

Item No. 7.1	Classification: OPEN	Date: 21 January 2014	Meeting Name: Planning Sub-Committee A
Report title:	Development Management planning application: Application 13/AP/3048 for: Full Planning Permission Address: 97 CRYSTAL PALACE ROAD, LONDON SE22 9EY Proposal: Change of use and conversion of former police station to 4 flats (Use Class C3) (2 x one bedroom and 1 x two bedroom and 1x3 bedroom) including the erection of rear roof extension, remodelling of elevations and the erection of a single storey side extension with roof terrace above; erection of a terrace of 5 four-bedroom houses on land to the rear facing Upland Road, each arranged over four storeys (basement, ground, first and second floor).		
Ward(s) or groups affected:	Peckham Rye		
From:	Head of Development Management		
Application Start Date 20/09/2013		Application Expiry Date 15/11/2013	
Earliest Decision Date 01/11/2013			

RECOMMENDATION

- 1 That planning permission be granted.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Site location and description

- 2 The site contains a double fronted Victorian two storey (plus basement) building that was formerly a police station; a more recent single storey extension to the south is also present. Last used over 12 months ago as a police station (Use Class *Sui Generis*) the site is presently unused. It is located on the corner of Crystal Palace Road and Upland Road. There is a modest garden at the front with a more extensive open area to the rear upon which were a number of Portacabins; this area was also used for parking.
- 3 The building is not listed in the setting of a listed building or within a conservation area. It is however in an area characterised by Victorian housing and the site is one of a few buildings in the area that are not in residential use.
- 4 Local plan designations for the site are as follows:
 - Air Quality Management Area
 - Suburban Density Zone- Middle

Details of proposal

- 5 The proposal is for a change of use of the site from a police station to residential creating nine dwellings on the site, four flats within the existing building and five

houses on the eastern part of the site.

- 6 Four flats in the existing building (referred to hereafter as 97 Crystal Palace Road) would be facilitated by internal alterations, the construction of two large rear dormer extensions and an extension to the basement (east and west) to provide 2 x one bedroom flats, a two-bedroom flat and a three-bedroom flat.
- 7 Five 4-bed houses (referred to hereafter as The Terrace) would be constructed on the eastern part of the site currently occupied by the yard to the rear of the building. They would be three storeys in height, the uppermost storey within a mansard roof with front and rear dormers. All of these dwellings would additionally have basements.
- 8 All proposed dwellings would have access to private outdoor amenity space: gardens for dwellings at ground floor level with terraces for the two one bedroom flats on the upper floors. A communal amenity area is proposed on what is presently the front garden, on Crystal Palace Road.

Planning history

- 9 13-AP-1594, planning permission refused on 23 July 2013 for:
Conversion of former police station to residential flats (4 no.), incorporating ground floor side extension with terrace on top, and roof extensions; and erection of a terrace of 5 dwellings on basement, ground, first, second and third floor levels on land to the rear of the site fronting Upland Road, landscaping and other works incidental to the site.
- 10 The reason for refusal was:
The development would be detrimental to the amenities of the occupiers of the adjoining residential properties by reason of its height, scale and massing. It would respectively result in an unacceptable loss of daylight and sunlight to windows and overshadowing to the garden of 95 Crystal Palace Road, would lead to a loss of privacy through overlooking from the proposed balconies over residential gardens to the north and the use of the balconies would lead to noise and disturbance. As such the development is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, saved Policy 3.2 Protection of Amenity of the Southwark Plan and Strategic Policy 13 High Environmental Standards of the Core Strategy 2011.
- 11 The present scheme has been designed with a view to addressing this reason for refusal with the pertinent differences being:
 - A reduction in the scale of the five house terrace on Upland Road by one storey to accord with the scale of development on Crystal Palace Road
 - Increased distance between the rear of The Terrace and the boundary with 95 Crystal Palace Road by 1m
 - Orientating the balconies for flats proposed at 97 Crystal Palace Road to reduce potential for overlooking
 - Loss of the roof terrace from proposed houses on Upland Road.

