

<b>Item No.</b> 7.3	<b>Classification:</b> OPEN	<b>Date:</b> 23 July 2013	<b>Meeting Name:</b> Planning Sub-Committee A
<b>Report title:</b>	<b>Development Management planning application:</b> Application 13/AP/0955 for: Full Planning Permission  <b>Address:</b> 151-161 GORDON ROAD, LONDON SE15 3RT  <b>Proposal:</b> Construction of 7 dwellings (3 x 4 bedroom and 4 x 5 bedroom) ranging in height from two to three storeys; associated refuse storage, cycle parking and landscaping.		
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>	The Lane		
<b>From:</b>	Head of Development Management		
<b>Application Start Date</b> 04/04/2013		<b>Application Expiry Date</b> 30/05/2013	
<b>Earliest Decision Date</b> 18/05/2013			

## RECOMMENDATION

- 1 Grant permission, subject to conditions.

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2 This application is brought before the Planning Sub-Committee for a decision at the request of Councillors and with the agreement of the Chair of the Planning Committee.

### Site location and description

- 3 The subject site is situated on Gordon Road and is currently vacant. The site lies within the Nunhead Green Conservation Area. There are no listed buildings within the vicinity of the site.
- 4 The site lies within an Air Quality Management Area, the Urban Density Zone and the Peckham and Nunhead Action Area as defined in the Adopted Policies Map (March 2012).

### Details of proposal

- 5 The proposal is for a development of 7 houses. The mix is 4 X 5 bed and 3 X 4 bed houses.

	<b>Overall Floor Area</b>	<b>Living</b>	<b>Kitchen/ Dining</b>	<b>Bed 1</b>	<b>Bed 2</b>	<b>Bed 3</b>	<b>Bed 4</b>	<b>Bed 5</b>	<b>Amenity Space</b>
<b>Unit 1 (Type A)</b>	120.6	21.6	14.4	12.6	12.0	8.0	8.1	8.0	43.2
<b>Unit 2 (Type A)</b>	120.6	17.2		15.7	12.0	10.5	8.2		37.5

<b>Unit 3 (Type A)</b>	120.6	17.2	14.6	15.7	12.0	10.5	8.2		39
<b>Unit 4 (Type B)</b>	129.1	17.2	14.6	15.7	12.0	10.5	8.2		70.6
<b>Unit 5 (Type C)</b>	128	17.7	14.9	12.5	12.1	8.8	8.0	7.5	40
<b>Unit 6 (Type C)</b>	128	17.7	14.9	12.5	7.5	8.8	8.0	7.5	36
<b>Unit 7 (Type C)</b>	128	17.7	14.9	12.5	12.1	8.8	8.0	7.5	44.2

- 6 No vehicle parking is proposed. A total of 22 cycle parking spaces are proposed. Refuse storage is to the front of each dwelling fronting onto Gordon Road. Communal storage is provided to the north of the site to serve the three units to the rear of the site. Each of the dwellings has a garden area to the rear. The dwellings to the rear are separated from those to the front by a 'mews street'.
- 7 There is no vehicle access to the proposal site. Pedestrian access to the units to the rear is via a laneway to the north of the site. Access to the units fronting onto Gordon Road is off the street.
- 8 The dwellings fronting on Gordon Road form a terrace of 4 properties (3 X Type A and 1 X Type B). These are part-three/part-two-storey with accommodation at roof-level (third storey level). These dwellings are 8.2m high at the highest point of the roofline. The dwellings to the rear are part-two/storey part three storey and form a terrace of 3 houses (3 X Type B). They are also 8.2m high at the highest point.
- 9 Proposed materials are brick. Windows are double-glazed timber framed windows. Doors are solid timber doors. Roofs will be a slate composite.

