

<b>Item No.</b> 7.4	<b>Classification:</b> OPEN	<b>Date:</b> 9 September 2014	<b>Meeting Name:</b> Planning Sub-Committee A
<b>Report title:</b>	<b>Development Management planning application:</b> Application 11-AP-0290 for: Full Planning Permission  <b>Address:</b> 13 RADNOR ROAD, LONDON SE15 6UR  <b>Proposal:</b> Erection of rear ground and first floor extensions and conversion to form two x two-bedroom and one x two-bedroom self contained residential units (three units in total).		
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>	Livesey		
<b>From:</b>	Head of Development Management		
<b>Application Start Date</b> 30/01/2011		<b>Application Expiry Date</b> 27/03/2011	

## RECOMMENDATION

- 1 That the application is referred back to Members for decision following a deferral; and that Members grant planning permission subject to Condition.

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2 This application was previously considered by the Peckham Community Council on 17 March 2011 and was deferred for the applicant to provide the following additional information:
  - Daylight / sunlight assessment
  - Traffic and parking survey
  - Arboricultural assessment

The requested information has subsequently been provided by the applicant, and further consultation has been carried out with neighbouring residents. The following report considers the merits of the proposals in the light of the additional information and current development plan policies.

### Site location and description

- 3 The application site contains an existing two storey dwelling at the end of a terrace of properties located to the eastern end of Radnor Road. The surrounding area is characterised by two storey houses and blocks of flats rising to five storeys in height. The application site benefits from a large area of rear garden ground in comparison to other dwellings within the locality.
- 4 The site is bounded to the north by the adjoining dwelling, to the east by the rear garden ground of the dwellings on Peckham Park Road and the flatted dwellings of Henslow House, to the south by an access road and the flatted dwellings of Rudbeck

House and bounded to the west by Radnor Road.

- 5 The building is not listed or within a conservation area. There is however a Grade II listed terrace to the rear of the site on Peckham Park Road.

### **Details of proposal**

- 6 The proposal under consideration is for the erection of rear ground and first floor extensions and conversion to form 2 x 2 bedroom and 1 x 2 bedroom self contained flats (3 units in total). The proposed flat and room size are as follows:

<b><u>Flat / Room</u></b>	<b><u>Internal Space</u></b>
<b>Flat 1 Total (2b/4p)</b>	<b>63sqm</b>
Bedroom 1	14sqm
Bedroom 2	14sqm
Combined Living and Kitchen	25sqm
Bathroom / WC	4sqm
<b>Flat 2 Total (1b/2p)</b>	<b>50sqm</b>
Bedroom 1	12sqm
Ensuite	4sqm
Combined Living and Kitchen	24sqm
W/C	3sqm
<b>Flat 3 Total (2b/4p)</b>	<b>59sqm</b>
Bedroom 1	13.5sqm
Bedroom 2	13sqm
Ensuite	4sqm
Combined Living and Kitchen	24sqm

- 7 The existing dwelling occupies a triangular shaped site and this is reflected in the shape of the existing dwellinghouse. There is an existing single storey rear wing to the dwellinghouse, a feature repeated on many of the dwellings within the locality. The proposed extensions would be located along the boundaries on either side of the rear wing. The rear wing itself would be increased in height to two storey with another two storey extension along a small portion of the southern boundary.
- 8 The proposed extension would extend 3.0 metres along the northern boundary, 2.0 metres of which would be two storey in height immediately adjoining the dwellinghouse. Along the southern boundary the proposed extension would project 3.0 metres from the existing dwellinghouse, 0.6 metres of which would be two storey in height immediately adjoining the dwellinghouse. The rear wing itself would only be extended in height and would not be subject to an increase in footprint.

