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**Report title:** Development Management planning application: Council's own development
Application 10-AP-3246 for: Council's Own Development - Reg. 3

**Address:**
BURGESS PARK, ALBANY ROAD, LONDON SE5

**Proposal:**
Alterations to Burgess Park including: Alterations to the entrances and boundaries at Old Kent Road and Camberwell Road; general alterations to accessibility and footpaths; repair and enlargement of Burgess Park lake including habitat enhancements/alterations, conversion of an area of amenity grassland east of canal bridge to meadow; works in relation to biodiversity across the park; felling and planting of trees; installation of new street furniture; maintenance of a fitness circuit and provision of outdoor gym equipment; structure landscaping relating to the great lawn and the plateau adjacent to Albany Road; creation of a new play area; conversion of existing internal roads to parkland and reorganisation and reduction of car parking spaces within the park.

**Ward(s) or groups affected:** Faraday and East Walworth

**From:** Head of Development Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Start Date</th>
<th>Application Expiry Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09/11/2010</td>
<td>08/02/2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECOMMENDATION**

1. Grant Planning Permission.

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

**Site location and description**

2. Sited south of Albany Road, east of Camberwell Road and west of the Old Kent Road, with St. George’s Way along much of its southern border, this is one of the largest parks in South London at 46.25 hectares in area. The park is split into two parts by Wells Way, with smaller areas separated from the park by Trafalgar Avenue to the east. A key feature of the eastern half of the park is a lake adjoining Cobourg Junior School. There are a number of roads within its boundary, such as Neate Street and Loncroft Road (both of which are partially closed to traffic), and parts of New Church Road and Cobourg Road. Buildings within the park include Chumleigh Gardens, St Georges Church (now residential), the former Public Baths in Wells Way and an old Lime Kiln, all of which are Listed buildings. However, the application boundary does not include the whole park but only the areas affected by the proposed alterations to the park.
West of Wells Way two areas of the park are excluded from the application boundary, one to the west near Addington Square and also the playground and cycle track bordering Albany Road and Wells Way. To the east, Chumleigh Gardens and depot, the sports pitches adjoining Cobourg Road, Neate Street and Waite Street, and the smaller areas east of Trafalgar Avenue are all excluded from this application site boundary.

Details of proposal

The application scheme is known as the ‘Burgess Park Project 2012’ and proposes alterations and improvements to Burgess Park including:
(1) Alterations to the entrances and boundaries at Old Kent Rd and Camberwell Rd;
(2) General alterations to accessibility and footpaths;
(3) Repair and enlargement of Burgess Park lake including habitat enhancements;
(4) Conversion of an area of amenity grassland east of canal bridge to meadow;
(5) Works in relation to biodiversity across the park;
(6) Felling and planting of trees;
(7) Installation of new street furniture;
(8) Creation of a fitness circuit and provision of outdoor gym equipment;
(9) Structure landscaping to the great lawn and the plateau adjacent to Albany Rd, and the creation of new landscape mounds;
(10) Creation of a new play area for older children;
(11) Conversion of existing internal roads to parkland; and
(12) Reorganisation and reduction of car parking spaces within the park.

The application indicates that, if planning permission is granted, works would begin in April 2011, with works expected to be completed by January 2012.

Planning history

Burgess Park was created after the Second World War, based on the Abercrombie Plan for Greater London, as a Metropolitan Park. It occupies land formerly occupied predominantly by Victorian terraced houses and gardens (many war damaged), factories and wharves alongside the Grand Surrey Canal which ran from Surrey Docks to Addington Wharf at Camberwell Road (and as the Surrey Canal Walk, south to Dock Head, by Peckham Road).

Burgess Park was always intended to have regional significance but is considered by many to have never really been finished. In March 2009 it was announced that Burgess Park had won £2 million from the London Mayor’s Priority Parks scheme (the other 10 finalists getting £400,000 each), with a further £4 million coming from the Government’s New Deal for Communities (NDC) scheme, so there is now funding available to help complete the park. This application is for the first phases of the improvement works, representing about three quarters of the expenditure. This phase prioritises some of the key elements of the overall plan for the park in order to ensure the maximum benefit is derived from the programme in the short term, without compromising longer term aspirations.

Over the course of the development of Burgess Park there have been many planning applications for alterations or developments affecting the park. The most relevant recent ones were the application (10-AP-3061) for a screening opinion for this scheme, which concluded that an EIA would not be needed, and the recent application (10-AP-1299) for changes to floodlights by the Burgess Park Tennis Centre, which has not yet
been determined. Other applications in recent years have also been limited to alterations to sports and other facilities within the park.

Planning history of adjoining sites

Since 1999 the Aylesbury New Deal for Communities (now the Creation Trust) has been working with the Council to deliver a major social programme on the Aylesbury Estate. This has aimed to provide more jobs, greater economic prosperity, improved education results for young people and lower crime levels. As part of the transformation of the area, improvements to the physical environment were also needed. In September 2009 the Council decided to redevelop the estate with demolition carried out in stages over the next 15 to 20 years. Burgess Park adjoins the estate and its revitalisation is seen as essential to help raise land values on the estate and to encourage inward investment.

The Aylesbury Action Area Plan (AAP) was adopted in January 2010 to guide the redevelopment of the estate and sets out a Masterplan for the new neighbourhood to be delivered over the next 15 to 20 years, including housing, shops, meeting places, work places, recreation, green spaces and transport. Burgess Park is a crucial element in that new neighbourhood and the AAP includes the whole of the park and has a range of policies to guide its development.

Phase 1A of the Aylesbury redevelopment is currently under construction, following the grant of outline planning permission and subsequent reserved matters. This phase will provide a new Resource Centre close to Westmorland Road, plus 260 new homes.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Summary of main issues

The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:

a) the principle of the development in terms of land use and conformity with strategic policies for Metropolitan Open Land,

b) the acceptability of the new landscaping design, landforms, revisions to lake, play areas and footpaths, and impact on accessibility, trees, planting and biodiversity.

Planning policy

Southwark Plan 2007 (July)

Policy SP1  Sustainability, equality and diversity
Policy SP2  Participation
Policy SP3  Quality and accessibility
Policy SP11  Amenity and environmental quality
Policy SP15  Open Space and Biodiversity
Policy 3.1  Environmental Effects
Policy 3.2  Protection of Amenity
Policy 3.7  Waste Reduction
Policy 3.9  Water
Policy 3.12  Quality in Design
Policy 3.14  Designing out crime
Policy 3.16 Conservation Areas
Policy 3.17 Listed buildings
Policy 3.18 Setting of listed buildings and conservation areas
Policy 3.25 Metropolitan Open Land
Policy 3.28 Biodiversity
Policy 5.3 Walking and Cycling
Policy 5.4 Public Transport Improvements
Policy 5.6 Car parking
Policy 5.7 Parking standards for disabled people and the mobility impaired

Aylesbury Action Area Plan (Jan 2010)

12 London Plan 2008 consolidated with alterations since 2004

Policy 2A.1 Sustainability criteria
Policy 3C.1 Integrating transport and development
Policy 3C.21 Improving conditions for walking
Policy 3C.22 Improving conditions for cycling
Policy 3C.23 Parking strategy
Policy 3D.4 Development and promotion of arts and culture, improving London’s open environment.
Policy 3D.8 Realising the value of open space and green infrastructure
Policy 3D.10 Metropolitan Open Land
Policy 3D.12 Open Space Strategies
Policy 3D.13 Children and young people’s play and informal recreation strategies
Policy 3D.14 Biodiversity and nature conservation
Policy 3D.15 Trees and woodland

Core Strategy

13 The Council submitted the draft Core Strategy to the Secretary of State on 26 March 2010 and the Examination in Public hearings took place in July 2010. The Core Strategy policies should be considered as currently having no weight when determining planning applications as they are awaiting the Inspector's report and his finding of soundness. Applications should continue to be determined pending receipt of the Inspector's report primarily in accordance the saved policies in the Southwark Plan 2007 and the London Plan 2008

14 The Inspector’s report on the Core Strategy is expected in early 2011. With a recommendation of soundness from the inspector there will be a very high degree of certainty that the Core Strategy will be adopted and that a number of existing Southwark Plan policies will be replaced. In view of this, on publication of the inspector's report, all core strategy policies should be given significant weight in determining planning applications. Less weight should be given to existing policies which are soon to be replaced. Formal adoption of the core strategy will follow in Spring 2011.