### **Planning history**

- 10 The most relevant application on this site was an application for the redevelopment of the site to provide seven two-storey dwelling houses with habitable roof spaces at the front and roof terraces at the rear with associated car parking (07/AP/2647). This was refused for four reasons (1) the height, mass, bulk and detailed design and impact on the Conservation Area (2) Inadequate visibility splay compromising highway and pedestrian safety, (3) Inadequate refuse and waste collection facilities for those units to the rear and (4) Overlooking from the roof terraces to the rear.
- 11 The appeal was upheld (Appeal Ref 08/2069509) and the Inspector upheld the first reason for refusal (design) and gave limited weight to the second (safety). The Inspector considered that the proposal had a detrimental impact on the Nunhead Green Conservation Area, **as a result of the proposal sitting forward of the building line, the prominent mansard roofs and the use of inappropriate materials.** The Inspector also gave limited weight to the issue of safety arising from the proposed entry and exit of vehicles from the site. In relation to the refuse issue, the Inspector considered that given the dwellings were under the management of a Housing Association, refuse would be stored and managed appropriately. Overlooking, or the perception of overlooking from the proposed rear balconies, was also a concern although the Inspector accepted that screening would overcome this issue. The Inspector also notes that the houses to the rear would not be visible in the same vista as the terraces, and for this reason it was considered that they would not harm the appearance of the Conservation Area.
- 12 01/CO/0154 Grant permission [decision issued 19/11/01] Demolition of asbestos clad pre-fabricated bungalow and provision of 1.8m high fencing to boundary of site.

## **Planning history of adjoining sites**

- 13 149 Gordon Road 02/AP/1723 Grant permission [decision date 31/12/2002] for the construction of 2 two-storey detached houses.

## **KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

### **Summary of main issues**

- 14 The key issues with this pre-application are as follows:

(a) Principle of development

(b) Impact of proposed development on amenity of adjoining occupiers and surrounding area

(c) Impact of adjoining and nearby uses on occupiers and users of proposed development

(d) Transport Issues

(e) Design

(f) Mayoral Community Infrastructure levy

(g) Sustainable development implications

(h) Air Quality

(i) Trees

### **Planning policy**

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

- 15 Relevant Sections
1. Building a strong competitive economy
  4. Promoting sustainable transport
  6. Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes
  7. Requiring good design.
  10. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
  12. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

London Plan (2011)

- 16 Policy 3.3 - Increasing housing supply  
Policy 4.4 - Optimising housing potential  
Policy 3.5 - Quality and design of housing developments  
Policy 3.8 - Housing choice  
Policy 3.9 - Mixed and balanced communities  
Policy 4.1 - Developing London's economy  
Policy 5.2 - Minimising carbon dioxide emissions  
Policy 5.3 - Sustainable design and construction  
Policy 5.7 - Renewable energy  
Policy 6.3 Assessing Effects of Development on Transport Capacity  
Policy 7.6 - Architecture

Policy 7.8 - Heritage Assets and Archaeology  
Policy 7.19 Biodiversity and Access to Nature

Core Strategy (2011)

- 17 1 - Sustainable Development
- 2 - Sustainable transport
- 5 – Providing new homes
- 7 – Family homes
- 11 - Open Spaces and Wildlife
- 12 - Design and conservation
- 13 - High environmental standards
- 14 - Implementation and delivery

Southwark Plan (2007) - saved policies

- 18 The Council's cabinet on 19th March 2013, as required by para 215 of the NPPF, considered the issue of compliance of Southwark Planning Policy with the National Planning Policy Framework. All policies and proposals were reviewed and the Council satisfied itself that the policies and proposals in use were in conformity with the NPPF. The resolution was that with the exception of Policy 1.8 (location of retail outside town centres) in the Southwark Plan all Southwark Plan policies are saved. Therefore due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans in accordance to their degree of consistency with the NPPF.
- 19 3.1 Environmental Effects
- 3.2 Protection of Amenity
- 3.6 Air Quality
- 3.7 Waste reduction
- 3.9 Water
- 3.11 Efficient use of land
- 3.12 Quality in Design
- 3.13 Urban Design
- 3.14 Designing out Crime
- 3.15 Conservation of the historic environment
- 3.16 Conservation areas
- 3.18 Setting of listed buildings, conservation areas and world heritage sites
- 3.28 Biodiversity
- 4.2 Quality of Residential Accommodation
- 5.2 Transport impacts
- 5.3 Walking and cycling
- 5.6 Car parking

Supplementary Planning Documents

- 20 Residential Design Standards SPD 2011
- Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2008

**Principle of development**

- 21 There are no land use objections to a residential development on this site. There are fewer than 10 units, so no affordable housing nor contributions is required by planning policy, although the applicant has indicated that the units will be 3 intermediate and 4 social rent in tenure.