### **Planning history**

- 9 Planning permission was previously granted in 2007 (07/AP/1794) for a similar development, containing three units, to that now proposed. However, that permission was not implemented and expired in 2010.
- 10 An earlier application (06/AP/1071) for larger extensions and conversion into three dwellings (larger than now proposed) was refused in 2006 for the following reasons:

*1) The excessive scale, height, bulk and mass of the proposed extensions in relation to the adjoining property at no. 11 Radnor Road would represent an oppressive form of development that would result in an increased sense of enclosure and loss of*

*outlook detrimental to the residential amenities of the adjoining occupiers.*

*2) The proposed development by virtue of its height, bulk and location on the common boundary with the access road into the estate is considered to constitute an overbearing and disproportionate structure creating a hostile environment to the detriment of the amenity of immediately adjoining occupiers and pedestrians using the access way.*

*3) The proposed part two part single storey rear extension adjacent to the boundary with the side access road would result in the loss of two trees which are considered to contribute to the visual amenity of the area.*

*4) The proposed development would result in the provision of a poor quality living environment to the ground floor unit (flat 2) due to the height, siting and proximity of the proposed extensions, resulting in a sense of enclosure and limited outlook to the main living area of the flat.*

*5) The proposed extensions would fail to respect and preserve the existing pattern of development within the area by extending almost to the rear boundary line of the property.*

### **Planning history of adjoining sites**

- 11 There is no planning history of relevance at adjoining sites.

### **KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

#### **Summary of main issues**

- 12 The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:
- a) The principle of the development in terms of land use and conformity with strategic policies;
  - b) The impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, as well as the surrounding built form, including impact on existing trees.
  - c) The impact of the proposal on neighbouring residential amenity; and
  - d) Transport and parking issues.

#### **Planning policy**

- 13 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2012

Section 4: 'Promoting sustainable transport

Section 6: 'Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes'

Section 7: 'Requiring good design'

Section 10: 'Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change'

- 14 London Plan 2011

Policy 3.3 Increasing housing supply

Policy 3.4 Optimising housing potential

Policy 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments

Policy 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions

Policy 6.9 Cycling

Policy 6.10 Walking

Policy 7.4 Local character

Policy 7.5 Public realm

## Policy 7.6 Architecture

### 15 Core Strategy 2011

Strategic Policy 1 - Sustainable Development  
Strategic Policy 2 - Sustainable Transport  
Strategic Policy 5 - Providing New Homes  
Strategic Policy 12 - Design and Conservation  
Strategic Policy 13 - High environmental standards

### 16 Southwark Plan 2007

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 4.3 - Mix of Dwellings

Residential Design Standards - Supplementary Planning Document 2011

#### **Principle of development**

- 17 The application site is located within an established residential area and the host building has a lawful residential use. The application property has a net original internal floor area that exceeds the Council's minimum threshold of 130 sq.m and therefore the conversion to provide self contained flats is acceptable in principle.
- 18 As noted above, the application was referred to the Peckham Community Council on 17 March 2011, who requested further information including a daylight/sunlight study, a traffic study and arboricultural study on an existing tree. This information was provided to the Council on 19 February 2014 and due to the long response period for this requested information, a 14 day period of reconsultation was commenced by notifying all surrounding residents. During this process a petition including 17 signatures was received by the council, citing the issues of noise, parking and daylight.
- 19 It is also noted that a similar development was permitted in 2007, though has subsequently expired. Whilst the fact that the council has previously found the same form of development to be acceptable is relevant, it remains necessary to carefully consider the proposal against the current development plan taking into consideration representations received from local residents.

#### **Environmental impact assessment**

- 20 Given the modest size of the proposed development, it does not meet the criteria which would trigger the requirement for an environmental impact assessment. However, the local impacts are considered below.

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

- 21 It is considered that the proposed development would not have a significant adverse impact on adjoining occupiers in so far as privacy is concerned and would not intensify existing levels of overlooking to any significant degree. Furthermore, all the additional windows proposed as part of this development would look directly into the rear garden ground. No additional windows have been proposed on the side elevations of the new development at either ground or first floor levels.

- 22 It is not considered that a tunnelling effect will be created by the proposed development in terms of the adjoining occupier at 11 Radnor Road as the extension will only extend 3.0 metres along this boundary and only 2.0 metres of this will be two storey in height, also avoiding a sense of enclosure.
- 23 With regards to impacts on light, there would be a minimal loss of daylight/sunlight to the adjoining dwelling at 11 Radnor Road with rooms likely to be affected being a bathroom and kitchen. It is not considered that the rear garden ground of the dwelling at 11 Radnor Road would experience a detrimental loss of daylight or sunlight, nor would it experience overshadowing detrimental to the amenity of the occupiers, largely as a result of the limited size of the development and the orientation of the adjoining application site. The proposal has also been significantly reduced in height from that previously refused ensuring that the current level of amenity enjoyed by adjoining occupiers would be safeguarded. A daylight and sunlight assessment has been submitted by the applicant which confirms that the proposal would have an insignificant impact on 11 Radnor Road, its impact has been assessed based on the adjoining property's close proximity to the proposed extension. The impact on window 1 on the ground floor is marginally below the recommendations of BRE guidelines, however calculations demonstrate general compliance with these guidelines.
- 24 In terms of outlook, the applicant has significantly reduced the height and depth of the rear extension from the previously refused scheme. This reduction would offset the minimal loss in outlook that would be experienced by the occupants of 11 Radnor Road. Additionally the improvements to the rear of the application dwelling, which currently consists of several extensions of varying design and quality and which has fallen into a considerable state of disrepair would be significantly improved by the proposed works. The outlook from No 11 Radnor Road would be typical of many properties in the street and would not significantly adversely affect the amenity of the current occupiers.
- 25 The proposed extension along the southern boundary would have no adverse impact on the occupiers of the neighbouring block of flats at Rudbeck House. The application site bounds an access road to the flats and the existing wall is just over two metres in height. The proposed extension would increase the height of a small portion of this wall to around 5.5 metres because of the two storey extension. Given the fact that this is principally a vehicular access and is bounded on the opposite side by a five storey block of flats, it is not considered that the proposed raising of the boundary wall would create a more hostile environment than that of the existing situation.
- 26 The current proposal is the same as that which was granted permission in 2007 and unlike the refused scheme in 2006, the proposed extension would not extend as far along the boundary as was previously proposed and the two trees situated within the rear garden of the application site along this boundary would remain. The increase of the wall height would not create any adverse impact on the adjoining occupiers and would have no significant impact terms of daylight or sunlight. There was a previously held concern that the increase in wall height along the southern boundary would result in a dark walkway being created, however the reduced length of the extension along this boundary would ensure that this does not occur.

#### **Impact of adjacent land uses on proposed residential**

- 26 It is unlikely that adjoining or nearby occupiers would have a negative impact on the proposed development as the proposed use is compatible with the existing residential use which is predominant in the area.

## **Transport issues**

- 27 It is unlikely that proposed development would have any adverse impact in terms of increased traffic generation. The application site has a relatively low PTAL rating of 2 however the site is within easy access of several bus routes on Peckham High Street and Peckham Park Road. Cycle storage would be provided for all the units within the development, ensuring that it is accessible to all occupiers. However the cycle storage would be located within the rear garden ground of the application site and as such cycles will require to be moved through the individual units in order to be parked. In this instance, the cycle storage is acceptable given the terraced character of the existing dwelling and the problems that would be created through forming an access on the southern boundary. In addition cycle storage has been provided for the first floor dwelling, which would not have access to the rear garden ground, within storage space on the ground floor beneath the stairway.
- 28 The applicant has submitted a traffic and parking survey which demonstrates that the surrounding road network has sufficient capacity to accommodate additional vehicle movements resulting from the proposed development. The report also demonstrates that the existing road network has existing capacity to accommodate any additional car parking resulting from the proposal. Due to the size of the units proposed, the applicant is not required to provide additional off-street car parking spaces. Radnor Road is not within a controlled parking zone and therefore a condition restricting the issuing of additional parking permits is not required in this instance.

## **Design issues**

- 29 The design of the proposed extensions relate to the shape of the application site and host dwelling which form an awkward triangular shape. Whilst the extensions are sizeable, extending further into the rear garden than the rear projections of neighbouring dwellings, they will appear as subordinate to the existing dwelling. Located within the large rear garden, the extensions will not appear as cramped within the site and will not result in adverse impacts upon either the appearance of the existing dwelling or the wider visual amenities of the surrounding area. Furthermore, the proposed development would restore a sense of symmetry and uniformity to the appearance of the rear elevation of the dwellinghouse.
- 30 The materials proposed are generally consistent with those of the existing dwellinghouse and the extensions are considered to be appropriate in terms of design, scale and massing.

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

- 31 The application property is not in a conservation area neither is it adjacent to one, therefore no impact has been identified. However the application property backs onto a terrace of listed properties on Peckham Park Road and therefore regard must be had for the likely impact the application proposal would have on the setting and character of the listed building. As the listed buildings benefit from fairly long gardens with a separating distance of some 65 metres and the fact that the proposed extension is of a reasonable size, 3m in length with a first floor extension 2m deep, it is unlikely to have a detrimental impact and therefore the setting of the listed buildings would be preserved.

## **Quality of Residential Accommodation and Suitability for Occupation**

### General

- 32 All of the proposed units would be dual aspect with each room having a generous size

window to allow for the penetration of natural light. There is a concern that bedroom one on the ground floor would receive limited light as a result of the two storey extension immediately adjacent. However this window faces approximately east north east and should therefore receive an adequate amount of daylight given the fact that the upper storey of the rear wing will be set back from the rear building line, allowing an adequate amount of light to penetrate.

#### Internal Space

- 33 The proposed one bedroom unit would be compliant with the internal space requirements of the Residential Design Standards SPD and would therefore provide a suitable form of accommodation for future residents. The proposed two bedroom flats would have a maximum occupancy of 4 persons as each bedroom would exceed the internal space standards for a double room. The Residential Design Standards SPD requires a minimum internal area of 70sqm for a 2 bedroom, 4 person unit. Each of the proposed units would fall below this standard with a proposed accommodation of 63sqm and 59sqm respectively.
- 33 Although the proposed overall proposed internal space for these units falls short of the requirement, each of the bedrooms complies with the minimum standard of 12sqm for a double room and both living/kitchen areas meet the minimum requirement of 24sqm. It should also be noted that each of the two bedroom dwellings are likely to be used by 2 or 3 people and in this instance, the Residential Design Standards SPD requires only 61sqm of internal space, of which the proposal would generally comply. Reconfiguring the internal layout of the 2 bedroom units to make one of the double bedrooms into a single would allow the proposal to comply with the standards, however this would not result in an increase in overall useable space. Therefore such an amendment to the proposed scheme would be unnecessary. There is less scope for the proposal to comply with overall minimum internal space standards due to it being the conversion of an existing building, which is located on an unusually shaped plot. The existing building is restricted and not as flexible in providing compliant overall flat sizes as a new-build scheme.
- 34 Furthermore, the need to provide for quality residential accommodation needs to be balanced with the need for the efficient use of land and to provide new homes in accordance with Section 6 of the NPPF, Policy 3.3 of the London Plan, Strategic Policy 5 of the Core Strategy and Saved Policy 3.11 of the Southwark Plan. As discussed above, the proposed rooms would all meet the standards of the Residential Design Standards SPD with adequate circulation areas and generous amenity space and therefore the quality of the accommodation is considered to be adequate. In addition, the proposal would provide for additional accommodation for residents whilst making the most efficient use of a brownfield site. It is considered that the proposed units provide a satisfactory standard of residential accommodation and it is not considered that the non-compliance with the overall internal space standards is a sufficient justification to withhold consent.

#### Amenity Space

- 35 Generous levels of amenity space have been provided for two of the three units. Flat 1 on the ground floor would have access to a private 115sqm garden to the rear of the building and Flat 2, also on the ground floor would have access to a private 80sqm garden. The two bedroom flat on the first floor will have no access to amenity space largely due to the constraints of the site and the design of the original dwellinghouse, however there is sufficient public open space within the area to alleviate this problem including the Surrey Canal MOL are which is a 250m walk from the application site and the Community Centre which is a 170m walk

### **Impact on trees**

- 36 There was a mature tree in the rear garden of the property. However, during the application process, this tree was removed. It was advised by the applicant, via the arboricultural assessment that the trees removal was due to its continued decay and for pedestrian safety. Given the loss of this tree, a condition is recommended requiring the planting of a suitably sited replacement tree within the rear garden area which will be of benefit to the visual amenities of the area. There are no other trees which would be affected by the proposed development.

### **Planning obligations (S.106 undertaking or agreement)**

- 37 The proposal raises no S106 issues.

### **Sustainable development implications**

- 38 The development would make efficient use of this site in a sustainable location in reasonable walking distance of shops, services and public transport. Given the modest size of the proposal, converting and extending an existing building, it is not considered appropriate to impose a condition requiring Code for Sustainable Homes adherence.

### **Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)**

- 39 The proposal involves the subdivision of an existing dwelling as well as extensions to the original building and therefore the application is liable for CIL. Although the application was submitted in 2011, prior to the implementation of the Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy, the liability for CIL is based on the date the application is determined. An increase in floor space of 57.6sqm is proposed which equates to a CIL Liability of £2,124.

### **Other matters**

- 40 As part of the consultation process, issues regarding damage to foundations, vermin, antisocial behaviour were raised as points of objection. However these are not material planning considerations and as such are not addressed within this report. All other points of objection are provided below and are addressed within the main body of this report.

### **Conclusion on planning issues**

- 41 In conclusion, the conversion of the property to self contained flats together with two storey rear extension is acceptable in principle. There are no significant impacts arising with regards to residential amenity for the reasons explained in preceding paragraphs and the design of the proposal is considered to be acceptable. Furthermore, the modest development would not result in significant impacts on local highway conditions including parking. The application proposes the same form of development to the permission granted in October 2007, which in the light of current Development Plan policies, and taking account representations received from neighbouring properties is concluded to be acceptable. It is recommended therefore that planning permission is granted subject to conditions.

### **Community impact statement**

- 42 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.

### **Consultations**

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

### **Consultation replies**

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

- 45 Summary of consultation responses

1 Radnor Road - object on grounds of parking congestion on the street. Also raised objection on non planning related issues with regards to noise and anti social behavior from the house, pest infestation and filth in the existing property.

**Officer Response** - The applicant submitted a Parking Survey which is addressed in the Transport Issues section of this report.

4 Radnor Road - object on grounds of parking congestion on Radnor Road.

**Officer Response** - The applicant submitted a Parking Survey which is addressed in the Transport Issues section of this report.

5 Radnor Road - Object on grounds of dust, noise and disturbance. Also raised objection on non planning related issue with regards to pest infestation in the existing property.

**Officer Response** - The construction of the proposal would be required to adhere to strict environmental standards.

7 Radnor Road - object on grounds of lack of hygiene, refuse and non planning related issue with regards to noise and filth in the existing property.

**Officer Response** - A Refuse storage area have been provided.

8 Radnor Road - object on grounds of increased traffic, refuse and potential pest infestation as currently experienced with the existing house.

**Officer Response** - The applicant submitted a Parking Survey which is addressed in the Transport Issues section of this report.

9 Radnor Road - object on grounds of noise, potential damage to foundations during construction works, increased parking and traffic congestion, dust and debris during construction will impact on health. Also raised objection on non planning related issue with regards to pest infestation in the existing house.

**Officer Response** - The applicant submitted a Parking Survey which is addressed in the Transport Issues section of this report. The construction of the proposal would be required to adhere to strict environmental standards.

11 Radnor Road - object on grounds of loss of outlook, loss of light, increased parking congestion, noise and disturbance, refuse. Also object on non planning related issue with regards to pest infestation and over-crowding in the existing house.

**Officer Response** - Issues of loss of outlook and light is addressed in the Amenity section of this report. The applicant submitted a Parking Survey which is addressed in

the Transport Issues section of this report.

18 Radnor Road - object on grounds of increased parking congestion. Also object on grounds of non planning related issues with regards to pest infestation and anti-social behaviour from the existing house.

**Officer Response** - The applicant submitted a Parking Survey which is addressed in the Transport Issues section of this report.

4 Rubeck House, Radnor Road - object on grounds of loss of light and increased parking congestion. Also object on non planning related issue with regards to noise and anti-social behaviour from the existing house.

**Officer Response** - Issues of loss of light is addressed in the Amenity section of this report. The applicant submitted a Parking Survey which is addressed in the Transport Issues section of this report.

5 Rubeck House, Radnor Road - object on grounds of increased parking congestion and refuse. Also object on grounds of non planning related issue with regards to noise and anti-social behaviour from the existing house.

**Officer Response** - The applicant submitted a Parking Survey which is addressed in the Transport Issues section of this report. The applicant has provided for a refuse storage area at the front of the property.

Hyde Housing Association - object on behalf of 11 Radnor Road on grounds of light infringement, increased levels of occupancy in the property will lead to increased parking congestion.

**Officer Response** - Issues of loss of outlook and light is addressed in the Amenity section of this report. The applicant submitted a Parking Survey which is addressed in the Transport Issues section of this report.

16 Radnor Road - object on grounds that noise, dust and dirt pollution and parking congestion. Also object on non planning related issue with regards to pest infestation in the existing house and if the proposed development were to go ahead such infestation will affect other properties along the street.

**Officer Response** - The construction of the proposal would be required to adhere to strict environmental standards. The applicant submitted a Parking Survey which is addressed in the Transport Issues section of this report.

A petition with 17 signatures was received as part of the reconsulation process. The issues of noise, parking and daylight were raised.

**Officer Response** - The applicant submitted a Parking Survey which is addressed in the Transport Issues section of this report. Issues of loss of light is addressed in the Amenity section of this report.

### **Human rights implications**

- 46 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.
- 47 This application has the legitimate aim of providing 2x2 bedroom and 1 x2 bedroom self contained flats (3 units in total). 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/2755-13 Application file: 11-AP-0290 Southwark Local Development Framework and Development Plan Documents	Regeneration and Neighbourhoods Department 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2TZ	Planning enquiries telephone: 020 7525 5403 Planning enquiries email: <a href="mailto:planning.enquiries@southwark.gov.uk">planning.enquiries@southwark.gov.uk</a> Case officer telephone: 020 7525 5428 Council website: <a href="http://www.southwark.gov.uk">www.southwark.gov.uk</a>

## APPENDICES

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

## AUDIT TRAIL

<b>Lead Officer</b>	Gary Rice, Head of Development Management	
<b>Report Author</b>	Joel Turner, Planning Officer	
<b>Version</b>	Final	
<b>Dated</b>	27 August 2014	
<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 Communities, Law and Governance	No	No
Strategic Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods	No	No
Strategic Director of Environment and Housing	No	No
Director Of Regeneration	No	No
<b>Date final report sent to Constitutional Team</b>	27 August 2014	

