

Minutes of local meeting on Monday 29 June 2009 held at Brockley Social Club, 340 Brockley Road SE4 at 7.00 pm.

Re. Proposed development of Units 2-5 Ashby Mews SE4

Present:

Case Officer: Jan Mondrzejewski
Applicant: Ivan Bateman
6 local residents
Brockley Society

Mr Bateman explained his development and showed residents plans of the scheme as recently revised.

A resident of Manor Avenue raised the issue of glare from glazing at the rear, as several of the existing units already give rise to this problem. The applicant stated that it was possible to install glazing with low glare properties and that this would be specified.

Several residents raised the issue of nuisance caused by existing occupiers. JM pointed out that these are established uses, operating without the constraint of planning conditions controlling hours of use or other practices such as working in the roadway outside the units. Were planning permission to be granted by the Council, it would be on the basis of conditions which sought to prevent such nuisance. Residents were advised that occupiers were still required to comply with Environmental Protection legislation although there were difficulties in getting the environmental protection enforcement officers to the site to witness breaches. This would be necessary if the Council wished to pursue legal action against the tenants.

Dumping in the Mews was another concern for local residents. Mr Bateman stated that he recently evicted one tenant for dumping and non-payment of rent. In this case the items dumped obviously came from the business in question. However, this is not always easy to prove this and Mr Bateman therefore intended to install CCTV to monitor and hopefully discourage dumping in the Mews.

Several residents considered that the first floor accommodation would be used for residential purposes. Mr Bateman stated that this was not what was being applied for and such use would be contrary to the requirements of the lease as well as the planning permission for the development. The first floor accommodation was designed so it could be used in conjunction with the ground floor accommodation or as a separate B1 Unit. Without the increase in floor space the applicant did not consider that the proposed development would be viable.

Mr Bateman was quizzed about the implications of the development being sold on. Mr Bateman said that this would not happen as the Company which would develop the site would be set up to provide income for his pension plan.

Many residents were concerned about the poor condition of the surfacing of the Mews. Mr Bateman stated that he would reinstate the Mews in front of the Units up to the junction with Ashby Road. He owned half the width of the Mews in front of the Units and he expected the other frontages to give their consent to the resurfacing of their own

ownerships at his expense. The existing gated access would be retained to discourage fly tipping.

The question of overlooking of gardens in Upper Brockley Road was raised. JM stated that doors and small balconies at first floor level which were originally shown on the submitted plans have now been replaced by dormer windows, which are smaller and do not project so far forward. Officers consider that these would be unlikely to give rise to overlooking/loss of privacy although obscure glazing could also be considered.

JM stated that in the case of the appeal in respect of 1-3 Ashby Road, this development increased the height of the existing boundary wall to adjoining gardens in Manor Avenue. In many respects this was comparable to the existing scheme and was one of a number of reasons why this particular development was refused planning permission. However, the Inspector did not feel the scheme was unacceptable in this case, due to the length of the rear gardens in question.

The meeting ended at 9.00 pm