## **Environmental impact assessment**

- 22 A Screening Opinion was not requested prior to the submission of the application as the scheme is not Schedule 1 development. It does fall within Schedule 2, being an urban development project. Having reference to the Column 2 criteria, the site area does not exceed the initial threshold of 0.5ha. In addition it has been determined that the development is unlikely to have a significant effect upon the environment by virtue of its nature, size or location based upon a review of the Schedule 3 selection criteria for screening Schedule 2 Development. The site is a brownfield site in an inner London location, and is located outside of a sensitive area as per Regulation 2(1) and the development is unlikely to generate any significant environmental effects.

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

- 23 The nearest residential occupiers are located at 149 and 149A Gordon Road to the north-west and north, 53-63 Kirkwood Road to the north/east, 163 Gordon Road to the south and 86-92 Gordon Road to the west of the site across Gordon Road.

#### **Overlooking/Loss of Privacy**

- 24 In relation to the impact on 149 and 149A, and Gordon Road, it is noted that there are no windows to the side elevation of the nearest proposed units and as such no overlooking of any windows of these properties will result. In relation to the overlooking of the rear gardens of these properties, there will be limited views into the garden of No. 149 and 149A from the rear windows of the front and back terraces, although this is not considered to be so detrimental to the amenity of these units so as to warrant a refusal. Such views from rear windows onto adjacent gardens are common in an inner-London development such as the one proposed in this instance.
- 25 In relation to the impact on the dwellings on Kirkwood Road, given the distances from the rear of the proposed houses to these dwellings on Kirkwood Road (22m), it is not considered overlooking will result from this proposal. The previous proposals for this site, which were subject to appeal, had proposed terraces and balconies to the rear of the properties closest to Kirkwood Road, and it is noted that these rear terraces/balconies have now been removed from this proposal. The Inspector did not consider that the location of the rear terrace of houses, in relation to the Kirkwood Road properties, was harmful. The window to window separation distances exceed the standard (21m) in the Council's Residential Design Guide SPD.
- 26 In relation to the impact on No. 163 Gordon Road, there are no side elevation windows on the proposed dwelling closest to this property and as such no direct overlooking will result.
- 27 The front window to window relationship, across Gordon Road, is typical of this street. At a distance of over 23m, this exceeds the standard of separation for street windows in the SPD (12m).
- #### **Internal Overlooking**
- 28 The mews arrangements could lead to overlooking internally within the development. However it is noted that at ground floor level, the boundary fences will preclude any overlooking. At first floor level it is noted that the windows are offset slightly to prevent directly facing windows. This is considered to overcome any concerns in relation to internal overlooking.

#### Overshadowing/Loss of Sunlight/Daylight

- 29 Having regard to the impact on No. 149 and 163 Gordon Road, it is not considered that loss of daylight/sunlight will result, having regard to the depth of the proposal and to the setback from the proposed dwellings from these properties.
- 30 While there will be some overshadowing of the rear gardens of those dwellings on Kirkwood Road, in the later evening, this is not sufficient to warrant a refusal of the application. It is noted that the previous proposals were of a similar height and overshadowing was not a reason for refusal. The Inspector in the appeal decision did not raise any issues of loss of amenity to gardens in Kirkwood Road owing to impacts on day/sunlight arising from the location of the rear terrace.

Impacts on amenity have been raised by local residents in letters of objection, particularly in relation to the houses located at the rear of the site, but it is not considered that these would be so significant as to justify refusal of permission.

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

- 31 The surrounding uses are mostly residential and as such it is not considered that any negative impact will result from these surrounding occupiers.

