

<b>Item No:</b> 7	<b>Classification:</b> Open	<b>Date:</b> 12 February 2013	<b>Meeting Name:</b> Planning Sub-Committee B
<b>Report title:</b>		<b>Addendum</b> Late observations, consultation responses, and further information.	
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>		East Dulwich, College, Peckham Rye, The Lane	
<b>From:</b>		Head of Development Management	

## PURPOSE

- 1 To advise Members of observations, consultation responses and further information 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 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 applications on the main agenda:

### 3.1 **Item 7.1: VISION HOUSE, 182 LANDELLS ROAD, LONDON SE22 9PP**

- 3.2 Add the following drawing to the plans listed on the draft recommendation and condition 2 (approved plans):

Drawing number GA-01, Revision: PL1 (Proposed ground floor plan)

- 3.3 Additional objection from 72 Silvester Road attached:

- 3.4 Officer response: The proposed building would be smaller than that which has already been approved on the site therefore the impact upon the neighbouring properties in terms of level of light and outlook would be improved. Two surveys have been undertaken to establish the site levels and in any event, given the separation distance of a minimum of 8m to the rear of 70 and 72 Landells Road it is not considered that if number 70 is 300mm lower than number 72 it would result in a demonstrable loss of light.

- 3.5 The design of the scheme would incorporate sustainability features including a green roof, and full details are set out at paragraphs 39 and 40 of the officer report. The proposed building with its pitched roof form and the use of brick

would be an appropriate contextual response to the largely Victorian surrounding buildings and would not result in any loss of visual amenity to the area.

- 3.6 Late objection from Councillor Barber (East Dulwich ward) attached:
- 3.7 Officer response: The site is not located within a flood risk zone and the proposed development would have no greater impact than the consented scheme. The Council's Asset Management Team has a remit to consider localised flood risk issues and to give approval for sustainable drainage schemes and the following informative is recommended:
- 3.8 *Prior to the commencement of works on site you are advised to contact Jon Kissi of the Council's Asset Management Team to ensure that appropriate drainage of the site would be undertaken (0207 525 2062).*
- 3.9 With regard to impact on light, the lower numbered properties on Silvester Road would be located further away from the proposed building than number 72 and as such would be less affected by the development. The proposed building would be smaller than that for which consent has already been granted.
- 3.10 **Item 7.2 and 7.3: DULWICH COLLEGE, DULWICH COMMON, LONDON SE21 7LG**
- 3.11 Response from the Dulwich Society
- 3.12 The Dulwich Society in principle welcomes the new scheme and acknowledges the distinctive and imaginative solution to a complex brief. The use of vertical red terracotta strips attached to the concrete elevation panels forms a welcome visual link in colour and materials with the Barry Building.
- 3.13 However, there is a strong objection to the use of grey concrete strips attached to the elevation panels which face east towards College Road and to the south on the 3-storey block. This would be seen by the public on a daily basis and would be detrimental to the setting of the Grade II\* listed Barry building which in contrast has predominantly warm colours of brickwork and terracotta. Materials should be a condition of any recommendation for approval.
- 3.13 **Item 7.6: HONOUR OAK CREMATORIUM, BROCKLEY WAY, LONDON SE4 2LJ**
- 3.15 Response from the Environmental Protection Team:
- 3.16 Confirmation received that the recommended noise condition would be acceptable for the scheme.

#### **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

## BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Individual files	Chief Executive's Department 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH	Planning enquiries telephone: 020 7525 5403

## AUDIT TRAIL

<b>Lead Officer</b>	Gary Rice, Head of Development Management	
<b>Report Author</b>	Victoria Lewis, Senior Planning Officer	
<b>Version</b>	Final	
<b>Dated</b>	12 February 2013	
<b>Key Decision</b>	No	
<b>CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER</b>		
<b>Officer Title</b>	<b>Comments Sought</b>	<b>Comments Included</b>
Strategic Director of finance and Corporate Services	No	No
Strategic Director of Environment and Leisure	No	No
Strategic Director of Housing and Community Services	No	No
Director of Regeneration	No	No
<b>Date final report sent to Constitutional Team</b>	<b>12 February 2013</b>	

Att. of Planning Committee 12<sup>th</sup> February 2013 – CASE 12/AP/2841 Vision house

I ask that the planning officer reads this letter out on my behalf as I need to attend my daughters parent's evening at her school and so I am unable to attend the committee meeting I would like to voice my objection to the application number 12/AP/2841.

