

Item No.	Classification:	Date:	Meeting Name:
7.1	OPEN	12 February 2013	Planning Sub-Committee B
Report title:	Development Management planning application: Application 12/AP/2841 for: Full Planning Permission Address: VISION HOUSE, 182 LANDELLS ROAD, LONDON, SE22 9PP Proposal: Demolition of existing commercial buildings and redevelopment of the site to provide 4 x 4 bedroom houses over three floors including 6 off street parking spaces together with refuse storage area and associated landscaping		
Ward(s) or groups affected:	East Dulwich		
From:	Head of Development Management		
Application Start Date 04/09/2012		Application Expiry Date 30/10/2012	

RECOMMENDATION

- 1 Grant Planning Permission

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2 This item has been requested by members to be considered at a sub-committee meeting.

Site location and description

- 3 The site is a triangular plot of land bounded by a narrow access road serving properties along Underhill Road to the north. The rear gardens of properties on Barry Road bound the site to the east and the rear gardens of properties along Silvester Road to the south. The site rises gradually towards the west, the existing two storey building is located within the north eastern corner of the site, an electrical sub station is located next to the building. Vehicular and pedestrian access to the site is from Landells Road, this access is initially shared with the rear access serving Underhill Road before becoming divided by a solid brick wall.
- 4 The existing building was used for offices, but has been vacant since 2010. The site is located within the following designations within the Core Strategy and Saved Southwark Plan
 - Urban Zone
 - Air Quality Management Area

Details of proposal

- 5 Planning permission is sought for the construction of a group of four x 4 bedroom houses. The houses would be sited within the easterly section of the site and set out

over three floors, with access gained from a lower ground floor and accommodation within the roof. The houses would be laid out in a group of 3 all of similar proportions with the fourth house set back from the front and rear building lines, being wider and set within a larger building plot. All of the houses would have rear gardens and access to 6 parking spaces, with storage for two bicycles provided for each dwelling to the front of the house.

- 6 The houses would be constructed in yellow London stock brick, with timber windows and a zinc roof.
- 7 Some small amendments were made during the course of the scheme, these include;
 - Reducing the height of the building by 550mm.
 - Rear boundary wall with Barry Road reduced from 6.5 metres to 3 metres.
 - A platform lift is included to provide full access to the house entrances.

Planning history

- 8 11/AP/2161 Planning permission granted 10/10/2011 for the demolition of existing commercial buildings and redevelopment of the site to provide three x 4 bedroom houses over three floors including 6 off street parking spaces and amenity space.

Planning history of adjoining sites

- 9 None relevant.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Summary of main issues

- 10 The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:
 - a) the principle of a residential use on the site
 - b) the design and the quality of the residential accommodation proposed
 - c) the amenity impacts of the development on the adjoining residential units.
 - d) impacts upon trees
 - e) transport impacts

Planning policy

Core Strategy 2011

- 11 Strategic policy 1 - Sustainable development
Strategic policy 2 - Sustainable transport
Strategic policy 5 - Providing new homes
Strategic policy 10 - Jobs and businesses
Strategic policy 11 - Open spaces and wildlife
Strategic policy 12 - Design and conservation
Strategic policy 13 - High environmental Standards

Southwark Plan 2007 (July) - saved policies

- 12 1.4 - Employment sites outside the preferred office locations and preferred industrial locations
Policy 3.2 – Protection of amenity
Policy 3.4 – Energy efficiency
Policy 3.6 – Air quality
Policy 3.7 – Waste management
Policy 3.9 – Water
Policy 3.11 – Efficient use of land
Policy 3.12 – Quality in design
Policy 3.13 – Urban design
Policy 3.14 – Designing out crime
Policy 3.28 - Biodiversity
Policy 4.2 – Quality of residential accommodation
Policy 5.3 – Walking and cycling
Policy 5.6 – Car parking

Residential Design Standards SPD (October 2011)
Dulwich Supplementary Planning Document (draft)