#### **Transport issues**

##### Vehicle and Pedestrian Access

- 32 It is noted that the council had previous concerns related to visibility splays although the Inspector did not consider it constituted a reason for refusal in itself. In this instance no additional parking is proposed over and above that serving the existing dwellings to the north of the proposed houses, (2 spaces) therefore vehicle access arrangements remain the same as existing.

##### Cycle storage

- 33 Each unit has two cycle storage spaces. There are six additional spaces provided for visitors. This level of provision is acceptable.

##### Car Parking

- 34 The proposed development is not located within a Control Parking Zone, but is located on the edge of an existing Peckham B CPZ (which is due to be extended on the northern section of Gordon Road). The proposed development is located in an area with a PTAL of 4. Impact on parking has been raised in letters of objection.
- 35 Typically the transport team would expect a higher level of parking to be associated with a development of the above nature, especially given that the houses are family-sized. It is reasonable to assume that this type of development may generate a higher level of car ownership.
- 36 The applicants have provided a detailed parking survey of both a 50m and a 200m distance (in keeping with the Lambeth Parking survey Methodology). The parking survey has shown that ample on-street space is available for vehicles which will be associated with the proposed development.
- 37 2011 Census car ownership data shows that there are likely to be 4 vehicles associated with the proposed development. Census car ownership data is a useful tool to ascertain the number of "residential" vehicles which are associated with a proposed development.

In a worse case scenario each family unit has two vehicles these can all be easily accommodated on the surrounding highway network, with no impact on residential parking amenity.

- 38 The Peckham B CPZ will be extended to cover the northern section of Gordon Road, and this may result in an increase in on street parking stress during CPZ operation hours (08:00-18:30); however during times of peak residential parking demand (00:30-05:30) on street stress will not differ significantly to existing levels.
- 39 The proposed development is not considered to generate a significant negative impact on the performance and safety of the surrounding highway network. The submitted parking survey has shown that at peak times of residential parking demand, the surrounding highway network can accommodate vehicles that will be associated with the development and not impact on existing residents parking amenity.

Servicing and refuse vehicle access

- 40 Servicing for the development will be under taken from Gordon Road. No servicing will take place using the existing access as there are two existing car parking spaces that do not allow for guaranteed unimpeded access.

#### **Design issues and Impact on character and setting of a listed building and/or conservation area**

- 41 The proposal is for a terrace of four houses fronting onto Gordon Road with a terrace of three houses to the rear. Regard is had to the appeal decision on this site which related to a development of seven units in a similar arrangement. In his report the Inspector upheld the Council's reason for refusal relating to design. The main areas of concern were the breaking of the existing building line, the mansard roofs and the proposed materials.
- 42 It is now considered that the height, scale and massing of the proposed for Gordon Road is appropriate for the historic scale of development in the rest of the street and those houses facing the street, and would relate well to the existing urban grain, development pattern and density.
- 43 The comments of the Inspector in relation to the proposed houses to the rear are noted and it was not considered that they impacted on the appearance of the Conservation Area due to their location. The council and the Inspector did not question the principle of this arrangement of dwellings. In relation to the units fronting onto Gordon Road, it is considered that the proposal has responded positively to the reasons for refusal. The overall height has been reduced and the detailed design is more in keeping with the existing streetscape. The building line has been maintained also and the use of materials such as brick has improved the overall quality of the development and as a result does not detract from the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The development of the vacant land is considered beneficial to the appearance of the street frontage with a positive impact on the appearance of the Conservation Area.
- 44 In relation to the properties at the rear, the overall height of these dwellings again has reduced since the previous refusal on the site, and the detailed design is more appropriate for the area. It is considered the creation of the pedestrian mews street is a positive addition since the previous application (parking was proposed on site previously). This will allow for a communal amenity area and allow for safe children's play.

## **Residential Design Standards**

- 45 When assessing residential standards the Council will have regard to the London Plan (2011), the adopted Core Strategy Document (2011), saved policies as contained in the Southwark Plan (2007) as well as to guidance as outlined in the Residential Design Standards Supplementary Planning Document (2011).