15 Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) and Planning Policy Statements (PPS)

PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development.
PPS1 Supplement: Planning and climate Change.
PPS4 Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth.
PPS5 Planning for the Historic Environment.
PPS9  Biodiversity and Geological Conservation.
PPS12 Local Spatial Planning.
PPG13 Transport.
PPG17 Planning for Open Space and Recreation.
PPG24 Planning and Noise.
PPS25 Development and Flood Risk.

Principle of development

16 Burgess Park was planned as a London regional park after the second world war and has gone through several periods of development since then, and is now a large established park. These proposals do not extend the park but improve and refine the existing park to be more make it more coherent and attractive, and encourage greater use by a broader range of people. This is achieved by improving access and visibility lines into and through the park, improving the landscape, facilities and biodiversity and making the park safer and more attractive for visitors to the park.

17 The Aylesbury Action Area Plan (AAP) has a number of development objectives that refer specifically to Burgess Park, particularly the redesign and improvement of Burgess Park to be a destination ‘World Park’ for South London. It also includes proposals for ‘Three Green Fingers’ of high quality open space linking the estate to the Park. Links across Albany Road, from the green fingers of Surrey Square Park, Missenden Play Area and Faraday Gardens, are needed to encourage movement into the Park.

Environmental impact assessment

18 An Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Screening Opinion was sought prior to the submission of this application. It was decided that no formal EIA was required as the potential impacts were not considered to be of more than local significance. However, detailed documentation supplied with the application does give detailed information on the likely environmental impacts of these proposals and on the proposed mitigation measures.

Impact of proposed development on amenity of adjoining occupiers and surrounding area

19 As the proposals are primarily physical improvements to the park, none of the park features will create additional noise levels or light pollution for those living near the park boundaries. New facilities, such as the new playground, are located close to existing play facilities and will not generate significant new patterns of movement or congregation. However, there should be additional amenity for local people, whether they are visiting or just passing through the park, and the improvements to Burgess Park are intended to enhance the surrounding areas.

Changes to the landscaping and layout of the park

20 The proposed Burgess Park Project has ambitious aims, to create a Masterplan to ‘complete’ this Metropolitan Park, with rich and diverse habitats and flora and fauna, a place for healthy living, play, sport and leisure, growing food and fishing.
The proposals are based around a threefold concept of ‘opening up views’, creating meaningful spaces and adding richness to the Park, thereby giving Burgess Park its own clear identity.

21 The proposed scheme recognises and plans for the increasingly intensive use of the park, improving public accessibility and safety, whilst also improving its potential as a wildlife habitat. In order to achieve these aims there will need to be very significant remodelling and landscaping changes to the park. This will involve improvements to the two main entrances, new footpaths through the park, revising the layout and extending the lake, reducing the height of mounds in some areas and building up the landform in others. This will inevitably mean some disruption and changes to the existing areas of trees, shrubs and other planting in the park.

22 One of the park’s fundamental problems is the current landform, which forms a barrier to movement, closes off long views, and creates areas of limited interest or functional benefit, so concealing the key assets that should make the park distinctive. This is because the park was assembled over a long period and demolition material was deposited, on the otherwise fairly level site, as two large plateau mounds. The plateau to the east of the park prevents views from the lake to Chumleigh Gardens and creates steep slopes along its eastern edge. This scheme will level this plateau, creating a strong visual connection between the historic heart of the park and the lake, and making the space accessible for all. The material removed will be used to create two distinctive sculpted landforms that will enclose the large lawn space, making it less windswept and bleak.

23 The west-east plateau on the western side of the park is under-used and has become a barrier to movement through the park. These proposals will reshape it, using the existing material, into a series of shallow sculpted landforms that will create south facing slopes for picnicking and sunbathing, separated by through routes which will provide safe and convenient north-south movement into and through the park.

24 The scheme involves a great deal of earth movement within the park. Approximately 85,000m³ of sub-soil will be moved within the site boundary; 35,000m³ west of Wells Way and 50,000m³ east of Wells Way. There will be no movement of soil across Wells Way but it is anticipated that about 23,250m³ of additional material (top soil, sub-soil, sand, etc.) will be imported to the site. The design of the scheme has been successful in minimising the need to export spoil from the site, by reusing the material to create new mounds within the park.

Alterations to the entrances and boundaries at Old Kent Rd and Camberwell Rd.

25 At the two main entrances to Burgess Park, on the Old Kent Road and on Camberwell Road, the proposals comprise new hard landscaping, tree planting and seating. At both entrances there will be a 3.5m high by 14m long decorative screen showing the historic road layout and a 3.5m high by 15m wide arch as an entrance feature. There will also be minor local re-contouring to the Old Kent Road entrance to create sight lines into the park, reducing the height of the existing mounds from 5.7m AOD to 3.7m AOD. (NB. The whole Park has a ground level of between 2m and 3m AOD).

26 These changes will provide more welcoming entrances and open up views into and through the park, enhancing the visual and physical connectivity throughout the park. The removal of steps at the Old Kent Road entrance will improve disabled access into the park (as well as access for pushchairs) and will benefit the townscape of the Old Kent Road by giving a clearer sense of the parkland beyond.
New entrances and landforms along Albany Road

This scheme (‘Project 2012’) proposes to achieve the objectives of the Aylesbury Action Area Plan to link the redeveloped estate and the Park, by creating revised landforms which will both present a more positive and appealing face to the road and increase the number of entrances into the park. These new entrance will align with the ‘green fingers’ of the estate and the re-contouring works will improve ease of movement north south between the communities either side of the park.

Four new mounds will be created west of Wells Way. The existing mound close to the cycle track will be re-sculptured and form the eastern part of the line of new mounds extending to Camberwell Road. The re-modelled eastern mound is just south of the existing adventure playground, go-kart track and cycle track, and adjoins Wells Way. The western three mounds are closer to Albany Road, with new access footpaths from the road and the Aylesbury Estate into the park between each of the mounds.

Structure landscaping to the ‘Great Lawn’ and the mounds adjacent to Albany Rd.

Changes to the topography (reshaping the surface levels) of the park is being proposed for a number of reasons. It helps create the long views from Old Kent Road to Chumleigh Gardens, and views of it at the heart of the park, and then onto Camberwell Road. To the east of Chumleigh Gardens is a large playing field with open areas to the south along the old canal route. The proposals will create a ‘Great Lawn’ which the main 5m wide footpath from the Old Kent Road will cross and the area will be partially screened by gently rising slopes to the north and east. The northern mound will be about 6m high and separate the (reduced sized) car park next to Albany Road from the open park land, with trees on its southern slope. The mound to the east and partially to the south, will reach 7m in height and separate the Great Lawn from the sports pitches immediately to the east, with trees on its western slope.

Gentle slopes facing onto the open grass land will be a species rich lawn for picnicking and relaxing to the front of the mounds. The backs of these slopes will be planted with meadow planting. The same approach will also be used for the new mounds to the west of Wells Way, which will be between 5m and 6m high.

Improvements to accessibility and use of the park

General alterations to accessibility and footpaths

The proposals include a new 5m wide hard surface footpath from Old Kent Road to Chumleigh Gardens, St. George’s Church and Bath House / Library. New footpaths, varying in width between 1.5m and 3m will be provided in the space adjacent to St. Georges Way. These will be a mixture of hard surfacing and permeable self-bonding gravel. Existing steep sloping footpaths will be removed and the gradient of all footpaths within the park will be become more gentle and accessible. All will be Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) compliant.

With straight paths with longer views along them, there will be the a much clearer feeling of being within a large well connected park with the added benefits for accessibility and the safety and security for all park users.

Installation of new park and street furniture

The proposals include new signage, seating, litter bins and railings throughout the park. Seating throughout the park will have arm rests (for accessibility) and there will be three timber benches at the Camberwell Road entrance.
Creation of a fitness circuit and provision of outdoor gym equipment

There will be a mown circuit route around the perimeter of the park to facilitate a fitness circuit for runners, cyclists and walkers with interpretation signs throughout. This will not involve any new planting, landscaping or building works. Two outdoor gyms will be located near the southern boundary of the park, with a total of seven pieces of outdoor gym equipment. One will be located along St. George's Way, east of Wells Way, and the other will be north of New Church Road in the western part of the park. They will be sited within grassed areas, with reinforced Grassmatt safety surfacing placed under each piece of equipment. They will be open to the park, without railings or fencing.

Creation of a new play area

A new 3,000m$^2$ play area aimed at children of 7-14 years of age will be provided to the east of Chumleigh Gardens, close to the newly created toddler play area. This will provide a play trail including a zip-wire, and play equipment, with safety surfacing, lawn and trees surrounded by hedgerows and fencing to create a dog-free area.

Impact on the Ecology and Biodiversity of the Park

Burgess Park is a non-statutory ‘Site of Borough Grade 2 Importance for Nature Conservation’. Surveys of the existing habitats and surveys for the presence of birds, bats and reptiles were carried out, particularly focusing on the areas most affected by the proposed works. The findings were that Burgess Park is not habitat-rich, being mainly man-made habitats which have yet to mature. The park is a large area and potentially a self-contained valuable ecological unit with the capacity to support a diverse range of common species. The park also has a great potential to increase local biodiversity due to its large size through increasing the extent of those areas managed specifically for nature conservation and through wildlife friendly management practices.

The habitat survey found over 250 botanical species including many non-native, but no rare, species. The proposals will retain and enhance the overall species diversity by retaining and adding to the range of ornamental and semi-natural habitats in the park and by marginally increasing the soft landscaping by the conversion of redundant roads and part of the car park to grassed areas.

There were 22 species of birds recorded, with only the House Sparrow and Common Starling being birds of high conservation concern, and five others of medium concern (Mallard, Greylag Goose, Swift, Green Woodpecker and Dunnock). The Park has a high potential for nesting birds, with strips of woodland and planted shrubs suitable for nesting habitats for both garden and woodland birds. This will be enhanced by further planting and provision of nesting boxes.

No reptiles were found over the course of seven surveys undertaken. Whilst there is a low potential for reptile occurrence, further checks will be carried out immediately prior to works commencing.

The Bat surveys identified four species of bats foraging and commuting across the park (to feed elsewhere). These were the Pipistrelle, Soprano Pipistrelle, Leisler’s Bat and Noctule. None were seen to emerge from trees, buildings or structures within the park and there is no indication of roosting in these areas. The survey indicated that the lake was the main area for foraging bats and used by all four species. The park has a high potential for foraging and commuting bats and a medium potential for roosting sites. The planting of native tree and shrub species will attract insects and also provide
a potential food source for bats and birds. Bat nesting boxes will also be provided in suitable locations.

41 The Bat survey met best practice and although not covering the whole park it rightly focused on the areas most affected by works. The report found no evidence of bats roosting which is consistent with the fact there are very few mature trees in the park. There was evidence to support the view that bats are roosting somewhere on the Aylesbury Estate. The bat activity survey is an important factor in the works as there could be disturbance during the lake works and clearing the area where the go-kart track is. As the works are being carried out during the period of the year that bats are active this should have little affect on their ability to forage and commute.

42 The reptile survey followed prescribed survey guidelines and established there are no reptiles present. This is consistent with the fact that there is poor linkage to sites that are known to contain reptiles in Southwark.

43 The habitat survey was thorough and covered the whole park. This report highlighted the fact that the habitats present were ideal for ecological enhancement and contained a range of plants that were easily replicable if this was required. Much of the more natural habitat is being retained so removal or and damage to the parks ecology during the works would have a short term impact but quickly recover. It is worth noting that many areas of wildlife value have established not by design but rather by relaxed management. This has allowed areas to be colonised and lose their original purpose, such as formal shrub or amenity grassland. Many of the natural areas are dominated by invasive buddleia, and plants of the higher and pioneer character such as bramble, ivy, nettles, duc, and creeping thistle. So managing and enhancing these areas and other parts of the park will improve the ecological diversity. The lake works will greatly improve the ecological diversity of the water body and create a substantial area of reed bed which is a national priority habitat.

Repair and enlargement of Burgess Park lake including habitat enhancements

44 The existing edge of the lake will be retained but softened where possible with new planted banks. The lake will be drained and the liner inspected and repaired or a new liner installed if necessary. All silt will be removed, retained and re-applied following the application of the repaired or new lining. The methodology of the draining of the lake should be subject to further approval, reserved by condition. The most significant improvement to the lake is its extension to the west, with 175m of the existing concrete wall removed and the lake extended and existing fountain relocated to a more visible position.

45 The existing volume of the lake is approximately 57,600m$^3$, with an average depth of 1.8m. The lake will be extended by approximately 7,200m$^2$, excavated to a depth of 1.5m, with the new volume of the extended area being about 10,800m$^3$. This represents an increase of 22.5% in surface area and an increase of 18.75% in volume.

46 New land bridges, connecting Old Kent Road to Chumleigh Gardens will improve circulation around and across the lake and will have planted banks with wetland planting. Trees to the east of Calmington Road will be incorporated as an island within the proposed wet woodland. The southern portion of the lake will become wet scrubland and reed beds. Eleven new fishing platforms will be provided, accessed from the southern land bridge; this will reduce potential conflict with pedestrians and cyclists. The existing scrubland/trees south of the 5m wide footpath will be removed and recycled for future use within the park. New floating bird islands will be created.
similar to those which currently exist.

Conversion of an area of amenity grassland east of canal bridge to meadow
An area of about 10,000m$^2$ of amenity grassland east of Canal Bridge will be converted to meadow-like gardens. New hedgerow and tree planting will be provided and the copse to the east of St. George’s Garden will be thinned to improve habitat. Two further copses nearest the Canal Bridge will be removed and recycled into the landscape. Replacement trees will be planted elsewhere in the park.

Conversion of existing internal roads to parkland
Approximately 1,000m (1km) of existing redundant roadway within the park will be converted to parkland. This will be Calmington Road and the parts of Neate Street and Loncroft Road that are already stopped up. The existing active parts of Neate Street and Loncroft Road will remain open to traffic. The part of New Church Road within the park will be reduced in width from between 7m and 8.5m to 4.1m wide, with the remaining width converted to lawn and planting on the north side of the road. The remaining road will be retained as a pedestrian route and cycle way.

Works in relation to biodiversity across the park
Burgess Park does not currently make the most of the open space from a biodiversity perspective. The proposed scheme will increase biodiversity by retaining existing habitat diversity and enhancing it through the creation of semi-natural habitats such as scrub, scattered trees, tree copses, semi-improved grassland, wet woodland and reed habitats. The new formal gardens on the south side of the park and the pictorial meadows in the north western corner of the park will enhance the overall ornamental and semi-ornamental habitats within the park creating a more diverse mosaic of foraging, nesting and overwintering habitats for wildlife than is currently supported in the park.

There will be five specific areas where habitats will be enhanced:
   a) New Church Road nature area;
   b) Dry grassland north east of Canal Bridge;
   c) Wet woodland and scrub in the vicinity of the lake and wetland planting to the lake banks;
   d) Meadow planting to the backs of the new landforms; and
   e) Meadow grassland between the new landforms and Albany Road in the western portion of the park.

Impact on trees
There are no very mature or ancient trees within the park but there are a few mature Poplars on the park boundary. There are tree-lined pathways of Horse Chestnut, Red Horse Chestnut, Common Lime and Small Leafed Lime. There are groves of planted single species, such as London Plane. Recent planting has included young False Acacia (Robinia), Rowan, Tree of Heaven, Cherry, Field Maple, Italian Alder and Silver Birch. Trees of greater maturity include Sycamore, London Plane, Norway Maple, Weeping Willow, Hornbeam, Cherry and Rowan. Small belts of young woodland present on the park edges feature many trees from the Poplar and Willow families, including White Poplar, Aspen, Osier and Crack Willow, with Ash, Sycamore and False Acacia. The scrub layer features Elder, Cherry, Plum, Blackthorn, Firethorn, Garden Privet and Cotoneaster. Ground cover is sparse due to lack of light and Ivy and Bramble are both abundant and Black Horehound frequent.
Felling and planting of trees.  

Although there are no Tree Preservation Orders or other protection for existing trees, the proposed improvement works aim to retain as many existing trees as possible. However, some losses are inevitable due to the new landscaping, remodelling of ground levels (especially the creation of new mounds adjacent to Albany Road) and also the new footpaths created to improve views through the park, safety and the cohesion of the park. Where trees are to be felled they will be replaced so that there is no net loss of specimen trees. In total 167 trees will be removed and 211 new trees planted. Although some of the trees lost will be mature, with a greater trunk girth and canopy spread than the replacement trees, the new trees will be of a greater variety than those lost. Some of the larger specimen trees planted will have a greater life span than the many cherry trees in the park already.

The principle areas where trees will need to be replaced are to the west of Wells Way where the existing mound is remodelled and three new mounds are created, along the path east of Chumleigh Gardens, surrounding the existing car park (where another mound will be created), and along the route of the new main footpath from Old Kent Road to Chumleigh Gardens. The improved entrance from Camberwell Road and the adjacent new mound next to Albany Road will result the largest loss of trees, with a mix of trees of variable size and quality, mainly Sycamore, Common or Broad Leaf Lime, Lawson’s Cypress and Field Maple. The other new mounds will need to replace a similar mix of trees, but with other trees such as some Common Ash and Silver Birch. Some Horse Chestnut and Poplar will also be lost near the existing car park.

New specimen tree planting, of 16-18cm girth, will include Alder, Ash, Silver Birch, Hazel, False Acacia, Sweet Gum, Field Maple, Rowan, English Oak, Pin Oak, Holm Oak, Red Oak, London Plane, Poplar, Willow, Whitebeam, small and large leafed Limes, and Elm. The shrubs selected for the woodland mix are also aimed at improving wildlife habitat and biodiversity, and includes Hazel, Hawthorn, Holly, Privet, Sloe, and Elder. This is considered to be a good selection of trees and shrubs to support wildlife and biodiversity.

Traffic issues

These proposals aim to build upon the already well established transport links into and around the park by improving the pedestrian and cycle environment. Currently access into the park is limited and it is not perceived as a safe place to walk through. This limits the effectiveness of the park as an appealing and convenient route for walkers and cyclists.

The proposed redesign increases the number of access/egress points, coordinating them with existing crossing points along main roads and by improving the safety and security within the park through better design and landscaping, improving natural surveillance and encouraging activity in previously isolated areas. Additional improvements to circulation and permeability are provided by reorganising and enhancing the internal network of paths and cycle tracks, creating more legible and accessible routes that follow desire lines to key destinations within and around the park.

The proposed consultation zone for the Cross River Tram set out in the Southwark Plan includes a large area on both the east and west sides of Burgess Park. In the Core Strategy, the route (in that plan simply referred to as a Public Transport Proposed Route), is shown going along Wells Way. There is nothing in the proposed Burgess
Park 2012 scheme which would prejudice the implementation of this new transport route if it were to be confirmed.

Reorganisation and reduction of car parking spaces within the park.

58 The existing car park with 74 spaces will be reduced in size and reconfigured to accommodate 20 cars, including 4 wider spaces for Blue Badge vehicles. This is to reflect sustainable transport objectives to encourage more sustainable forms of travel. The existing access from Albany Road via Chumleigh Street will be retained. The existing recycling facilities and four parking spaces for the disabled will also be retained. Concerns about the inadequacy of four Blue Badge parking bays for the disabled can in part be addressed by the availability of on-street parking (limited to three hours) on the roads that will continue to be within or adjacent to the park.

Design issues

59 The design criteria broadly follows that required by guidance provided by CABE and the redesign of the park is strongly influenced by the historical context of the canal, roads, boundaries and other infrastructure. Subsequent development of the park has been incomplete and resulted in a fragmented, incoherent use of space with limited accessibility or aesthetic appeal.

60 In general, spaces defined by realigned and existing pathways and earthworks are strongly geometric, reflecting the primary historical alignment of the park along the length of the canal. The design has successfully addressed the need to rationalise poorly located or missing pathways and entrances by incorporating these into a comprehensive review of access points and desire lines. These have improved connections for pedestrians and cyclists, especially from the Aylesbury Estate and along commuter routes. Site lines across the park have been realigned so that the spire of St. George's Church provides a primary way finding view, particularly from the Old Kent Road entrance.

61 The prominent use of earthworks provides a strongly geometrical pattern which has a major impact on sense of space and enclosure. This is amplified by the height and grade of these new landforms which constitute significant changes to the topography of the park. They are characterised by an east-west rectangular alignment and a pair of amphitheatre-like forms which encompass the great lawn area.

62 A procession of mounds lead from a redesigned and more welcoming park entrance at Camberwell Road, along a tree lined avenue before entering into the re-graded and levelled lawn area. Earthworks then provide a gateway to an extended area of lake and wetland before completing the journey to a re-graded entrance at Old Kent Road.

63 There is less emphasis on structural tree planting to internally connect areas of the park or to define park edges. Planting does however aim to use trees and hedges within discrete areas to define and enclose spaces, such as at St George's Gardens, or through informal groups of scattered planting between earthworks and lake edges and islands. Away from small areas of wet scrub and woodland more architectural or definitive tree planting is limited to the entrances at Camberwell and Old Kent Roads. Extensive areas are laid to species rich lawn and meadows which provide a theme associated with new landforms and intersections.

64 Other design elements include steel arch structures which aim to focus and enhance entrances and views into the park, historical panel features, shared surfaces and
extensive reuse of existing materials such as granite kerbs. Widened paths are surfaced with either paving or self-bound gravel which enhance sustainability. Overall, the choice of furniture and materials is well specified with innovative seating, signage and screens. These provide a consistent feel and quality whilst also being robust and simple to maintain.

Impact on character and setting of a listed building and/or conservation area

The park is either bounded by or can be seen from a number of conservation areas: Cobourg Road, Trafalgar Avenue, Addington Square and Glengall Road. There are a number of listed buildings within these conservation areas and the park is also opposite No's 66-92 (even) Camberwell Road which are Grade II listed. A series of views have been analysed from these listed buildings and conservation areas in order to assess the impact of the proposed landscaping works on their wider setting. The study confirms that there will be a minimal impact on the wider impact of these heritage assets. In some cases due to the relocation of the paths and regarding of landforms, views of the listed buildings; such as the Former St. George’s Church, will be improved.

Burgess Park has a number of historical assets and in making the park a more attractive environment and a more useable space, the proposals have aimed to enhance the setting of these assets. For example, one of the key objectives was to open up and reveal views of Chumleigh Gardens (a listed building) at the heart of the park. The reconfiguration of the topography around the Lime Kiln will improve its overall setting, better integrating the listed structure into the park. Although not a listed structure, the canal was an important element of the historic environment of the park and the redesign protects the original alignment and aims to allow the heritage of the site to be ‘read’ in the landscape. The choice of landscaping materials and design will not compete with the heritage assets or detract from their significance.

In PPS 5, Policy HE10: provides additional policy principles guiding the consideration of applications for development affecting the setting of a designated heritage asset. Of particular relevance is HE10.1, which advises that local planning authorities should consider favourably applications that preserve those elements of the setting and that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset. We are further advised in the practice guidance accompanying PPS 5 (paragraph 113) that: ‘setting is the surroundings in which an asset is experienced. All heritage assets have a setting, irrespective of the form in which they survive and whether they are designated or not. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance, or may be neutral.’

It is considered that the proposal complies with Southwark Plan (2007) Policies: 3.15, 3.16, 3.17 and 3.18 and the aims of PPS 5, in that it seeks to preserve and enhance the setting of adjoining conservation areas and listed buildings. In summary, it is considered that the proposed landscaping works will not necessarily compete or have a detrimental impact on the wider setting of the conservation areas and listed buildings.

Planning obligations (S.106 undertaking or agreement)

Planning obligations are sought to mitigate specified negative impacts of development which is in other respects acceptable. As there are no negative impacts to be mitigated with
these proposals there is no requirement for any planning obligations (S106 Planning Agreement). The enhancements to the park will be of benefit to the users of this key community resource, retaining and enhancing the range of facilities available in a more inviting and well-connected environment.

**Sustainable development implications**

70 The proposals enhance the park's ability to create more comfortable microclimates, use less water and manage surface water more effectively. They also include the recycling of existing site materials within the park, achieve a cut and fill balance to ensure all cut materials stay on site, and felled trees will be used either for play, dead wood habitat for the park or chipped and re-used in planting areas.

71 Climate change has been a major consideration in the planning of these proposals. It is widely acknowledged that winters are going to become increasingly wet with higher incidences of storms and summers are likely to be longer, drier and hotter. The park therefore has to take a responsible approach to water management, where water is captured and stored for when it is needed in dry months.

72 The proposals aim to reduce water use and adopt a sustainable approach to drainage. A bore hole will replace the mains water supply as the source for keeping the lake topped up and the wet woodland areas will hold surface water rather than losing it to storm water drainage, and bioswales will be introduced to provide sustainable drainage from hard surfaced areas (these are vegetated open channels designed to attenuate and treat storm water runoff, promoting slowing, cleansing and infiltration along the way). The scheme therefore provides for flood storage volumes with a sustainable urban drainage system (SUDs) to attenuate surface water in extreme weather events and rainwater harvesting to replenish the proposed wildlife aquatic sanctuary.

73 The Burgess Park project aims to be energy efficient and minimise carbon emissions, whilst maximising the efficient use of materials and resources. As with all parkland the main energy source is from solar power but energy efficiency measures in this scheme also include being designed for less intensive maintenance (e.g. less mowing), enhanced routes through the park to encourage walking and cycling, reduction in car parking numbers, minimising lighting within the park and re-use of existing energy efficient lights. There will also be new waste and recycling bins throughout the park, whilst existing waste management and recycling will continue.

74 The proposals also include areas for community food growing and will incorporate new habitats for wildlife, including new types of habitat for a potential drier future. The park will aim to not only adapt to climate change but try and mitigate the impacts of it.

**Other matters**

**Loss of the cycle track and cycle workshop**

75 There have been a number of objections to the loss of these facilities in the proposal, including queries about whether there was any consultation and doubts cast about either the suitability of the replacement BMX track, or its likelihood of being provided.

76 Consultations regarding the cycle track and associated activities has been included throughout the design process, including during the competition stage. Consultation events took place on 9 December 2009, 26 April 2010 (with a youth focus group dedicated to the cycle track, go-kart track and adventure play) and a play workshop on
10 June 2010 with Children’s Services present. Changes to the bund were discussed at this workshop and with Children’s Services on 6 July. Two dedicated ‘conflict resolution’ meetings were held on 21 September and 1 October 2010 with the public and representatives of Friends of Burgess Park, Burgess Park Action Group, and individuals training a young BMX Olympic hopeful. On 21 September 2010 a location for the BMX track, which will be delivered and funded separately to the Burgess Park 2012 project, was agreed. The most suitable area was considered to be the disused children’s play area on the corner of Albany Road and Wells Way. The Council made it clear that it would be fully open to the public as well as experienced BMX riders. A further meeting on 1 October 2010, attended by representatives of Friends of Burgess Park and Burgess Park Action Group, considered options for the bund around the cycle track which were agreed and are included in the application plans. At the time this planning application was submitted, details relating to the proposed new BMX facility were not fully developed, but the Council expects to submit a separate application shortly.

77 A food growing area will be provided within the park in response to the loss of the growing area near the cycle track. The other activities that take place near the cycle track could still take place following the redesign of the landform, albeit in a different location to the east of the adventure playground.

78 One of the key priorities for this project was to create a safer and more legible park by re-sculpting areas of topography throughout the park, to create more useable spaces. The bund around the cycle track was one of the key areas for this change, as it currently creates the narrowest part of the park at 20m wide. The bund that wraps around the cycle track area exacerbates issues of anti-social behaviour, and turns its back on the park with no visual or physical connection.

Family friendly areas and dog free zones

79 A number of comments have been made regarding the lack of family friendly areas, in particular dog free zones. Throughout the pre-application consultation process there were discussions with the community regarding fenced off areas to create dog-free areas. A family-friendly area, which is also a play area for 7 - 14yr olds, of 3,000m², has been designated for picnicking, picnic tables and play equipment that will be fenced and hedged to prevent dog access. However, as a result of consultation with the public, it was agreed not to put up any further fencing throughout the park to create dog-free zones.

Conclusion on planning issues

80 The proposals for the improvement of Burgess Park should achieve the objectives of improved access, cohesion and identity for Burgess Park. The proposals should enable the park to meet its social, economic and environmental potential, which it currently does not achieve. The enhanced park should also provide more of what the community needs in terms of a high quality, safe open green space for passive enjoyment, social interaction, events, recreation and leisure activities. Environmental sustainability and biodiversity are well considered, as are the revised landforms, their wind shelter, and replacement planting.

81 The scheme has undergone extensive pre-application consultation so it is no surprise that the numbers of responses to the statutory consultation are not great for a development of this scale and importance locally. There are both expressions of support for the project and some objections and concerns expressed about specific
aspects of the proposals. The issues being raised, and the reasons for the final form of the proposals, are explained in this report. However, whilst there are issues where there may still be concerns, the overall benefits of the proposals greatly outweigh any concerns and there are significant improvements for public access, amenity and safety, as well as the enhancement of the landscape, biodiversity and enjoyment of the park facilities, all of which should be supported.

82 The scheme is consistent with the status of the Park as Metropolitan Open Land, and will retain the openness and recreational function of the land, in line with Policy 3.25 of the Southwark Plan. It will enhance the appreciation of heritage assets within and close to the Park, consistent with the requirements of PPS5 and the Southwark Plan, as well as improving the biodiversity of the landscape. As such, it is recommended that planning permission be granted.

Community impact statement

83 In line with the Council's Community Impact Statement the impact of this application has been assessed as part of the application process with regard to local people in respect of their age, disability, faith/religion, gender, race and ethnicity and sexual orientation. Consultation with the community has been undertaken as part of the application process.

a) The impact on local people is set out above.

b) The following issues relevant to particular communities/groups likely to be affected by the proposal have been identified as the changes to access and parking, the future of the cycle track and the remodelling of the landforms.

c) The likely adverse or less good implications for any particular communities/groups have been also been discussed above. Specific actions to ameliorate these implications include additional pedestrian and cycle access routes, with better accessibility, greater natural surveillance and safety, and a further planning application to be submitted for the proposed BMX track.

Consultations

84 Details of consultation and any re-consultation undertaken by the Head of Development Management in respect of this application are set out in Appendix 1.

85 In addition to the formal consultation on the planning application, the council carried out extensive local consultation during the design process. Following the appointment of LDA Design to prepare the outline vision for the Park (and this application) in October 2009, focus group sessions have been held on key elements of the plan (including biodiversity and fishing), stakeholder workshops and a number of public events have also been held. Several groups were identified for consultation including technical and partner stakeholders, and representatives of the community and public.

86 Consultation was targeted at representatives of community groups with an interest in the revitalisation of Burgess Park, businesses in South London, under-represented groups such as faith groups, disabled and deaf people, older people, black Asian and other minority ethnic communities, Gypsies and travellers, women and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and low income groups. Young persons living within the local area and the general public living and working in the local area. A dedicated web site
and Facebook page were also set up. Details of 17 consultation events and workshops have been provided. These identified a great deal of support for the proposals and contributed ideas for the plans and suggestions for further facilities.

87 There was support for the alterations to the lake and by those taking part in fishing. The main concern was to minimise the loss of mature trees when lake is expanded. There was also support for the removal of redundant roads and the earthworks, although some concern that the mounds to the western end of the park could create a barrier to the Aylesbury Estate. Many elements of the plans were influenced by consultations and include the entrance panels to provide the identity of Burgess Park, varied use of the lake, improved planting and biodiversity, additional street tree planting, and trees removed to be incorporated into the design as art, embedded play, habitat creation and landscaping mulch. Also additional north – south footpaths, improved signage, improved cycle connections, new play and outdoor gym equipment, new connections across lake to be land bridges and that all materials retained on site be used for landform strengthening, were incorporated or amended following input from stakeholders.

88 Details of a further 24 consultation events and workshops, which discussed the more detailed plans, have been given including detailed comments and suggestions made and design responses made to the suggestions. Overall, a comprehensive programme of consultations has ensured that there were opportunities for the general public and all interested parties to comment and contribute to the development of the scheme. It has also been demonstrated that the comments and suggestions made throughout the consultation process were fully taken into account and often led to changes in the design of the scheme.

Consultation replies

89 Details of consultation responses received are set out in Appendix 2.

Summary of consultation responses

90 There has been both support for the whole of the Burgess Park improvement proposals, and support for it in general but objections or concerns about specific aspects of the scheme. These objections or concerns are about one of three specific aspects of the scheme:
   a) The loss of trees or the size and maturity of some of the trees;
   b) The loss of the cycle track and associated facilities and doubts about the provision of the new BMX track, which is subject to a separate application; and
   c) The loss of car parking and its impact on families, the elderly or disabled visiting the park.
These concerns are addressed in the report.

91 Comments with support or no objection have been received from Natural England, The Environment Agency, Groundwork London, the Camberwell Society and Transport for London.

92 There have also been detailed comments from the Council’s Tree Officer/Arboriculturalist, Archaeologist, Ecologist and Conservation and Design officers.
**Human rights implications**

93 This planning application engages certain human rights under the Human Rights Act 2008 (the HRA). The HRA prohibits unlawful interference by public bodies with conventions rights. The term 'engage' simply means that human rights may be affected or relevant.

94 This application has the legitimate aim of providing improvements to an existing public park. The rights potentially engaged by this application, including the right to a fair trial and the right to respect for private and family life are not considered to be unlawfully interfered with by this proposal.
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Consultation undertaken

Site notices date: 09/12/2010 (24 in total displayed around the boundaries of the park)

Press notice date: 2/12/2010

Case officer site visit date: 5/1/2011

Neighbour consultation letters sent: 8/12/2010 (reconsultation carried out on 23/12/10 following receipt of additional/revised information)

Internal services consulted: 7/12/2010

Archaeologist; Arboriculturalist; Conservation and Design; Ecologist; Environment Protection; Parks and Sports; Planning Policy; Property Division; Public Realm Assessment; Public Realm Project Design; Transportation Planning.

Statutory and non-statutory organisations consulted:

Neighbours and local groups consulted:
There were 2,482 consultation letters originally sent to neighbour addresses on 8Th December 2010 (plus 14 additional addresses added during consultation): The individual addresses were (including addresses where all flats were also consulted):
1 – 53 Addington Square; Burgess Park Tennis Centre, 44 Addington Square; 1 – 5 Albany Mews; 4 -12, 88 -140, 200-202, 416 Albany Road; Ellison House, Albany Road; 1 – 28 Arklow House, Albany Road; 1 – 34 Riddell Court, 20 Albany Road; 1 – 30 Foxcote, 150 Albany Road; 1 – 34 Emberton, 190 Albany Road; 1 – 31 Danesfield, 220 Albany Road; 1 – 28 Calverton, 240 Albany Road; 1 – 36 Silverthorne Lofts, 400 Albany Road; 1 -6, 47 – 53 Bagshot Street; 1 – 16 Domville Court, 70 Bagshot Street; 112 – 141 Latimer, Beaconsfield Road; Old Peoples Club, Wyndham Estate, Bethwin Road; Tenants Club, Wyndham Estate, Bethwin Road; 1 – 88 Andoversford Court, Bibury Close; 1 – 36 Cam Court, Gloucester Grove Estate, Bibury Close; 1 – 18 Downtend Court, Bibury Close; 1 – 24 Willbridge Court, Bibury Close; 18, 20 Boundary Lane; 44 – 256 Bradenham, Boyson Road; 1, 2 Bradenham Close; 62 – 114 evens, 81 – 179 odds, Camberwell Road; Railway Arches 270 – 278, Camberwell Road; 1 – 116 Wickway Court, Cator Street; Parks Depot, Chumleigh Street; 1 - 104 Cobourg Road; Cobourg Primary School, Cobourg Road; New Peckham Mosque, 99 Cobourg Road; 1 – 24 Dragon Road; 1 - 36 Quedegeley Court, Ebley Close; 1 - 32 Quenington Court, Ebley Close; 1 - 29 Westonbirt Court, Ebley Close; 80 -144 Gayhurst, Hopwood Road; 1 – 40 Kitson Road; 3 Kitson Villa, Kitson Road; 1 – 67 Masterman House, Elmington Estate, Lomond Grove; 39 - 49 Loncroft Road; Centre for Wildlife Gardening, 28 Marsdem Road; 1 – 12 Kenyon House, Elmington Estate, New Church Road; 1 – 51 Leslie Prince Court, 50-52 New Church Road; 1 – 72 Evelina Mansions, New Church Road; 1 – 19, 83, 36 – 52 New Church Road; 9 Nile Terrace; 1 -18 Oakley Place; St. George's Methodist Church, Oakley Place; 1 – 4, 320 – 372, 301- 363 Old Kent Road; Muslim Association of Nigeria, 365
Old Kent Road; 1 - 43 Parkhouse Street; 90 – 153 Galleria Court, Pennack Road; 1 – 5 Pepler Mews; 1 – 172 Chiltern House, Portland Street; Rainbow Nursery, Astley Estate, Rowcross Street; 1 – 8 Rust Square; Wickway Community Centre, St. George’s Way; 1 - 94 St. George’s Way; 1 – 8 Sears Street; Walworth Academy, 34-40 Shorncliffe Road; 1 - 43 Southampton Way; 20 – 30 Sumner Road; Christ Apostolic Church, 1A Sumner Road; 1 – 89 Galleria Court, Sumner Road; 241 - 471 Wendover, Thurlow Street; New Deal for Communities, Wendover, Thurlow Street; Aylesbury Learning Centre, Wendover, Thurlow Street; 37, 38 Urlwin Street; 1 – 22 Alexandra Court, Urlwin Street; 5 Hambledon, Villa Street; 1 – 20, 55 Wells Way; Camberwell Public Baths, Wells Way; 1 – 30, 39, 55, 59, 66 Wells Way; 1 – 149 Chartridge, Westmoreland Road;
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Consultation responses received

Internal services

Arboriculturalist:
National, regional and local policy presumes that there should be no net loss of canopy cover; or rather that total tree canopy should be increased where possible. In this proposal a greater variety of tree sizes and a greater number of total specimen trees is required to ensure a sustainable tree population and an adequate replacement of canopy cover.

In order to ensure that there is no longer term net loss of tree canopy, an adequate number of trees of varied girth size is necessary. This may be achieved by using trees of minimum 14-16cm for the majority of the design rising to 25-30cm girth at entrances and landmark or feature planting. To provide no net loss of canopy cover a minimum total of 450 trees is required, which is composed of the 217 replacements proposed and the 233 other trees lost. This will need to be addressed by a condition on the permission granted.

Suitable planting and maintenance specifications will be required to ensure that all landscape successfully establishes. Given the known risk of damage due to vandalism and uncontrolled dogs, tree guards are therefore essential. The standard tree protection details for all retained trees should be monitored during construction works.

The sense of fragmentation is significantly reduced via the connectivity and coherent visual appeal provided by avenues and less formal parkland planting, such as successive groupings of trees. Although the planting design goes some way to reflect this by retaining existing avenues a large number of gaps are left where infill planting is necessary, especially within the compartment planting design to the south and west of Chumleigh Gardens and succession planting along avenues. The opportunity therefore exists to reduce fragmentation in this way.

The removal of mature Lime trees affected by landforms near the entrance to Camberwell Rd is regrettable since they are a remnant of rear gardens, are of historical value and are in good condition. They have been identified as being of potential use to bats and are therefore of benefit to a protected species. It is considered that the benefits of the development outweigh the harm caused. However, appropriate and adequate mitigation is required via replacement planting of this avenue. This should also be a condition on the permission granted.

The park’s tree assets are a major component of the green infrastructure and critical to its sense of enjoyment and functioning as habitat for biodiversity. The opportunity exists for this to be addressed within the current application via conditions, with planting identified which on balance leads to an increase, or at the very least no overall loss, of canopy cover.

Other than sufficient tree replacement, maintenance specifications should be provided together with information on defect period, nursery stock type and supplier. Tree locations, species and sizes are to be confirmed.
**Archaeologist:**

Burgess Park lies outside the archaeological priority zones of Southwark, except for the strip of land which falls within the Old Kent Road Archaeological Priority Zone, adjacent to the entrance from the Old Kent Road.

The junction between the Old Kent Road and Albany Road is historically known as St Thomas a Watering. This site is mentioned by Chaucer in the Canterbury Tales. This marks the traditional boundary of the limits of the City of London and was also an execution place for North Surrey; execution sites, by tradition are located at major boundaries. Major historical figures executed at this site include Sir Thomas Wyatt, who led a rebellion against Queen Mary in 1554. Historical references to executions at this site range from the early Tudor period until the 1740s. It also appears that a number of religious martyrs may well have been executed here during the reign of Elizabeth I. Ground works within the area of the Old Kent Road entrance will have the potential to impact on remains related to this site. There is little archaeological information related to what is likely to be found at execution sites of this period. It could range from very little - postholes for supporting gallows or scaffolds, areas of ash related to where people were burnt or burials of the victims. Ground works in this area will require monitoring and to be under archaeological control. Any strategy for the archaeology in this area will need to make a full consideration of the potential for human remains to be present.

The rest of the park is subject to remodelling. Modern mounds built above grade are not of archaeological interest; therefore archaeological input is needed for their removal. Area of excavation should be monitored. These areas should focus on locations of former industrial buildings and within the area of the canal. The written scheme of investigation for this monitoring should target resources to such features and the area of the Old Kent Road as detailed. Recommend that conditions are imposed on any permission (*included in recommended conditions*).

**Ecologist:**

1. The Bat survey met best practice and although not covering the whole park it rightly focused on the areas most affected by works. The report found no evidence of bats roosting which is consistent with the fact there are very few mature trees in the park. There was evidence to support the view that bats are roosting somewhere on the Aylesbury Estate. The bat activity survey is an important factor in the works as there could be disturbance during the lake works and clearing the area where the go-kart track is. As the works are being carried out during the period of the year that bats are active this should have little affect on their ability to forage and commute.

2. The reptile survey followed prescribed survey guidelines and established there are no reptiles present. This is consistent with the fact that there is poor linkage to sites that are known to contain reptiles in Southwark.

3. The habitat survey was thorough and covered the whole park. This report highlighted the fact that the habitats present were ideal for ecological enhancement and contained a range of plants that were easily replicable if this was required. Much of the more natural habitat is being retained so removal or damage to the parks ecology during the works would have a short term impact but quickly recover. It is worth noting that many areas of wildlife value have established not by design but rather by relaxed management. This has allowed areas to be colonised and lose their original purpose, such as formal shrub or amenity grassland. Many of the natural
areas are dominated by invasive buddleia, and plants of the higher and pioneer character such as bramble, ivy, nettles, dock, and creeping thistle.

So managing and enhancing these areas and other parts of the park will improve the ecological diversity. The lake works will greatly improve the ecological diversity of the water body and create a substantial area of reed bed which is a national priority habitat.

**Statutory and non-statutory organisations**

**Natural England** – no objections. Encouraged to note habitat enhancements. As site is a Grade 2 Site of Importance for Nature Conservation any adverse effects are to be avoided as far as possible. This is in line with London Plan policy 3D.14. Tree loss should also be minimised. Recommend that the council ensures the delivery of the proposed protection and enhancement measures through the use of planning conditions. Also recommended further sources for information on natural character areas and play areas.

**Transport for London** – no objections. Do not believe that the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on the TfL Road Network.

**Environment Agency** - The Environment Agency does not object to the proposed development subject to the groundwater protection and flood risk conditions being imposed. We welcome the proposed redevelopment of Burgess Park in order to provide better recreation facilities in this public amenity space.

**Metropolitan Police** - No issues to raise regarding the application.

**Neighbours and local groups**

The Friends of Burgess Park (FOBP) fully support improvement work to Burgess Park and will continue to work constructively on this project with Southwark Council and other local groups. FOBP support the idea of developing a master plan with a longer term shared view of how the park needs developing. But because the money (£4.5m from the London Mayor and Aylesbury NDC) needs to be spent very soon the focus has to be on work undertaken now along side ensuring the park continues to function for local residents.

Groundwork London - Groundwork London support the application for improvements and alterations to Burgess Park. Groundwork London, and previously as Groundwork Southwark & Lambeth, has been directly involved with Burgess Park for over fifteen years. In that time we have helped to bring about a number of alterations to the Park, largely driven by the aspirations of the local community. Through our membership of the Burgess Park Masterplan Steering Group, we have been able to see the new plans for the Park progress and are confident that the plans that have now been submitted as a planning application adequately reflect the consultation held with the Steering Group and wider community. Our support reflects our understanding that, as part of these plans, it is necessary for a number of the interventions we previously led to be removed or adapted to allow for wider regeneration of the Park. It is important to acknowledge that these interventions were appropriate at the time that they were initiated but should not be a reason for preventing the strategic regeneration of the Park that has long been the aspiration of the Council and local community. Finally, we congratulate both Southwark Council and LDA Design for their transparent and open consultation process that has allowed these plans to be so greatly
driven by the needs and aspirations of the local community.

**Camberwell Society:**
The Society welcomes the plan to create a more rational set of paths and to open up vistas across the park so that the lake can be seen from further away. We are pleased too that the entrances to the park have been addressed and that the commitment is to use high quality, durable materials. We regret that a car park will be retained (albeit a smaller one) but we are pleased that so much effort and attention is being spent on this much loved but currently incoherently structured park.

**Evolution Quarter Residents Association (EQRA), 11 Calypso Crescent** – Represent residents of about 300 properties around Chandler Way. Wholly support the principle of improving and transforming Burgess Park so that its full potential can be reached. EQRA considers these proposals address the fundamental design issues in order to achieve a more cohesive and uniform park, which will allow it to function, look and feel like an urban park which residents and park users will understand and use. Disappointed at the lack of a new entrance for Chandler Way and lack of dog free areas but overall support the scheme and ask that permission is granted.

**69 Coleman Road** – Supports proposal overall, but raises comments about some of the pathways (whether they are coherent, too narrow in key locations, or need additional features of explanation); the mounds appear high and will obscure views and raise concerns about safety; the level of consultation on the old playground area is less than on other areas and more needs to be done.

**(No number given) Addington Sq.** - Concerned about reduction in car parking near café and play area. If anything it should be expanded. Needed by mothers with toddlers and elderly who may not qualify for Blue Badges. Commuters can be discouraged by a 3hr parking limit. Reducing car parking will reduce viability of café and also accessibility and enjoyment of a beautiful park.

**14 Addington Sq.** - Council staff should not alter the plan for which they have employed landscape designers. Why employ designers then alter their designs? The altered car park is unnecessarily long and create a dead area of a long grassy strip alongside Albany Road. There seems to be no plan to stop commuters from using the car park, as now. Parking spaces should be indented along the south side of Albany Road, outside the park. See no reason for a car park at all.

**34 Galleria Court, Sumner Rd.** Support the position of the ‘Friends of Burgess Park’ (FOBP) which is:
1. Concern that there is no specified ‘family friendly’ areas, that are secure and dog free, for picnicking and play. This could be part of an extended playground area.
2. Informal sports on open areas dominated by one group, shouldn’t they contribute to costs of repair and maintenance. Use of the space should be rotated.
3. Need to strike a balance between accessibility and safety with habitat provision, e.g. like at Russia Dock Woodland. The Friends would like to see wildlife groups brought in to advise, such as LWT, TrUE, BTCV and others.
4. Is it possible to secure some funding for lake from elsewhere?
5. Would like evidence that safety will be designed in, not a reliance on CCTV.
6. Maintenance should be closely allied with design. Need maintenance strategy;
7. Is there a need to level the entrance at Old Kent Road, why not keep buffering slopes? Scale of intervention needs to be balanced realistically with costs.
8. Cycle routes need to be tied in around whole park. There needs to be a strategy.
Will cyclists be encouraged to use new north-south routes?

9. Existing and proposed events need to make money for the park.

10. Sustainability needs to be developed as a theme, e.g. for lighting, recycling, power generation, composting, boreholes, etc.

11. Who is providing expert advice on detailed design elements like play?

12. Would like to have the following represented on the steering group: play, safety, food and growing, biodiversity and planting, furniture and surfaces, including lighting.

Agree with the following:

13. Converting redundant roads to parkland;

14. Improving entrances at Camberwell Road and Old Kent Road;

15. Improving accessibility and footpaths, including new main footpath from Old Kent Road to Chumleigh Gardens;

16. Repairing and re-shaping the lake;

17. Planting new gardens at St. George’s Way;

18. Enhancing biodiversity through an overall increase of at least 200 trees and creating more areas for wildlife;

19. Creating a new 5km fitness circuit for runners, cyclists and walkers. Also outdoor Gyms and satellite play areas;

20. Recycling existing site materials within the park;

21. Food growing area near the Surrey Canal Walk;

22. National standard BMX track;

23. Readjusting the scale of the landscaping in order to preserve wildlife;

24. Leave the underpass as it is until a safe alternative can be put in place;

25. Keep the sports hub near Neate Street in its current state;

26. Preserve and improve the space behind Chumleigh Gardens;

27. Preserve the trees along Wells Way, Canal Walk, Cobourg Road and clumps along St. George’s Way;

28. Keep the hillocky landscape between Old Kent Road and the lake;

51 Augustus Court, 94 Old Kent Road – Object to the halving of the cycle and kart track. There is no alternative provision and the promise of a new BMX track, as a separate application, has not happened and it will not cater for everyone using the cycle centre now.

128 Chartridge, Westmoreland Road – Concerned about proposed changes to the cycle track and cycle workshop. Would object to their removal. They provide other activities such as gardening, taking care of chickens and bee keeping. There are other issues that need dealing with, such as anti-social behaviour of some users of the park.

57 Lorrimer Road – Object to loss of the Freedom Bike Project and associated activities. Critical of lack of consultation about future of cycle track and the Freedom Bike Project.

71b Balfour Street – Object to loss of the Freedom Bike Project and associated activities. Critical of lack of consultation about future of cycle track and the Freedom Bike Project.

F3, 18 Gondar Gardens, NW6 – Work at Chumleigh Gardens and object to removal of the cycle track and the gardening and food side of the project. Must not close down
any facility where the funding for an alternative facility is now uncertain.

23 St. Georges Church, Wells Way – object to loss of 167 trees. Saplings are no replacement for mature trees. Support new mounds (sound barriers) on Albany Road and extension to lake, can these go ahead and save trees for further discussion.

4A Albany Mews – Asked about details that she could not find (but are in application and on web site). Main concerns are on accessibility, biodiversity (including protection of wildlife during works) and reduction in car parking spaces, especially as there is little or no public transport as an alternative.

74 Camberwell Road – concerned that proposals are unclear and poorly understood. The Freedom cycle track has not been included, will it be relocated or scrapped? Elitist BMX track not wanted by residents. Oppose loss of copse along Albany Road planted 10 years ago. Why has the Camberwell Beauty logo for Burgess Park has been scrapped? Proposals will close ¾ of Burgess Park for a year. Objected to purple signs being erected for 3 years blocking view of park.

Burgess Park Action Group and resident of 2 Coleman Road – Oppose the felling of over 220 trees especially the two woodlands, west of the lake and the mature trees west of the Library and near the cycle track. Object to loss of 30yr old nesting woodland by the lake by putting an enormous 5m wide road through it. The revamp of the Old Kent Rd entrance is a waste of money and removes 8 trees just for a straight path instead of a gently winding one. Support the lowering of the southern bund but oppose all but a gentle lowering of eastern and western bunds. Extraordinary that money is wasted on the Old Kent Road entrance but the need for improvement to Southampton Way entrance is ignored. The ‘red line’ needs to expand to include all the MOL, including the car scrap yards and New Church Road should be closed and included in the park. Support provision of gyms but not next to roads. The park has very little greenery in winter and replanting should include at least 10% native evergreens. To describe the park as having inherent low carbon credentials is inaccurate. Lighting around the lake has been left on all night for over 20 years and lights on defunct playground left on for 10 years. There should be a condition requiring all lights in the park should be on timers, movement sensors or push-button controls. Support the use of a borehole to supply water to the park but it should be powered by renewable energy in order to avoid adding to the park’s carbon emissions. Support the repair and relining of the lake but not the spending of large amounts of money and carbon resources on its expansion. Oppose bin design proposed as they are similar to those previously vandalised. Suggest use of wire bins and large felled trees (with a quarter cut out of them and varnished) as sturdy seating. Support improved Camberwell Road entrance but should be more ‘V’ shaped and allow for access from pedestrian crossing at end of Albany Road.

152 Waller Road, SE14. – Support and share views of the Burgess Park Action Group as set out above

35 Camberwell Grove – Support comments made by resident of 2 Coleman Rd as set out above.

44 Camberwell Grove – Supports comments made by BPAG/2 Coleman Road, especially in relation to straightening and flattening for ‘straight sight lines’ is unpleasant and mature trees should be conserved.
No name or address / e-mail. - Need to retain the three silt traps for the lake to avoid silting in future. Land bridge will use pipes which will need changing, better to have an island with two bridges linking it. Suggest that borehole should be sited in wet land to have fresh water running through wet lakes to avoid stagnation and Mosquitoes breeding. Small island and fisherman’s platforms need to be moved.