

**Note of Local Meeting**  
**Dacre Arms, 11 Kingswood Place, London SE13 5BU**



**7.00pm, 16<sup>th</sup> March 2016**  
**The Crypt, St Margaret's Church**

---

**Application details**

**Reference: DC/15/92746**

**Proposal:** Retrospective planning application for the retention of an outbuilding forming a servery for food and drink to the rear at Dacre Arms, 11 Kingswood Place, SE13, together with the provision of a seating area to the front using dwarf bricks, walls and metal railings (**Amended Description**)

**Attendance**

Councillor Kevin Bonavia (KB)  
Lauraine Pearson, Applicant (LP)  
Michael Forrester, Planning Officer (MF)  
Karl Fetterplace, Planning Officer (KF)  
35 local residents (signed attendance sheet)

**Note of Meeting**

Introduction

Councillor Bonavia explained the reason for holding a meeting and that it was an opportunity for those attending to listen to the applicant speak on the proposal, seek clarification on elements of the proposal and provide comments on points of concern. He confirmed that the application would be considered by the Planning Committee.

Officers explained the process to this point and moving forward and stated that the meeting would be minuted and appended to the committee meeting report and any new concerns raised would be considered in the committee report.

Applicant's Presentation

Lauraine Pearson provided an overview of the proposal. The main points were as follows:

- The rear servery is proposed to be used occasionally in the summer months for events to alleviate pressure on bar and the works to the front garden would aim to attract customers to the pub. There are no wholesale proposed changes to the Dacre Arms

- The works are in keeping with character of the area and are considered an improvement to the Dacre Arms

### Q & A Session

Q: The bar would serve drinks, but would there be any music played in the beer garden?

LP: There would not be any music or speakers in the garden, as is the case now.

A Commitment was given to this.

Q: Lewisham planners and licensing officers have confirmed an application would be required to vary the existing pub licence.

LP: This would be made following planning application.

Q: Why is the application retrospective? Why was it not lodged prior to works being undertaken?

LP: There was originally a building in the beer garden that was used as a storeroom. This was demolished and replaced with another storeroom, thought was then given to part of the building being used as a servery and provision was made for this.

Planners clarified although this was an application for retrospective works, it was considered under the usual process and policies and that the railings and bricks in the front garden are the works that require permission, not the table.

Q: The hours of use of the servery in the condition proposed by officers (12:00-19:30 Sunday-Thursday and 12:00-21:00 Friday-Saturday) differs from what the committee report states that the applicant proposed (14:00-20:00 on Fridays and Saturdays).

Officers clarified that the hours proposed by the applicant were considered in the proposed condition regarding the hours of use of the servery.

LP: The intention is to use the area for the warmer months only. This is difficult to define and would be based on the weather. The times in the proposed condition would be suitable.

KB: The applicant is asked to consider which months they intend the servery to be used for.

Q: Have noise complaints been received about the Dacre? If the outdoor area is already being used and if there haven't been issues already then why would this be an issue going forward?

KB: None received by me.

Officers were not aware of any complaints.

KB: Any complaints received would also be considered in any future licensing application.

Q: What would be the difference between having a servery in the rear garden and the garden the way it is used now?

LP: None.

Q: Why is the outside seating area considered acceptable from a design perspective?

KF: The pub is in a conservation area & conservation officers have been consulted and in conjunction with planning officers have found this to be acceptable.

KB: Clarification was provided that this is an officer recommendation that is to be further considered by committee members.

Q: Has a viability assessment been undertaken for the pub?

KF: A viability assessment is not required in this instance.

Q: Could a condition be included stating that there should be no amplified music played in the beer garden?

Officers clarified that a condition can be considered regarding amplified music.

Q: Is this front area to be used as a smoking area?

LP: There is a non-smoking sign out the front, customers are asked to smoke in the beer garden.

KB: Clarification was provided that a planning condition cannot be included regarding this, but it could be considered in any future licensing application.

Q: Could planning officers consider that a good neighbour agreement be drafted, similar to the Hare and Billet in Blackheath?

Objection is raised to bench outside the pub, could it be removed? The table leads to more noise being created than might otherwise be created if it weren't there and houses/gardens are overlooked from it.

LP: A good neighbour agreement could be a consideration in a licencing application.

MF: The intensification of the use cannot be considered for the front garden as the table does not require planning permission, but is considered in relation to the beer garden as the servery building requires planning permission.

KB: The pub owners have agreed to act in a neighbourly manner.

Q: In relation to events, would there not be some music? Would this be applied for at a later date?

LP: No and no. The only music would come from inside the pub.

Q: The works to the front unbalance the building. Stocks bricks have been used, but these don't match the pub, therefore there is discord. The bench changes the nature of the frontage of pub, although it is acknowledged that this is not a planning issue.

KB: Noted and earlier response provided re: officers considering design to be acceptable.

Q: Some residents were of the opinion that additional traffic would be created by events, however some also were not.

KB: This is a general issue that is existing, but it has been considered as part of this application.

KF: This has been considered in the report, although it is noted that the beer garden can already be used for events without the servery structure.

KB: In the interests of good neighbourliness, the publicans could speak to the Church regarding this.

LP: Discussions have previously been had between the pub and the church regarding parking, but no arrangement could be agreed.

KB: I will raise this as an issue with the church.

### Conclusion

KB: Closing remarks – the report will be amended to take account of issues raised/offers made – officers to confirm with applicant what offers will be made and the minutes will be appended to report. In summary:

- The hours proposed to be conditioned by officers were agreed upon (12:00-19:30 Sunday-Thursday and 12:00-21:00 Friday-Saturday).
- The applicant is asked to consider which months they intended the servery to be used for. A wider definition should be considered and then stuck to.
- The applicant stated that the use of the front table area could be restricted to 19:30 throughout the week.
- A Commitment was given that there would not be any music or speakers in the garden. Amplified music can be considered as a planning condition and the applicants are happy with this.
- Councillor Bonavia to discuss potential parking arrangements between the Dacre Arms and the Church, with the Church.

Meeting closed at 8.15pm.

There was an informal discussion until 8:30pm, during which the applicant agreed to remove the table from the front garden.