### Floor Areas

- 46 In relation to the proposed overall floor areas of the units, the unit sizes and individual room sizes comply with the minimum standards as set out in the Residential Design Standards SPD 2011.

### Daylight/Sunlight

- 47 The units are all dual aspect which is a positive feature maximising sunlight levels and allowing for cross-ventilation.

### Amenity Space

- 48 The Residential Design Standards 2011 state that each unit within a housing development should have a minimum of 50 sq. m. private garden space. The garden spaces in this instance fall short of this 50 sq. m. save for one of the units. However the constraints of the site are noted and it is not considered that the shortfall would warrant a refusal in this instance. Each house has its own rear garden, and the pedestrian mews street between the front and back terraces adds to a sense of space in the development. Whilst the gardens are for family houses, and are quite limited in size, there are other larger open spaces available locally - such as Dr Harold Moody Park opposite - for more active recreation.

## **Impact on trees**

- 49 There is an existing lime tree on the site, and its loss has been raised in letters of objection. An Arboricultural Implications Assessment has been submitted with the application. The tree has been categorised as a category B tree which is defined as 'retention desirable'. It is noted in the report that the physical layout of the development does not allow for the retention of the tree. The proposed rear gardens do not allow for a suitable replacement tree to be re-planted, given the limited size of these gardens. It is considered that offsite planting should be required by way of condition.

## **Mayoral Community Infrastructure levy**

- 50 Section 143 of the Localism Act 2011 states the 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. CIL is payable on applications for the creation of new residential units. The CIL liability then relates to the total residential floorspace of 874.9 sq. m. which equates to £30,621.50.

## **Sustainable development implications**

- 51 The proposal should comply with Strategic Policy 13 'High Environmental Standards' of the Core Strategy. It is stated that the development will achieve Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4. This is in line with policy. A condition should be imposed to ensure that this standard is achieved.



## **Waste**

- 52 Refuse and recycling facilities are located to the front of the four units facing onto Gordon Road. A communal waste area to the north of the site for the remainder of the units is proposed for the units to the rear. The width of this area is not considered sufficient to allow unimpeded pedestrian access. A solution was explored which involved moving the front terrace houses closer to No. 163 but this was not considered desirable. At the time of writing the applicant has been requested to reconsider this aspect and the most practical solution is to have individual bins for the houses to the rear which the householder would be required to move to the front of the site. A condition concerning refuse storage is recommended, and any updates will be reported in the supplementary.

## **Air Quality**

- 53 The applicants have submitted an Air Quality Assessment. This concludes that predicted NO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> concentrations do not exceed the relevant air quality objectives in 2011 or 2015 at any of the modelled locations. Environmental Protection agree that no mitigation measures are required although considered that dust during construction should be controlled by way of Environmental Management Plan.

## **Soil Contamination**

- 54 It is noted that the site has been previously developed contained temporary pre-fab housing. Environmental Protection has recommended that relevant conditions should be imposed to ensure that no detrimental health impacts result from any possible contamination.

## **Conclusion on planning issues**

- 55 The principle of the proposal is acceptable. The applicants have addressed the reasons for refusal that were upheld at appeal stage, in relation to the previous application. The detailed design and height of the proposal is now considered appropriate in terms of the impact on the streetscape and the impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. It is not considered that there will be any significant impacts on neighbour amenity and it has been demonstrated that there is sufficient parking capacity to accommodate the development. Having regard to these issues, and others discussed in the body of the report, the recommendation is to grant permission subject conditions.

## **Community impact statement**

- 56 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.
- 57 a) The impact on local people is set out above.
- 58 b) The following issues relevant to particular communities/groups likely to be affected by the proposal have been identified as
- 59 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 are

## **Consultation**

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

## **Consultation replies**

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

## Summary of consultation responses

- 62 1 petition objecting (33 signatures) have been received in relation to this application. The petition set out objections to all or part of the application including impact on privacy, impact on environment, insufficient parking, health and safety and the removal of the lime tree.

Objections have been received from the following addresses

61 Kirkwood Road; 55A Kirkwood Road and 71 Kirkwood Road; 63 Kirkwood Road; 59 Kirkwood Road; 53 Kirkwood Road; 92 Gordon Road; 165 Gordon Road; 94 Gordon Road; 90 Gordon Road; 63 Kirkwood Road; 141 Gordon Road; 143 Gordon Road; 145 Gordon Road;

The main planning issues raised are:

- Height of the properties, especially to the rear
- Impact on the quality of life in the dwellings to the side and behind in Kirkwood Road
- Would obliterate any light coming into the gardens of houses
- No other properties built to such a height at the rear of Kirkwood or Gordon Road
- Would impact on growing of fruit and vegetables
- Lead to loss of privacy and overlooking of gardens and back windows
- Violation of right to light
- Loss of the lime tree. The condition of the tree was not inspected properly.
- Does not comply policy on Conservation Areas
- Larger buildings should be to the front
- Lack of parking
- Impact on traffic levels
- Design is not in keeping with existing houses
- Proposals would detrimentally impact the quality, character and amenity value of the area.
- Proposals would be visually overbearing and would result in overlooking and loss of privacy
- Should be sufficient space between old and new buildings to maintain the amenity and privacy of existing houses.
- Site access would lead to safety hazards
- Proposals for internal circulation are not acceptable
- Removal of boundary fence between existing adjacent property and propose dwellings will lead to loss of privacy
- Proposal conflicts with Human Rights Act
- Will lead to overshadowing of adjacent property
- Will block natural light to the existing window
- Will result in drainage problems
- Concerned about the level of noise that will result.
- Impact on wildlife
- Should be no conflict of interest in this application
- Materials are inappropriate
- Space is too narrow between the buildings for it to be a mews development

- The parking survey was not carried out adequately
- Impact of the surrounding CPZ
- Assessment of 0.5 vehicles per household is not representative of this section of Gordon Road
- The larger houses are likely to generate parking demand
- The number of properties to the rear should be reduced to make provision for parking
- Design is not acceptable
- Density is not in keeping with the area
- Adjacent and surrounding houses are 2 storey yet the houses in the proposal are 3 storey as with the previously rejected scheme.
- The recently built houses are in keeping with surrounding houses
- Transport assessment is not accurate
- Recent development at No. 189 is an eyesore
- Plans should be rejected until the proposal is of a more suitable size and density.
- Houses should not be built in back gardens
- Refuse storage arrangements are not acceptable
- Security and safety concerns
- Need more detail of design and boundary arrangements
- Road safety concerns
- Too many dwellings on the site
- Will block natural light to adjacent dwellings
- Site should be put to use creating jobs for the local community on low income.

1 letter of support has been received from 73 Gordon Road  
 Support application  
 Proposals are well thought through  
 Respects the setting and character of the Conservation Area

### **Human rights implications**

- 63 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.
- 64 This application has the legitimate aim of providing residential units. 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**

<b>Background Papers</b>	<b>Held At</b>	<b>Contact</b>
Site history file: TP/2467-151 Application file: 13/AP/0955 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 5420 Council website: www.southwark.gov.uk

## APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	Consultation undertaken
Appendix 2	Consultation responses received
Appendix 3	Neighbour Consultee List
Appendix 4	Recommendation

## AUDIT TRAIL

<b>Lead Officer</b>	Gary Rice, Head of Development Management	
<b>Report Author</b>	Rónán O'Connor, Senior Planner	
<b>Version</b>	Final	
<b>Dated</b>	8 July 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 & Corporate services	No	No
Strategic Director, Environment and Leisure	No	No
Strategic Director, Housing and Community Services	No	No
Director of Regeneration	No	No
<b>Date final report sent to Constitutional Team</b>		11 July 2013

## APPENDIX 1

### Consultation undertaken

**Site notice date:** 22/04/2013

**Press notice date:** 25/04/2013

**Case officer site visit date:** 22/04/2013

**Neighbour consultation letters sent:**

18/04/2013

**Internal services consulted:**

Environmental Protection  
Transport  
Design and Conservation  
Urban Forester

**Statutory and non-statutory organisations consulted:**

None

**Neighbours and local groups consulted:**

As per Appendix 3

**Re-consultation:**

None

## APPENDIX 2

### Consultation responses received

#### Internal services

Environmental Protection - Recommend condition in relation to soil contamination  
Transport – No objection raised

#### Statutory and non-statutory organisations

None

#### Neighbours and local groups

1 petition objecting (33 signatures) have been received in relation to this application. The petition set out objections to all or part of the application including impact on privacy, impact on environment, insufficient parking, health and safety and the removal of the lime tree.