I live at 72 Silvester Road directly behind the South West elevation of the proposed new development, my Garden backs onto the centre of the end elevation of the new proposed, the new proposed end elevation extends 4.5m either side of my back garden.

I speak on behalf of some of my other neighbours and generally we feel we have had the rug pulled from under our feet, the current approved scheme for the site was presented in 2011 this scheme was more sympathetic with the neighbouring properties and had many sustainable features, because of the nice sloping green roof many of my neighbours did not object as it was a nice looking scheme and was pleasing to the eye.

The new monolithic proposal will dominate the landscape, as the four new houses have been squeezed into the area with no aesthetic considerations to the neighbouring properties.

The new proposal is dominating and will affect my family's amenity of our already small garden and general outlook from our back windows. There is much more brickwork on display above the top of my fence line than of the approved design and a bland dormer zinc roof, the straight lines will form a massing/monolithic effect to the sky line and will be very oppressive to look at and to live with on a daily basis.

If this new proposed scheme was presented to begin with i.e. back in 2011 all of my neighbours would have objected to the scheme in the first instance, as it is the applicant seems to have got permission using the sustainability aspects knowing that the neighbours would not object as much to the nice scheme, but has now used this platform to creep in an additional dwelling whilst removing the nicer aspects of the original scheme- neglecting all our requests to reinstate the curved green roof to reduce the impact of outlook from our gardens and back windows.

The angles of light calculations have been worked out to the my back window heights the scheme has not taken into account that my neighbours property no 70 Silvester road is 300mm lower than my house which means that their light will be greatly affected.

The current approved design was more sympathetic to the surrounding area with the curved sustainable green roof, which made the best of the building being so close to our boundaries.

It is us that will have to live with this for the rest of our lives our OUTLOOK will be greatly impacted.

For the reasons above I call on the committee to refuse this proposal.

Regards

72 Silvester Road, SE22 9PF

Hi Sonia,

Tonight this planning application will be decided by Planning Sub-Committee B.

Sadly its timing is such that local East Dulwich councillors are unable to attend this committee. This is especially unfortunate having requested this application be decided by a planning committee if council officials were minded to approve it under delegated powers. It doesn't help that the decision isn't being made locally as they used to be made - two of us would have been able to attend if it had.

As local councillors we have a number of concerns about this planning application and the information being used to make the decision beyond those that local residents have eloquently made.

The area has suffered a number of serious flooding incidents. Basements along Barry Road, Upland Road, Crystal Palace Road have been flooded on a number of occasions. So the proposal to construct basement gardens without proper flooding assessments being produced and reported upon concerns us. The gardens will have Barry Road and Silvester Road sloping gardens excess water flow towards them. We would hope no decision would be taken until this flood risk is properly assessed. Before approving these schemes having been alerted to this flooding risk and approving them without sufficient information you must be certain Southwark Council won't be liable for subsequent losses.

We're also concerned that the reference for the light study was 72 Silvester Road. Other lower numbered homes along Silvester Road are lower and potentially more impacted. Again we would hope no decision would be taken until the light study has used more appropriate Silvester homes neighbouring the site.

A number of local neighbours to the site have commented how the already approved scheme was attractive. For that scheme the visible roof line would only be 800mm above the fence line and of an angled green roof. This application would provide for a significantly worse outlook for neighbouring homes very close to those homes especially those on Silvester Road. To compound this a zinc roof is proposed presented to neighbours and the loss of outlook will be significant.

To summarise we think the decision needs further information to be properly and fully considered.

Regards james

James Barber  
Liberal Democrat councillor for East Dulwich 07900 227366  
[www.jamesbarber.org.uk](http://www.jamesbarber.org.uk) <http://twitter.com/CllrJamesBarber>

"Southwark Council does not accept liability for loss or damage resulting from software viruses.

The views expressed in this e-mail may be personal to the sender and should not be taken as necessarily representing those of Southwark Council.

The information in this e-mail and any attached files is confidential and may be covered by legal and/or professional privilege or be subject to privacy legislation. It is intended solely for the individual or entity to which it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, the retaining, distribution or other use of any transmitted information is strictly prohibited.

E-mails are transmitted over a public network and Southwark Council cannot accept any responsibility for the accuracy of a message that may have sustained changes in transmission".