for the site. Officers advised that this area was previously a playground and that there would be no SUDS fitted but the drainage would be an improvement on the existing situation.

RESOLVED: That planning permission be granted.

The meeting closed at 10.15 p.m.

CHAIR:

DATE: