

Item No: 6.	Classification Open	Committee: Dulwich Community Council	Date: 24 November 2011
From: Head of Development Management		Title of Report: Addendum Late observations, consultation responses, information and revisions.	

PURPOSE

- 1 To advise Members of observations, consultation responses and information/revisions received in respect of the following planning applications on the main agenda. These were received after the preparation of the report and the matters raised may not therefore have been taken in to account in reaching the recommendation stated.

RECOMMENDATION

- 2 That Members note and consider the late observations, consultation responses and information/revisions received in respect this item in reaching their decision.

FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION

- 3 Late observations, consultation responses, information and revisions have been received in respect of the following planning application on the main agenda:

ITEM 4 25- 27 Lordship Lane 11/AP/2953

A late objection has been received from a resident of Ulverscoft Road

The objector raises the following points;

As Southwark's Core Strategy states, Lordship Lane is a very attractive place to visit and shop. It also says "We will continue to protect the interesting character of this popular street."

Lordship Lane is presently relatively free of large-scale advertising, which is part of what gives it this "interesting character". Such a large and intrusive hoarding, in such a prominent location on Lordship Lane, will in my view considerably detract from that character, as well as being a distraction to drivers (particularly those coming down East Dulwich Grove, as the pub is virtually opposite its junction with Lordship Lane).

I recognise that the advertisement will no longer be illuminated (though rather puzzled that the documentation still includes a description of lighting) but am still of the opinion that an advertisement of this size is detrimental to the character of the area.

I also recognise that the proposal is for a temporary 12-month period, but am concerned that this could be the thin end of the wedge to the advertisement becoming a permanent fixture after the 12 months have elapsed. I am also concerned that it could set a precedent for similar large advertisements elsewhere on Lordship Lane, again to the considerable detriment of the area's character.

The Council's transport officers have offered the following further advice;

The proposed advertisement is not considered to have a negative impact upon the free flow of traffic, pedestrian or highway safety along Lordship Lane or East Dulwich Grove.

As part of our assessment of the proposals we have obtained collision data for Lordship Lane where it meets the junction of East Dulwich Grove. As is the standard approach we have obtained data for the last three years. These statistics detail that there were three slight collisions at this location in the last three years. Additionally, we have obtained collision data for the stretch of Lordship Lane between East Dulwich Road and East Dulwich Grove. This data demonstrates that there have been four collisions in the last four years (three slight, one serious). Two of these accidents occurred as pedestrians were crossing the zebra crossing. It should be noted though that the application site is a significant distance from the zebra crossing; far enough away not to be linked to possible future collisions at this location. While there have been some collisions within the last three years at this location it is not considered to be a significant level.

It is deemed that the proposals are in accordance with Policy 3.23 Outdoor Advertisements and Signage of the Southwark Plan. Specifically in terms of the fact that the proposed advert does not obscure any visibility splays from any nearby junctions. It is also noted that the proposed advertisement is static and therefore less likely to distract road users when compared to an intermittent light source. The proposed advert also permits free movement along Lordship Lane and does not obstruct the free movement of pedestrians.

Therefore in light of these points the advertisement is not considered to be a hazard to road users on Lordship Lane or contrary to policy on highway grounds.

The provision of a new Puffin crossing is to be provided outside of the Public House, it is not considered that the proposed hoarding would impact upon highway safety taking account of these works which will reduce traffic speed along this section of Lordship Lane.'

REASON FOR LATENESS

- 4 The comments reported above have all been received since the agenda was printed. They all relate to an item on the agenda and Members should be aware of the objections and comments made.

REASON FOR URGENCY

- 5 Applications are required by statute to be considered as speedily as possible. The application has been publicised as being on the agenda for consideration at this meeting of the Sub-Committee and applicants and objectors have been invited to attend the meeting to make their views known. Deferral would delay the processing of the applications/enforcements and would inconvenience all those who attend the meeting.

RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 6 These are contained in the report.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IMPLICATIONS

- 7 These are contained in the report.

LOCAL AGENDA 21 (Sustainable Development) IMPLICATIONS

- 8 These are contained in the report.

Lead Officer: Gary Rice, Head of Development Management

Background Papers: Individual case files.

Located at: Regeneration & Neighbourhoods Department, Council Offices,
Tooley Street, SE1.