London Plan 2011

- 13 Policy 3.3 - Increasing housing supply
Policy 3.5 - Quality and design of housing developments
Policy 4.2 - Offices
Policy 5.1 - Climate change mitigation
Policy 5.2 - Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
Policy 5.3 - Sustainable design and construction
Policy 6.9 - Cycling
Policy 6.13 - Parking
Policy 7.4 - Local character
Policy 7.6 - Architecture

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

- 14 Section 1 - Building a strong, competitive economy
Section 4 - Promoting sustainable transport
Section 6 - Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes
Section 7 - Requiring good design
Section 11 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Principle of development

- 15 Saved policy 1.4 of the Southwark Plan states that:

Outside the Preferred Office Locations, and Preferred Industrial Locations, on sites which have an established B Class use and which meet any of the following criteria:

- i) The site fronts onto or has direct access to a classified road; or
- ii) The site is within a Public Transport Accessibility Zone; or
- iii) The site is within the Central Activities Zone; or
- iv) The site is within the Strategic Cultural Area.

- 16 On employment sites outside the POLs and PILs and where criteria i-iv above do not apply, a change of use from an employment use to suitable mixed or residential uses will be permitted. The site is not protected for employment purposes, as none of the above criteria applies, as such the redevelopment to a residential use is considered acceptable.

- 17 The draft Dulwich SPD paragraph 3.8 states that back land development is not suitable in Dulwich. In this circumstance the land is already developed and policies of the Core Strategy and Saved Southwark Plan support a residential use for the site. Given the weight attached to national, regional and adopted local policy, the guidance set out in the Dulwich SPD should in this circumstance be given limited weight.
- 18 Furthermore, the site benefits from an extant permission allowing the development of the site for residential purposes.

Environmental impact assessment

- 19 The site does not require any formal assessment as it falls outside of the EIA criteria.

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

- 20 311 -335 (odd) Underhill Road

This comprises a mix of ground floor commercial properties with residential on the upper floors and solely residential dwellings. To the rear of this section of Underhill Road there is a service access road which leads to the rear of nos.311- 335 (odd). There would be a distance of between 4 – 5 metres from the closest dwelling and the rear boundaries of the properties on Underhill Road, which is a slight improvement on the existing relationship, however the overall footprint of the building is greatly reduced to this elevation with an 8 metre deep blank wall around 6 metres high excluding the set back roof element. There will be a reduction in built form along this elevation, compared with the existing building and thus a more open aspect to the properties along Underhill Road. In terms of privacy, no windows are provided to the side elevation but the provision of a small balcony may give rise to some sense of visual intrusion. It is therefore suggested that a condition requiring some form of screening be provided to the balcony of the corner unit.

- 21 130 - 142 (even) Barry Road

Presently the existing building sits very close to the boundary with the rear gardens of nos. 130- 142 (even) Barry Road, whilst there is a screen of trees to the boundary with nos. 140-142. Currently there is a 6.5 metre wall on the boundary, it is proposed to reduce this to 3 metres. The proposal will see the removal of the building, with the new dwellings set further away to provide gardens. The existing trees would also be removed as part of the development. As the houses are set on a lower level than properties on Barry Road only part of the first floor and the set back roof level would be readily visible. The removal of the trees would represent a loss of visual amenity to residents, however this was considered as part of the previous application and judged to be acceptable providing a suitable landscaping condition was imposed. The proposal would as with the earlier scheme increase the amount of built form, however the development would provide sufficient space between the buildings such that there would not be any loss of privacy or outlook, maintaining a window to window distance of between 22 and 26 metres which would comply with SPD residential guidelines of a minimum of 21 metres. It is not considered that the proposal would be detrimental to the residential amenity of these properties, and the opening up of the space and creation of gardens would improve their general outlook.

- 22 68 – 80 (even) Silvester Road

The proposal would result in a building of 12.5 metres depth, rising from 6 to 8.2 metres in height, 1.5 and 1.8 metres off the rear garden boundary of Silvester Rd.

The houses would be constructed below the existing ground level of the site, (1.8m) consequently the amount of building visible over the rear fences would be 3.5 metres. which includes the 2 metre height of the roof which is set 1 metre in from the edge of the wall with a steep pitch. The main dwellings affected are nos. 72 and 74 as the properties either side at 70 and 76 would have an outlook beyond the side of the new houses. The gardens have a north easterly orientation so there would be no significant loss of sunlight. The remaining issue is therefore outlook. It is acknowledged that the proposal would impact on the outlook of some of these properties along Silvester Road, however it is not considered that the reduction in the levels of outlook are sufficient to warrant refusal of the application, given the amount of building visible and the separation of approximately 8 metres from the back addition and 14 metres from the main dwelling of 72 and 74 Silvester Road.

23 The houses beyond this point (78 - 80) would have views from the upper floors into the gardens of the proposed dwellings, the group of conifers would have shielded these buildings from the existing building, but in any event the landscaping and treatment of these rear garden areas would preserve the residential amenity of these dwellings.

24 180 Landells Road

This property shares its side garden boundary with the site, formerly this area was used as an informal car park, associated with the business. This application would not change the situation as the parking area for the dwellings would be located in this area, together with the refuse store. Details of the boundary treatment should form part of any condition of planning permission. The separation distance of 26 metres from the dwelling at Landells Road and the proposed new dwellings would not give rise to any amenity issues.

25 Future occupiers

Saved policy 4.2 of the Southwark Plan requires residential developments to provide a good standard of accommodation for future occupiers. With regard to room and overall dwelling sizes and amenity space standards, these are set out in the adopted Residential Design Standards SPD (2011).

26 The overall sizes of the dwellings would comfortably exceed the Councils standards, with total floor areas of 143sq m (Unit 1), 154sq m (unit 2), 154sq m (Unit 3) and 154sq m (Unit 4). The overall range for a 4 bedroom house is between 104 sq metres and 110sq metres.

27 The proposal would result in a density of 234 habitable rooms per hectare which would comply with strategic policy 5 of the Core Strategy which permits a density of between 200-350 habitable rooms per hectare in the suburban density zone.

28 With regard to amenity space, the Residential Design Standards SPD advises that new dwellings should have private garden spaces of at least 50 sq metres, each of the dwellings will meet this although unit 3 would have a maximum depth of 8 metres and unit 4 a maximum depth of 5 metres, notwithstanding the shorter garden depths it is not considered that this would compromise the useability of the space.

Impact of adjoining and nearby uses on occupiers and users of proposed development

29 The proposal would introduce a residential use in place of a commercial premises, given the area is largely residential there would be no conflict of uses as a result.

Traffic issues

- 30 Saved policy 5.2 of the Southwark Plan seeks to ensure that developments do not result in adverse highway conditions. The site has a PTAL of 2 (low) and is not located in a controlled parking zone.
- 31 It is proposed to provide 6 parking spaces within the site using the existing crossover, and there would be sufficient space to enable vehicles to turn, enter and exit the site in a forward gear. Saved policy 5.6 of the Southwark Plan establishes maximum parking standards, and in this location a maximum of 1.5-2 spaces per dwelling would be permitted. The proposal would comply with this policy and it is not considered that the provision of 6 parking spaces to serve 4 houses would result in significant levels of overspill parking, that can not be accommodated on street. Details of the access gate referred to in the design and access statement should be subject to a condition of any permission.
- 32 Saved policy 5.3 of the Southwark Plan requires developments to adequately cater for the needs of pedestrians and cyclists, and requires 1.1 cycle parking spaces per dwelling. Cycle storage for two bicycles is shown in the front garden areas to each dwelling, the proposed arrangements are considered satisfactory subject to the details of the storage design and as such no objections are raised.

Design issues

- 33 Unlike the earlier approved scheme, the current scheme proposes a more conventional design with a pitched roof set with dormer windows to the front and rear, with large expanses of glazing to the front and rear elevations of the lower and upper ground floors. The buildings are shown as constructed in yellow London stock brick, with timber windows and a zinc roof. The flat areas of the roof will be planted to form a green roof with space for roof top solar panels and photovoltaic panels. The character of the site appears to be robust enough to accommodate this backland development. The brick finish is the most suited of the external materials for the area.
- 34 Residents have raised objections to the design, however the height massing and footprint of the current scheme is similar to that approved. Whilst the proposal has simplified the design, it is not considered that the development would be harmful to the visual amenity of residents. Overall on balance, it is considered that the design of the proposal would be acceptable and that it would preserve the visual amenities of the area.

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

- 35 The proposal is not within a conservation area and would not affect any listed building.

Impact on trees

- 36 The proposal would result in the loss of some trees located on the rear boundary with the Silvester and Barry Roads. The Tree Officer has inspected the trees and whilst they do have an amenity value in terms of screening, they do not meet the criteria for formal protection by way of a preservation order. Conditions are suggested to protect trees in neighbouring gardens and to provide a detailed landscaping plan and details for the maintenance of the proposed green roof.
- 37 It is noted that one of the objectors has raised the issue of bats, however there is no evidence given. Furthermore, with the existing extant permission in place and no

planning requirements in respect of the demolition of the existing building or for felling the existing trees there are no measures under planning legislation to address this issue. The applicant is still however bound by other legislation aimed at protecting endangered species.

Planning obligations (S.106 undertaking or agreement)

- 38 The number of units proposed is below the threshold for contributions to be sought.

Sustainable development implications

- 39 The proposed development would employ the following micro generation technologies as part of the integral design;
- Green roof construction for all 4 units
 - Roof top solar panels for both water heating and electricity
 - Permeable road surfaces
 - Rainwater harvesting
 - Passive solar gain to main living spaces
 - Natural ventilation
- 40 It is considered that these measures would contribute to the sustainability of the dwellings which are anticipated to meet Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 in line with the objectives of the Core Strategy. A condition to ensure that they meet this level is suggested.

Other matters

- 41 Datum levels
Some concern has been raised around the levels indicated on the submitted plans and an objector remains dissatisfied as to their accuracy. The applicant has rechecked the spot levels within the site and confirmed the plans are correct. It is therefore suggested that a condition be imposed to ensure that the impacts from the development remain as shown on the approved plans.
- 42 Refuse
The refuse and recycling areas are clearly set out within the development with a storage area by the sub station and a collection point by the access gate to meet the requirements of the Council's refuse collector. A condition is suggested to provide details of the proposed enclosures and arrangements in place for movement from storage areas to collection points and back.
- 43 CIL
S143 of the Localism Act 2011 states that any financial sum that an authority has received, will, or could receive in the payment of CIL as a material "local financial consideration" in planning decisions. The requirement for Mayoral CIL is a material consideration. However, the weight to be attached to a local finance consideration remains a matter for the decision-maker. Mayoral CIL is to be used for strategic transport improvements in London, primarily Crossrail. The total payment required for the scheme is £21,210 (606 sq m x £35). No deduction is made as a consequence of the demolition of the commercial building as this has been vacant for a period exceeding 6 months.

Conclusion on planning issues

- 44 Planning permission is sought for the redevelopment of the above site to provide a group of four x four bedroom houses. The principle of the redevelopment of the site is established by virtue of an earlier permission granted in 2011 which granted

permission for 3 dwellings. A number of objections have been received to this revised scheme, with many residents concerned about the design of the new dwellings and whilst there may be a preference for a particular design this in itself is not seen as a reason to withhold planning permission. The proposal would provide 4 large family homes with gardens and parking spaces, the dwellings would be highly sustainable, meeting sustainable homes code level 4.

- 45 It is acknowledged that there will be an impact to some of the neighbouring properties, but these will be limited and for a number of dwellings there will be an overall improvement on the existing situation. Taking account of the impacts, the mitigation measures that can be imposed via condition and the benefit of reusing the site for residential purposes it is recommended that planning permission is granted.

Community impact statement

- 46 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 above.

c) The likely adverse or less good implications for any particular communities/groups have been also been discussed above.

Consultations

- 47 Details of consultation and any re-consultation undertaken in respect of this application are set out in Appendix 1.

Consultation replies

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

Summary of consultation responses

- 49 Thirteen letters have been received to the original submission raising the following concerns:

Insufficient car parking provided

Overlooking from dormer windows

Loss of amenity from car fumes associated with the development

Bland design, curved roof of previous scheme was better

Concern over construction impacts

Light pollution

Loss of trees and wildlife

Security of rear gardens

Overshadowing of rear gardens on Silvester Road with oppressive brickwork to side wall

Datum levels on the site not clear

Human rights implications

- 50 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.
- 51 This application has the legitimate aim of providing new residential housing. 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.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Site history file: TP/2597-180A Application file: 12/AP/2841 Southwark Local Development Framework and Development Plan Documents	Chief Executive's Department 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH	Planning enquiries telephone: 020 7525 5403 Planning enquiries email: planning.enquiries@southwark.gov.uk Case officer telephone: 020 7525 5434 Council website: www.southwark.gov.uk

APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	Consultation undertaken
Appendix 2	Consultation responses received
Appendix 3	Recommendation

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Gary Rice, Head of Development Management	
Report Author	Sonia Watson, Team Leader	
Version	Final	
Dated	23 January 2013	
Key Decision	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Strategic Director of Finance & Corporate Services	No	No
Strategic Director, Environment and Leisure	No	No
Strategic Director, Housing and Community Services	No	No
Director of Regeneration	No	No
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team	31 January 2013	

APPENDIX 1

Consultation undertaken

Site notice date: 11/09/2012

Press notice date: None

Case officer site visit date:

Neighbour consultation letters sent: 11/09/2012

Internal services consulted:

Design
Transport
Urban Forester

Statutory and non-statutory organisations consulted:

None

Neighbours and local groups consulted:

68 SILVESTER ROAD LONDON SE22 9PF
331 UNDERHILL ROAD LONDON SE22 9EA
327 UNDERHILL ROAD LONDON SE22 9EA
329 UNDERHILL ROAD LONDON SE22 9EA
70 SILVESTER ROAD LONDON SE22 9PF
78 SILVESTER ROAD LONDON SE22 9PF
80 SILVESTER ROAD LONDON SE22 9PF
76 SILVESTER ROAD LONDON SE22 9PF
72 SILVESTER ROAD LONDON SE22 9PF
307 UNDERHILL ROAD LONDON SE22 9EA
309 UNDERHILL ROAD LONDON SE22 9EA
305 UNDERHILL ROAD LONDON SE22 9EA
FLAT D 150 BARRY ROAD LONDON SE22 0HW
303 UNDERHILL ROAD LONDON SE22 9EA
311 UNDERHILL ROAD LONDON SE22 9EA
323 UNDERHILL ROAD LONDON SE22 9EA
325 UNDERHILL ROAD LONDON SE22 9EA
315 UNDERHILL ROAD LONDON SE22 9EA
317 UNDERHILL ROAD LONDON SE22 9EA
82 SILVESTER ROAD LONDON SE22 9PF
FLAT 2 148 BARRY ROAD LONDON SE22 0HW
FLAT 3 148 BARRY ROAD LONDON SE22 0HW
311A UNDERHILL ROAD LONDON SE22 9EA
FLAT A 74 SILVESTER ROAD LONDON SE22 9PF
FLAT B 74 SILVESTER ROAD LONDON SE22 9PF
FLAT 4 148 BARRY ROAD LONDON SE22 0HW
REAR OF 66 SILVESTER ROAD LONDON SE22 9PE
FIRST FLOOR FLAT 132 BARRY ROAD LONDON SE22 0HW
GROUND FLOOR FLAT 132 BARRY ROAD LONDON SE22 0HW
180 LANDELLS ROAD LONDON SE22 9PP
178 LANDELLS ROAD LONDON SE22 9PP
176 LANDELLS ROAD LONDON SE22 9PP
172 LANDELLS ROAD LONDON SE22 9PP
174 LANDELLS ROAD LONDON SE22 9PP
321 UNDERHILL ROAD LONDON SE22 9EA
FLAT A 66 SILVESTER ROAD LONDON SE22 9PE
FLAT B 66 SILVESTER ROAD LONDON SE22 9PE
313A UNDERHILL ROAD LONDON SE22 9EA
313 UNDERHILL ROAD LONDON SE22 9EA
335 UNDERHILL ROAD LONDON SE22 9EA
FLAT C 150 BARRY ROAD LONDON SE22 0HW
FLAT 1 148 BARRY ROAD LONDON SE22 0HW
GROUND FLOOR FLAT 321 UNDERHILL ROAD LONDON SE22 9EA

335A UNDERHILL ROAD LONDON SE22 9EA
319B UNDERHILL ROAD LONDON SE22 9EA
FIRST FLOOR FLAT 321 UNDERHILL ROAD LONDON SE22 9EA
333A UNDERHILL ROAD LONDON SE22 9EA
333B UNDERHILL ROAD LONDON SE22 9EA
319A UNDERHILL ROAD LONDON SE22 9EA
GROUND FLOOR 325 UNDERHILL ROAD LONDON SE22 9EA
325A UNDERHILL ROAD LONDON SE22 9EA
FIRST FLOOR AND SECOND FLOOR FLAT 283 UNDERHILL ROAD LONDON SE22 0AN
331A UNDERHILL ROAD LONDON SE22 9EA
128A BARRY ROAD LONDON SE22 0HW
FLAT A 136 BARRY ROAD LONDON SE22 0HW
FLAT B 136 BARRY ROAD LONDON SE22 0HW
FLAT B 130 BARRY ROAD LONDON SE22 0HW
FLAT C 142 BARRY ROAD LONDON SE22 0HW
FLAT A 130 BARRY ROAD LONDON SE22 0HW
FLAT C 136 BARRY ROAD LONDON SE22 0HW
FLAT A 150 BARRY ROAD LONDON SE22 0HW
FLAT B 150 BARRY ROAD LONDON SE22 0HW
FLAT C 138 BARRY ROAD LONDON SE22 0HW
FLAT A 138 BARRY ROAD LONDON SE22 0HW
FLAT B 138 BARRY ROAD LONDON SE22 0HW
FLAT 2 128 BARRY ROAD LONDON SE22 0HW
FLAT 3 128 BARRY ROAD LONDON SE22 0HW
FLAT 1 128 BARRY ROAD LONDON SE22 0HW
134A BARRY ROAD LONDON SE22 0HW
134B BARRY ROAD LONDON SE22 0HW
FLAT 4 128 BARRY ROAD LONDON SE22 0HW
FLAT A 142 BARRY ROAD LONDON SE22 0HW
FLAT B 142 BARRY ROAD LONDON SE22 0HW
FLAT B 140 BARRY ROAD LONDON SE22 0HW
FLAT 5 128 BARRY ROAD LONDON SE22 0HW
FLAT A 140 BARRY ROAD LONDON SE22 0HW

Re-consultation:

30/10/2012

Consultation responses received

Internal services

Design - No objection to the design overall, use of brick welcomed as is the proposed sustainable design of the buildings.

Transport - The applicant is proposing a total of six spaces for the four units which equates to 1.5 spaces per unit. In this location we would consider this to be an acceptable level of on-site parking. Cycle storage details required as well as details of the refuse storage areas.

Urban Forester - Conditions required to deal with landscaping plans, maintenance of green roof areas and tree protection for trees on adjoining land.

Statutory and non-statutory organisations

None

Neighbours and local groups

Rear of 66 Silvester Road

While I think bringing this building back into use is a good idea I do not think that there are enough off street parking spaces in the proposal as it stands.

To allocate parking for six cars in a development of four, four bedroom houses is unrealistic. I'm certain that any family who can afford a newly built four bedroom house in this area will have more than one car per household. This means that the off street parking should be at least eight places (this doesn't take into account any driving visitors).

I live opposite the proposed site, all the streets around it are narrow and already full with parked cars. As well as making it difficult to park, it is also sometimes tricky to negotiate the narrow roads: twice this year I've had my wing mirror knocked off. I think any new development should consider carefully the existing parking situation and allocate a realistic number of spaces in an attempt to avoid more cars on already cramped roads.

68 Silvester Road

1. The noise construction will cause as we have young children under 4 and an elderly mother who is directly facing the back.
2. We have a garden that does not get much light as it points away from the rising sun so a 3 storey block will make the situation worse
3. A refuge place around here will make the vermin problems worse as we are facing the back of a fish and chips shop and news agent. The vermin and fox problems we are facing on a daily basis will become worse.
4. Not to mention we have a small garden and we like to use it, car activity from the developments will cause unnecessary noise and pollution.
5. Also we have a dire problem with parking in this area, more cars in the area for the residents together with their visitors will make things worse.
6. the problem with cement trucks and waste from construction can be a problem.
7. The new proposal will be overpowering and my house will be overlooked by all the front windows and balconies there will be noise from the cars parking the other side of my wall.
8. The new dormer windows, which sit right under the roof line are very worrying as they

will be in direct view of our windows. This will affect the outlook from our house.

9. The green sloping roof has been removed from the scheme and it looks very stark now with the expanse of brickwork and zinc roof.

10. The new proposal for four houses looks bland and too square looking it has no character so is not a positive contribution to the surrounding area.

82 Silvester Road

I strongly object to the planning permission on the grounds that there will be noise and light pollution from the proposed dwellings and gardens. I am also extremely disappointed with the decision to allow the trees to be cut down at the rear of my garden.

I do not like the new design of the houses preferring the original plans where the curved roof was more pleasing to the eye and a more sympathetic design. Furthermore I think the original number of dwellings was substantial. The new design looks to incorporate a further, additional house.

76 Silvester Road

I have looked over at the proposed scheme for the building of the 4 new houses, this scheme will affect the privacy as there are more windows and some larger than the original plan with plain glass and not obscure glass in the lower panels.

The design seems unsuitable for the area as its massing does not form a positive contribution to the surrounding area.

There is also less planting which will effect the wildlife that at present nest in the trees.

In the original plans the curved Green sedum design blended in more with the area.

70 Silvester Road

- The original proposal would have been an imposition, however the new proposal is even less sympathetic to the surrounding area and not in keeping with the housing already situated.
- The visual impact of the new proposal is considerable given that the more eco friendly grass roof has been substituted by a new roofing material and a significant number of windows.
- In my opinion the proposed new development will overshadow my back garden, back living room, kitchen and bedrooms for most of the day. It will overlook the rooms to the back of my house causing an unacceptable loss of privacy.
- The location of the car park to my property will cause unacceptable additional disturbance. I have had investigations to my property regarding seasonal movements of the ground- which is common to this area and thus I am extremely concerned that the building works, and removal of trees etc may affect the soil and hence the foundations of my home.
- Will the wall of my garden which backs on to proposed building be disturbed, if so and how? as this will have implications for the security of my home, the planting currently in the garden and our use of the garden

74A Silvester Road

I would like to strongly object to the new proposal.

I spend a lot of my time in my back garden and get a lot of enjoyment there.

The new proposal will overshadow my garden and will affect the pleasure and relaxation i get from being out in my garden. The new proposal is not sympathetic with the landscape, it looks like a prison block.

There will be more brickwork showing above my fence line than the previous design which will not be nice to look at and will be very oppressive.

The previous sloped green roof design was more pleasing to look at than this new proposal.

74B Silvester Road

There is also issues of how the building is overlooking directly into our flat, the loss of privacy and most importantly for us whom we are already living in a small confined space (we are a family of four with two teenage children) we think it will be important to consider the impact that four, 4 bedroom houses will have in our lives, the noise pollution the car pollution and so fourth.

78 Silvester Road

The new proposed scheme has a greater area to the Barry Road elevation which creates an intrusive impact to the neighbouring properties. My family's enjoyment of our small garden will be spoiled by the overlooking windows and the noise from the proposed scheme. It is not clear if the new back windows will have an obscured bottom window pane as the current approved scheme. Also, the current approved application has the lower windows in obscured glass. This new application has larger windows and no obscured glass so meaning we shall be overlooked even more. The new design looks very cramped and it seems to be too much of an attempt to try and squeeze four houses into this small area of space. I believe there to be an over development of this site and not much thought and consideration for all the residents who have lived here who have enjoyed their space and view.

178 Landells Road

The newest proposal is a completely different matter. It is totally bland and uninspired.

It has no relevance or reference whatsoever to Vision House OR the present design that has been granted planning permission.

It is not in keeping with the area which I know and love, having lived locally for the last 28 years. I plan on living here for many years to come and would be greatly saddened having to look at such an out of place building from my kitchen, bedroom, bathroom and garden; reminded for evermore, of the day that lazy, cost cutting blandness, with its swathes of blank brickwork, won the day over sympathetic, yet contemporary design. This area deserves more!

I cannot object strongly enough to the new proposal.

In addition, how many cars will the extra four bedrooms generate? That would be 16 bedrooms in total. The present proposal of six off street parking spaces is not enough as it is.

172 Landells Road

The current design is bland and not in keeping with the area

Barry Road

From my perspective the wall is a nice feature of these properties as a) it ensures that the gardens are not overlooked from the rear and b) the wall has well developed climbing plants (ivy etc). While I do not object to the development in principle my suggestion would be to keep a decent amount of the wall and if possible, take care to retain some of the climbing plants that cover the wall.

317 Underhill Road

The style of the building does not fit the style of the original building 'Vision House' previous scheme was nice contemporary design. The latest proposal is bland and unsightly. I also have concerns around the parking for the scheme.

80 Silvester Road

The original plans levelled the site thus removing the trees, but had no impact on our boundary. The revised scheme maintains the levels and erects a 2 m high fence on the boundary, which will restrict light and impact to our garden

The removal of trees and the impact due to overlooking to nos 72- 82 Silvester Road has not been assessed.

The outline of the building is higher and the mansard windows will overlook our garden reducing our privacy.

It is understood that the developers originally sought 11 units on this site, the continued neglect of the site gives no confidence that this scheme will not be replaced by another larger scheme.

RECONSULTATION RESPONSES

R/O 66 Silvester Road

The proposal has not responded to earlier concern, previous reasons for objection still stand.

72 Silvester Road

In response to the newly submitted drawings from the applicant, although the applicant has dropped the building height down 550mm, my original objection (below) still stands as i do not feel this has done anything to reduce the impact this ugly stark domineering building will have on my family's amenity it will feel like there is a prison wall at the end of our small garden and would like to voice my objection to this yet again.

I also do believe that during the morning it will cause shadowing to my already small garden (6.7m x 5.5m) our house is some 7.5m in height our garden is north facing and we lose sunlight to it after 12.00Hrs the new proposed will be around 6.5 -7m in height? So any loss of light in the morning will reduce our sunlight to just a few hours a day.

I would also like to reiterate that although the applicant claims that they have moved the new proposal further away from the boundary this is not the case from my calculations they have in fact moved the new building some 483mm closer to the boundary, looking at 11/AP2161 drawing No. 168-11-05-A shows the dimension as 1.695m from my boundary, they have deliberately tried to obscure the new measurement Ref: drawing SP-02-PL3 (1212mm) with the smallest font and they have then put a line indicator above it to obscure it, i have had to zoom in on this measurement to read it.

I would like to call the council to make some independent datum level checks to the site and surrounding houses before any works proceed, and to make this survey available to the neighbouring residents.

82 Silvester Road

My objections still stand, as the changes you have proposed have made no difference.

172 Landells Road

The changes do not alter the proposed design therefore original objections still stands.