Planning history of adjoining sites

- 12 None of relevance

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Summary of main issues

- 13 The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:
- a. The principle of the proposed development with respect to land use
 - b. The impact of the development on local amenity
 - c. Quality of residential accommodation
 - d. The design of the proposed development
 - e. Transport impacts
 - f. Environmental considerations

Planning policy

14 Core Strategy 2011

SP1 - Sustainable development
SP2 - Sustainable transport
SP5 - Providing new homes
SP11 – Open spaces and wildlife
SP12 - Design and conservation
SP13 - High Environmental standards

15 Southwark Plan 2007 (July) - saved policies

The council's cabinet on 19 March 2013, as required by paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework (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. The following policies are particularly relevant to this application:

Policy 3.2 – Protection of amenity
Policy 3.11 – Efficient use of land
Policy 3.12 – Quality in design
Policy 3.13 – Urban design
Policy 4.2 – Quality of residential accommodation
Policy 5.2 – Transport impacts
Policy 5.3 – Walking and cycling
Policy 5.6 – Car parking
Policy 5.7 – Parking standards for disabled people and the mobility impaired

Residential Design Standards Supplementary Planning Document 2011
Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document 2009

16 London Plan 2011

Policy 3.4 Optimising housing potential
Policy 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments
Policy 3.8 Housing choice
Policy 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
Policy 5.3 Sustainable design and construction
Policy 6.9 Cycling

Policy 6.13 Parking
Policy 7.6 Architecture
Policy 7.15 Reducing noise and enhancing soundscapes
Policy 7.19 Biodiversity and access to nature

17 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

This application should be assessed against the NPPF as a whole, however the following sections are of particular relevance:

- 6. Delivering a wide choice of family homes
- 7. Requiring good design
- 10. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- 11. Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Principle of development

- 18 There is no local development plan designation for land use at the site and a *Sui Generis* use is not protected by any particular planning policy. Being in the suburban density zone, the principle of a residential use at the site is acceptable.

Environmental impact assessment

- 19 An environmental impact assessment is not required for a development of this scale.

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

- 20 There are a number of ways that the proposed development could affect local adjoining occupiers, who predominately occupy residential properties. These include the impact on privacy, sunlight and daylight and the potential for a sense of enclosure. These matters are discussed below:

Privacy

- 21 Any loss of privacy is most likely to affect the occupiers of 95 Crystal Palace Road which is to the north of the site. Balconies proposed at second floor for 97 Crystal Palace Road would be recessed while at first floor level, the only balcony proposed will face Upland Road to the south and only afford a very restricted view into the garden of 95 Crystal Palace Road. These are significant alterations from the refused scheme which included projecting balconies to the rear of 97 Crystal Palace Road at first and second floor.

Daylight and sunlight

- 22 A daylight and sunlight report has been submitted with the application. It presents the results of a modeling exercise that has been undertaken in accordance with Building Research Establishment (BRE) report 209- "Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice".

- 23 The analysis of the impact on the amount of daylight received by existing properties is based on the amount of Vertical Sky Component (VSC), an indicator of the amount of sky that will be seen inside the modelled window; analysis was undertaken for 95 and 99 Crystal Palace Road and 2-8 Upland Road. The guidance states that if the resultant VSC is less than 0.8 its current value, the occupants of the affected building are likely to notice the reduction in daylight. Results of the modelling show that for all but one window at 95 Crystal Palace Road, no windows will have their Vertical Sky Component (VSC) reduced to less than 0.8 of its former value. The window affected is on the southern elevation of the rear ground floor extension which serves a dining

room benefiting from rooflights and bi-folding doors on its rear elevation; a good level of daylight will be retained for the room as a whole.