Objections have been received from the following addresses

61 Kirkwood Road; 55A Kirkwood Road and 71 Kirkwood Road; 63 Kirkwood Road; 59 Kirkwood Road; 53 Kirkwood Road; 92 Gordon Road; 165 Gordon Road; 94 Gordon Road; 90 Gordon Road; 63 Kirkwood Road; 141 Gordon Road; 143 Gordon Road; 145 Gordon Road;

The main planning issues raised are:

Height of the properties, especially to the rear

Impact on the quality of life in the dwellings to the side and behind in Kirkwood Road

Would obliterate any light coming into the gardens of houses

No other properties built to such a height at the rear of Kirkwood or Gordon Road

Would impact on growing of fruit and vegetables

Lead to loss of privacy and overlooking of gardens and back windows

Violation of right to light

Loss of the lime tree. The condition of the tree was not inspected properly.

Does not comply policy on Conservation Areas

Larger buildings should be to the front

Lack of parking

Impact on traffic levels

Design is not in keeping with existing houses

Proposals would detrimentally impact the quality, character and amenity value of the area.

Proposals would be visually overbearing and would result in overlooking and loss of privacy

Should be sufficient space between old and new buildings to maintain the amenity and privacy of existing houses.

Site access would lead to safety hazards

Proposals for internal circulation are not acceptable

Removal of boundary fence between existing adjacent property and propose dwellings will lead to loss of privacy

Proposal conflicts with Human Rights Act

Will lead to overshadowing of adjacent property

Will block natural light to the existing window

Will result in drainage problems

Concerned about the level of noise that will result.  
Impact on wildlife  
Should be no conflict of interest in this application  
Materials are inappropriate  
Space is too narrow between the buildings for it to be a mews development  
The parking survey was not carried out adequately  
Impact of the surrounding CPZ  
Assessment of 0.5 vehicles per household is not representative of this section of Gordon Road  
The larger houses are likely to generate parking demand  
The number of properties to the rear should be reduced to make provision for parking  
Design is not acceptable  
Density is not in keeping with the area  
Adjacent and surrounding houses are 2 storey yet the houses in the proposal are 3 storey as with the previously rejected scheme.  
The recently built houses are in keeping with surrounding houses  
Transport assessment is not accurate  
Recent development at No. 189 is an eyesore  
Plans should be rejected until the proposal is of a more suitable size and density.  
Houses should not be built in back gardens  
Refuse storage arrangements are not acceptable  
Security and safety concerns  
Need more detail of design and boundary arrangements  
Road safety concerns  
Too many dwellings on the site  
Will block natural light to adjacent dwellings  
Site should be put to use creating jobs for the local community on low income.

1 letter of support has been received from 73 Gordon Road  
Support application  
Proposals are well thought through  
Respects the setting and character of the Conservation Area

## APPENDIX 3

### Neighbour Consultee List for Application Reg. No. 13/AP/0955

<b>TP No</b>	TP/2467-151	<b>Site</b>	151-161 GORDON ROAD, LONDON, SE15 3RT
<b>App. Type</b>	Full Planning Permission		

Date Printed	Address
18/04/2013	9 Buchan Road Nunhead London SE15 3HQ
18/04/2013	57A KIRKWOOD ROAD LONDON SE15 3XU
18/04/2013	55B KIRKWOOD ROAD LONDON SE15 3XU
18/04/2013	55A KIRKWOOD ROAD LONDON SE15 3XU
18/04/2013	57B KIRKWOOD ROAD LONDON SE15 3XU
18/04/2013	59B KIRKWOOD ROAD LONDON SE15 3XU
18/04/2013	59A KIRKWOOD ROAD LONDON SE15 3XU
18/04/2013	71 KIRKWOOD ROAD LONDON SE15 3XU
18/04/2013	69 KIRKWOOD ROAD LONDON SE15 3XU
18/04/2013	67 KIRKWOOD ROAD LONDON SE15 3XU
18/04/2013	73 KIRKWOOD ROAD LONDON SE15 3XU
18/04/2013	102B GORDON ROAD LONDON SE15 3RP
18/04/2013	102A GORDON ROAD LONDON SE15 3RP
18/04/2013	75 KIRKWOOD ROAD LONDON SE15 3XU
18/04/2013	86 GORDON ROAD LONDON SE15 3RG
18/04/2013	FIRST FLOOR FLAT 167 GORDON ROAD LONDON SE15 3RT
18/04/2013	49 KIRKWOOD ROAD LONDON SE15 3XT
18/04/2013	45 KIRKWOOD ROAD LONDON SE15 3XT
18/04/2013	FLAT A 84 GORDON ROAD LONDON SE15 3RG
18/04/2013	GROUND FLOOR FLAT 167 GORDON ROAD LONDON SE15 3RT
18/04/2013	FLAT C 84 GORDON ROAD LONDON SE15 3RG
18/04/2013	FLAT B 84 GORDON ROAD LONDON SE15 3RG
18/04/2013	90 GORDON ROAD LONDON SE15 3RP
18/04/2013	88 GORDON ROAD LONDON SE15 3RP
18/04/2013	100 GORDON ROAD LONDON SE15 3RP
18/04/2013	92 GORDON ROAD LONDON SE15 3RP
18/04/2013	98 GORDON ROAD LONDON SE15 3RP
18/04/2013	96 GORDON ROAD LONDON SE15 3RP
18/04/2013	94 GORDON ROAD LONDON SE15 3RP
18/04/2013	149 GORDON ROAD LONDON SE15 3RT
18/04/2013	86L GORDON ROAD LONDON SE15 3RP
18/04/2013	86K GORDON ROAD LONDON SE15 3RP
18/04/2013	149A GORDON ROAD LONDON SE15 3RT
18/04/2013	147 GORDON ROAD LONDON SE15 3RT
18/04/2013	GROUND FLOOR FLAT 169 GORDON ROAD LONDON SE15 3RT
18/04/2013	FIRST FLOOR FLAT 169 GORDON ROAD LONDON SE15 3RT
18/04/2013	86D GORDON ROAD LONDON SE15 3RP
18/04/2013	86B GORDON ROAD LONDON SE15 3RR
18/04/2013	86A GORDON ROAD LONDON SE15 3RR
18/04/2013	86E GORDON ROAD LONDON SE15 3RP
18/04/2013	86I GORDON ROAD LONDON SE15 3RP
18/04/2013	86H GORDON ROAD LONDON SE15 3RP
18/04/2013	86G GORDON ROAD LONDON SE15 3RP
18/04/2013	53 KIRKWOOD ROAD LONDON SE15 3XU
18/04/2013	43 KIRKWOOD ROAD LONDON SE15 3XT
18/04/2013	47 KIRKWOOD ROAD LONDON SE15 3XT
18/04/2013	65 KIRKWOOD ROAD LONDON SE15 3XU
18/04/2013	63 KIRKWOOD ROAD LONDON SE15 3XU
18/04/2013	61 KIRKWOOD ROAD LONDON SE15 3XU
18/04/2013	143 GORDON ROAD LONDON SE15 3RR
18/04/2013	141 GORDON ROAD LONDON SE15 3RR
18/04/2013	139 GORDON ROAD LONDON SE15 3RR
18/04/2013	145 GORDON ROAD LONDON SE15 3RT
18/04/2013	165 GORDON ROAD LONDON SE15 3RT
18/04/2013	163 GORDON ROAD LONDON SE15 3RT
18/04/2013	157 GORDON ROAD LONDON SE15 3RT
20/06/1837	by email
20/06/1837	by email
20/06/1837	by email
20/06/1837	X