- 24 For sunlight, the assessment is only undertaken for properties with a window within 90 degrees of south which means that any impact would be limited to properties north of the site. Based on the annual probable sunlight hours (APSH), this assessment shows that of the windows serving habitable rooms, one will receive 0.73 times its present APSH. This is the same window affected by a notable loss in daylight. As it is a room served by glazing on two other aspects, it is considered that the reduction in APSH on this one window will not materially reduce the overall amenity for 95 Crystal Palace Road with respect to sunlight.
- 25 Overshadowing to the garden on 95 Crystal Palace Road is also assessed in the daylight and sunlight report. BRE guidelines suggest that for an area to appear adequately sunlit at least half of it should receive at least two hours of sunlight on 21 March. Two hours of sunlight would be received by 51.8% of the garden on 21 March.

Sense of enclosure.

- 26 The Terrace's rear walls would be between 5-8m from the site's northern boundary with 95 Crystal Palace Road. There will be some impact, however, the reduction in height of this proposal compared to the refused scheme means that this impact is much reduced and the impact will not cause unacceptable harm.

Noise

- 27 There are potential impacts on noise for the residential properties to the north of the site, particularly with amenity areas proposed on its northern part. However, these are predominantly at ground floor level and it should be taken into account that the site was formerly used as a police station. This would have generated more activity than a single family dwelling, including vehicle movements on the rear parking area and activity from people working at and visiting the site. So, while there may be increased noise levels from the use of outdoor amenity areas, this is likely to be restricted to daylight hours for most of the year and the night time noise environment may in fact be quieter.

Objections

- 28 There have been two objections to the application, one from the occupier of 93A Crystal Palace Road and another from a local resident at 4 Upland Road. References are made to loss of daylight and sunlight and the impact from noise. While no assessment has been undertaken on the impact on daylight, sunlight and overshadowing for 93A Crystal Palace Road, because the impact on 95 Crystal Palace Road is acceptable, by inference the impact on 93A Crystal Palace Road would also be acceptable, being as it is further from the site.
- 29 4 Upland Road, south of the site is not affected by a loss or sunlight or overshadowing. The daylight assessment shows that the amount of VSC received by habitable rooms on this property will be between 0.81 and 0.90 its present value. An effect that is acceptable, according to the BRE guidelines.
- 30 For the reasons detailed above it is considered that the impact of the proposed development on surrounding properties will not give rise to unacceptable harm.

Quality of Residential Accommodation

Dwelling and room sizes

- 31 All dwelling sizes comply with the council's minimum size requirements as detailed in the Residential Design Standards SPD 2011. Table 1 below shows the dwelling sizes

in comparison to the minimum requirements:

Building	Dwelling reference	Bedrooms	Proposed area (sq.m)	Minimum area required (sq.m)	Difference (sq.m)
97 Crystal Palace Road	Flat 1 (ground and basement)	2	80	70 (66)	+10 (+14)
	Flat 2 (ground and basement)	3	96	95 (85)	+1 (+11)
	Flat 3 (first and second floors)	1	71	50	+21
	Flat 4 (first and second floors)	1	61	50	+61
The Terrace (new build)	House 1	4	211	113 (110)	+98 (+101)
	House 2	4	190	113 (110)	+77 (+80)
	House 3	4	193	113 (110)	+77 (+80)
	House 4	4	196	113 (110)	+77 (+80)
	House 5	4	193	113 (110)	+77 (+80)

Table 1- Proposed dwelling sizes

- 32 The largest minimum dwelling size standards are presented for comparison in table 1 with figures in brackets representing the average requirements for dwellings of the sizes represented. As is shown in the table, the dwelling sizes are generous, particularly for the proposed houses. All room sizes bar a small number of bathrooms accord with the minimum room standards in the SPD too. The bathrooms that do not comply are all in flats proposed at 97 Crystal Palace Road. One is 4.45sq.m, just below the required area of 5sq.m while the other two are en-suite bathrooms and the dwellings they are in have separate W.C.s. The dwelling and rooms sizes of the proposed development are of a good standard.

Amenity Space

- 33 The supplementary planning document (SPD) states that outdoor amenity space for new housing should provide at least 50sq.m of outdoor amenity space in rear gardens of a least 10m length. Gardens for houses range between 45-47sq.m and between 5-8 m in length. Lightwells are also included which have some outdoor space, however these are not considered to be good quality outdoor amenity spaces. The shortfall in outdoor amenity space for the houses is small and while the gardens are fairly short, this is determined by the constraints of the site and not considered to be sufficient reason for refusal.
- 34 Flats 1 and 2 in 97 Crystal Palace Road would both benefit from private gardens while Flat 4 would have a southerly terrace. All of these areas are greater than the 10sq.m recommended in the SPD. Flat 3 however would have a modest terrace of 4.54sq.m. While less than ideal, this terrace has been designed in order to reduce loss of privacy to existing neighbours which was one of the reasons for the refusal of the previous

scheme. Flat 3, would be a 1 bedroom flat and the amenity standard can be applied more flexibly.

Lifetime Homes

- 35 The proposal has been developed to meet Lifetime Homes Standards where applicable.

Daylight and sunlight

- 36 The BRE guidance referred to above was also used to assess daylight and sunlight for the proposed dwellings. For daylight, an average daylight factor (ADF) calculation was undertaken because the internal arrangements were known. The recommended ADF values for different habitable rooms are as follows:

- Bedrooms - 1%
- Living rooms- 1.5%
- Kitchens- 2%

- 37 The results indicate that the relevant ADF factors will be met for all rooms in the basement and ground floor areas and by inference for any floors above these.

Privacy

- 38 Windows on the upper floors of The Terrace are designed to provide restrictive views, particularly to the west where the flats on 97 Crystal Palace Road are proposed. Flat 3 will result in some degree of overlooking into the rear gardens of the The Terrace but would be similar to that from 95 Crystal Palace Road. The outdoor amenity spaces on 97 Crystal Palace Road would not give rise to unacceptable harm to the privacy of the ground floor amenity areas proposed. It should also be borne in mind that this is a suburban area where some degree of overlooking is likely to occur.

Transport issues

Car parking

- 39 The proposal does not include any provision for off-street parking and is not within a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). Nine new dwellings have the potential to increase parking stress. A transport statement submitted includes the results of a parking survey, the same that was reported for the refused application. This shows that there is parking capacity within the surrounding streets. The site has a public transport accessibility level (PTAL) of 4 (medium) and together with a condition requiring the developer to provide three years membership of a local car club to future residents, a development without on-site parking is considered to be acceptable.

- 40 Being fewer than 10 units, this development does not need to provide on site parking for disabled people or those who are mobility impaired. The transport planning team have suggested that the developer might make a financial contribution to secure an on-street bay for disabled people and those who are mobility impaired. Because the scheme does not have any specific disabled/wheelchair units, there would not necessarily be a need for such a space which is why officers consider this contribution not to be necessary in this instance.

Cycle Parking

- 41 A total of 20 cycle parking spaces are shown in two storage areas on the drawings submitted, greater than the required minimum provision of 16. Separate provision is indicated for the flats and the houses which will be a more convenient arrangement. Both areas are weatherproof, however the exact details of the type of stand is not provided, this will be subject to a condition

- 42 One of the objections received refers to the additional stress to on-street parking. As

explained above, the travel surveys undertaken show that there is presently capacity. Lack of parking is not considered to be a reason for refusal.

Design issues

- 43 The design on the Crystal Palace Road frontage will remain substantially the same preserving the character of this part of the street. The major changes would occur along the Upland Road Facade. Scale, massing, fenestration and materials are discussed below.

Scale and massing

- 44 A three storey terrace along Upland Road relates well to the urban form in the area taking its lead from the scale of buildings adjacent. The overall bulk and mass are much reduced from the refused scheme and would sit more comfortably in this setting. The form of The Terrace has also been simplified with a consistent height that would result in a more coherent scheme; the previous scheme proposed a reduction in height for House 1 by one storey in comparison to the rest of the terrace.

Fenestration and materials

- 45 A contemporary approach has been taken with the detailed design of The Terrace. The fenestration is shown to have a hierarchy and a good degree of symmetry emphasising the terrace block approach. The mix of traditional brick and more modern materials such as aluminium would provide an urban grain appropriate to its surroundings. Interest is provided on the Upland Road facade by the use of timber cladding and a soldier brick course at first floor level. A simpler approach has been taken for the rear of The Terrace with the same materials. The west elevation of the terrace - facing the rear of the proposed flats - has additional interest with aluminium panels continued from the roof to the ground floor framed on either side by a brick facade with extruded bricks and punctuated by window boxes angled to prevent overlooking. Other works to the flank elevation of 97 Crystal Palace Road facing Upland Road are the installation of a folding door providing access to the southern terrace for Flat 3 and a soldier brick course to a raised parapet in front of the terrace. The latter serving as a continuation of a similar course on The Terrace. Extruded bricks will also add interest to the Upland Road facade of 97 Crystal Palace Road.
- 46 The council's design and conservation team have not objected to the scheme and have advised that this proposal is an improvement on the refused scheme particularly because of the rationalisation of dwelling heights on The Terrace. They have recommended a condition be imposed requiring details of the material to be used for the projecting windows to be provided.

Impact on trees

- 47 Two Cypress trees to the front of the site which are of low quality would be removed to facilitate landscaping works. The impacts of the development on Sycamore north of the site at 95 Crystal Palace Road can be mitigated through a suitable condition. No works to this Sycamore are proposed.

Planning obligations (S.106 undertaking or agreement)

- 48 The proposed development is below the threshold for a contribution under S.106.

Environmental Considerations

Energy

- 49 Low energy design principles have been used in the design of this scheme which include the use of low energy lighting, low U-Values for walls floors and roofs and high

performance glazing. In addition to these, on site renewable energy will be generated through the installation of photo voltaic (PV) and thermal solar panels and air source heat pumps. A 40% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions over the baseline is predicted taking the development to a code for sustainable homes score of 4. A condition is recommended for this rating to be tested post-completion and the results to be provided for approval.

Contaminated land

- 50 A phase 1 desk study has been submitted which has not identified any specific contaminative land uses at the site. Some localised contamination may be present in the made ground and a condition has been recommended to ensure suitable investigation and if required, remediation.

Flood risk

- 51 The site is not in a Flood Risk Zone; no mitigation measures are required.

Wildlife

- 52 A report following an initial bat survey has concluded that the site has a negligible habitat value for bats and that no emergence survey works are necessary. The council's ecologist has advised that the site is close to several known swift roosts and has recommended a condition requiring six swift nesting boxes to be at the site.

Other matters

Density

- 53 The density of the proposed development would be 525 habitable rooms per hectare, greater than the 200-350 range referred to in Strategic Policy 5- Providing new homes of the Core Strategy 2011. Densities above the range may be acceptable if the development achieves an exemplary standard of design. Criteria for exemplary design are presented in the Residential Design Standards SPD and this proposal meets several of these including significantly exceeding the minimum floorspace standards; good sunlight and daylight standards; good accessibility to meet Lifetime Homes standards and good stacking to reduce noise nuisance. On balance, the exceedance of the density standard is considered acceptable. It should be taken into account that this is a relatively modest site where density calculations tend to be higher.

Refuse

A refuse store capable of accommodating 4x180 litre bins for waste and 3x180 litre bins for dry recyclables is proposed at the front of 97 Crystal Palace Road. Recessed bin stores are proposed for each of the houses.

Community infrastructure levy (CIL)

Section 143 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. CIL is payable on the proposed floorspace which comes to a total of 1 303 sq.m equating to a payment of £44,600.

Conclusion on planning issues

- 56 A change of use of this land to residential is acceptable in principle. The proposal would bring back into use a presently unused site, importantly retaining the existing Victorian building. The new row of terrace houses on Upland Road would not result in

unacceptable harm to local amenity and it is considered that the reason for the refusal of the previous scheme has been addressed. The bulk and massing are acceptable in this suburban context and materials proposed are of a suitable quality. It is recommended that planning permission be granted, subject to conditions.

Community impact statement

- 57 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. No adverse impact on groups with the above protected characteristics is envisaged as a result of this decision. The impact on local people is set out above.

Consultations

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

Consultation replies

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

- 60 Summary of consultation responses

2 objections:

- 61 Occupier of 93A Crystal Palace Road

The objection refers to the impact on this resident's amenity from:

- Loss of light, to the garden in particular
- Overlooking and loss of privacy
- Overshadowing.

The objector also feels that the proposal is too dense and would give rise to pressure for on-street parking.

- 62 Response:

The harm to the amenity of 95 Crystal Palace Road has been found to be acceptable, based on the daylight and sunlight report which also includes overshadowing. The impact from the development will diminish to the north and will be reduced at 93A Crystal Palace Road. Thus it is considered that the impact on 93A Crystal Palace Road would not be so harmful as to warrant refusal. Parking surveys undertaken by the applicant's transport consultant indicate that there is presently capacity on the surrounding streets. Coupled with a condition requiring the developer to provide car club membership, the transport effects are not such to warrant refusal.

Occupier of 4 Upland Road

- 63 This objection refers to the impact on parking in the area; impact on sunlight and daylight; noise introduced by the large number of dwellings and the density.

Response:

- 64 The transport assessment has indicated that there is capacity on surrounding streets for on-street parking. There will be no impact on sunlight as the objector lives to the south of the site, the reduction in VSC as provided in the Daylight and Sunlight Report concludes that it would not be noticeable. There may be some noise from additional

dwellings but this is not likely to be significantly above that which already exists. Finally, a development of this density is considered to be acceptable as it meets several of the criteria for exemplary design.

Human rights implications

- 65 This planning application engages certain human rights under the Human Rights Act 2008 (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.
- 66 This application has the legitimate aim of providing nine residential dwellings. 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/2598-97 Application file: 13/AP/3048 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 1778 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	Dipesh Patel, Team leader major applications team	
Version	Final	
Dated	8 January 2014	
Key Decision	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Strategic director of finance and corporate services	No	No
Strategic director of environment and leisure	Yes	No
Strategic director of housing and community services	No	No
Director of regeneration	No	No
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team		9 January 2014

APPENDIX 1

Consultation undertaken

Site notice date: 08/10/2013

Press notice date: N/A

Case officer site visit date: 04/11/13

Neighbour consultation letters sent: 09/10/13

Internal services consulted:

Design and Conservation Team
Transport Planning Team
Environmental Protection Team
Urban Forester
Council Ecologist

Statutory and non-statutory organisations consulted:

Thames Water

Neighbours and local groups consulted:

09/10/2013	UPLAND TAVERN 90 CRYSTAL PALACE ROAD LONDON SE22 9EY
09/10/2013	7 UPLAND ROAD LONDON SE22 9EE
09/10/2013	92A CRYSTAL PALACE ROAD LONDON SE22 9ER
09/10/2013	92B CRYSTAL PALACE ROAD LONDON SE22 9ER
09/10/2013	11 UPLAND ROAD LONDON SE22 9EE
09/10/2013	86B CRYSTAL PALACE ROAD LONDON SE22 9EY
09/10/2013	88 CRYSTAL PALACE ROAD LONDON SE22 9EY
09/10/2013	86A CRYSTAL PALACE ROAD LONDON SE22 9EY
09/10/2013	97 CRYSTAL PALACE ROAD LONDON SE22 9EY
09/10/2013	89 CRYSTAL PALACE ROAD LONDON SE22 9EY
09/10/2013	FIRST FLOOR AND SECOND FLOOR FLAT 5 UPLAND ROAD LONDON SE22 9EE
09/10/2013	91B CRYSTAL PALACE ROAD LONDON SE22 9EY
09/10/2013	9 UPLAND ROAD LONDON SE22 9EE
09/10/2013	GARAGE A REAR OF 11 UPLAND ROAD LONDON SE22 9EE
09/10/2013	GARAGE B REAR OF 11 UPLAND ROAD LONDON SE22 9EE
09/10/2013	91A CRYSTAL PALACE ROAD LONDON SE22 9EY
09/10/2013	REAR OF 1 TO 3 UPLAND ROAD LONDON SE22 9EE
09/10/2013	93B CRYSTAL PALACE ROAD LONDON SE22 9EY
09/10/2013	2A NORTH CROSS ROAD LONDON SE22 9EU
09/10/2013	99A CRYSTAL PALACE ROAD LONDON SE22 9ES
09/10/2013	93A CRYSTAL PALACE ROAD LONDON SE22 9EY
09/10/2013	3 UPLAND ROAD LONDON SE22 9EE
09/10/2013	2A UPLAND ROAD LONDON SE22 9EE
09/10/2013	2B NORTH CROSS ROAD LONDON SE22 9EU
09/10/2013	2C NORTH CROSS ROAD LONDON SE22 9EU
09/10/2013	FLAT 3 10-12 UPLAND ROAD LONDON SE22 9EJ
09/10/2013	FLAT 4 10-12 UPLAND ROAD LONDON SE22 9EJ
09/10/2013	FLAT 1 10-12 UPLAND ROAD LONDON SE22 9EJ
09/10/2013	FLAT 2 10-12 UPLAND ROAD LONDON SE22 9EJ
09/10/2013	FLAT 7 10-12 UPLAND ROAD LONDON SE22 9EJ
09/10/2013	FLAT 8 10-12 UPLAND ROAD LONDON SE22 9EJ
09/10/2013	FLAT 5 10-12 UPLAND ROAD LONDON SE22 9EJ
09/10/2013	FLAT 6 10-12 UPLAND ROAD LONDON SE22 9EJ
09/10/2013	15B UPLAND MEWS UPLAND ROAD LONDON SE22 9EE
09/10/2013	8B UPLAND ROAD LONDON SE22 9EE

09/10/2013 9 UPLAND MEWS UPLAND ROAD LONDON SE22 9EE
09/10/2013 13 UPLAND MEWS UPLAND ROAD LONDON SE22 9EE
09/10/2013 FLAT 1 92 CRYSTAL PALACE ROAD LONDON SE22 9ER
09/10/2013 3A UPLAND ROAD LONDON SE22 9EE
09/10/2013 7A UPLAND ROAD LONDON SE22 9EE
09/10/2013 4 UPLAND ROAD LONDON SE22 9EE
09/10/2013 6 UPLAND ROAD LONDON SE22 9EE
09/10/2013 101 CRYSTAL PALACE ROAD LONDON SE22 9ES
09/10/2013 99 CRYSTAL PALACE ROAD LONDON SE22 9ES
09/10/2013 94 CRYSTAL PALACE ROAD LONDON SE22 9ER
09/10/2013 1C UPLAND ROAD LONDON SE22 9EE
09/10/2013 1 UPLAND ROAD LONDON SE22 9EE
09/10/2013 1B UPLAND ROAD LONDON SE22 9EE
09/10/2013 2 UPLAND ROAD LONDON SE22 9EE
09/10/2013 LIVING ACCOMMODATION 90 CRYSTAL PALACE ROAD LONDON SE22 9EY
09/10/2013 8A UPLAND ROAD LONDON SE22 9EE

APPENDIX 2

Consultation responses received

Internal services

Design and Conservation Team
Transport Planning Team
Urban Forester
Council Ecologist

All comments received are referred to in the main body of the report.

Statutory and non-statutory organisations

Thames Water- No objections and request that an informative be placed on the decision notice.

Neighbours and local groups

Objections from residents of 93A Crystal Palace Road and 4 Upland Road.