# APPENDIX 1

## Consultation undertaken

**Site notice date:** 11 February 2011

**Press notice date:** Not required

**Case officer site visit date:** 11 February 2011

**Neighbour consultation letters sent:** 11 February 2011

**Internal services consulted:**

**Conservation and Design  
Transport Group**

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

**Not required**

**Neighbours and local groups consulted:**

11/02/2011 FLAT 4 HENSLOW HOUSE LINDLEY ESTATE PECKHAM PARK ROAD LONDON SE15 6UP  
11/02/2011 FLAT 3 HENSLOW HOUSE LINDLEY ESTATE PECKHAM PARK ROAD LONDON SE15 6UP  
11/02/2011 FLAT 5 HENSLOW HOUSE LINDLEY ESTATE PECKHAM PARK ROAD LONDON SE15 6UP  
11/02/2011 FLAT 7 HENSLOW HOUSE LINDLEY ESTATE PECKHAM PARK ROAD LONDON SE15 6UP  
11/02/2011 FLAT 6 HENSLOW HOUSE LINDLEY ESTATE PECKHAM PARK ROAD LONDON SE15 6UP  
11/02/2011 124A PECKHAM PARK ROAD LONDON SE15 6UZ  
11/02/2011 122B PECKHAM PARK ROAD LONDON SE15 6UZ  
11/02/2011 124B PECKHAM PARK ROAD LONDON SE15 6UZ  
11/02/2011 FLAT 2 HENSLOW HOUSE LINDLEY ESTATE PECKHAM PARK ROAD LONDON SE15 6UP  
11/02/2011 FLAT 1 HENSLOW HOUSE LINDLEY ESTATE PECKHAM PARK ROAD LONDON SE15 6UP  
11/02/2011 FLAT 8 HENSLOW HOUSE LINDLEY ESTATE PECKHAM PARK ROAD LONDON SE15 6UP  
11/02/2011 FLAT 7 RUDBECK HOUSE LINDLEY ESTATE RADNOR ROAD LONDON SE15 6UT  
11/02/2011 FLAT 6 RUDBECK HOUSE LINDLEY ESTATE RADNOR ROAD LONDON SE15 6UT  
11/02/2011 FLAT 8 RUDBECK HOUSE LINDLEY ESTATE RADNOR ROAD LONDON SE15 6UT  
11/02/2011 FLAT 2 RUDBECK HOUSE LINDLEY ESTATE RADNOR ROAD LONDON SE15 6UT  
11/02/2011 FLAT 1 RUDBECK HOUSE LINDLEY ESTATE RADNOR ROAD LONDON SE15 6UT  
11/02/2011 FLAT 3 RUDBECK HOUSE LINDLEY ESTATE RADNOR ROAD LONDON SE15 6UT  
11/02/2011 FLAT 5 RUDBECK HOUSE LINDLEY ESTATE RADNOR ROAD LONDON SE15 6UT  
11/02/2011 FLAT 4 RUDBECK HOUSE LINDLEY ESTATE RADNOR ROAD LONDON SE15 6UT  
11/02/2011 122A PECKHAM PARK ROAD LONDON SE15 6UZ  
11/02/2011 16 RADNOR ROAD LONDON SE15 6UR  
11/02/2011 14 RADNOR ROAD LONDON SE15 6UR  
11/02/2011 18 RADNOR ROAD LONDON SE15 6UR  
11/02/2011 20 RADNOR ROAD LONDON SE15 6UR

11/02/2011 2 RADNOR ROAD LONDON SE15 6UR  
11/02/2011 10 RADNOR ROAD LONDON SE15 6UR  
11/02/2011 1 RADNOR ROAD LONDON SE15 6UR  
11/02/2011 11 RADNOR ROAD LONDON SE15 6UR  
11/02/2011 13 RADNOR ROAD LONDON SE15 6UR  
11/02/2011 12 RADNOR ROAD LONDON SE15 6UR  
11/02/2011 22 RADNOR ROAD LONDON SE15 6UR  
11/02/2011 9 RADNOR ROAD LONDON SE15 6UR  
11/02/2011 8 RADNOR ROAD LONDON SE15 6UR  
11/02/2011 118 PECKHAM PARK ROAD LONDON SE15 6UZ  
11/02/2011 120B PECKHAM PARK ROAD LONDON SE15 6UZ  
11/02/2011 120A PECKHAM PARK ROAD LONDON SE15 6UZ  
11/02/2011 4 RADNOR ROAD LONDON SE15 6UR  
11/02/2011 3 RADNOR ROAD LONDON SE15 6UR  
11/02/2011 5 RADNOR ROAD LONDON SE15 6UR  
11/02/2011 7 RADNOR ROAD LONDON SE15 6UR  
11/02/2011 6 RADNOR ROAD LONDON SE15 6UR  
20/06/1837 181 Lewisham High Street London SE13 6AA

**Re-consultation:**

Reconsultation letters were sent to the above properties on 06/03/2014.

## **APPENDIX 2**

### **Consultation responses received**

#### **Internal services**

Conservation and Design - comments incorporated into the body of the report  
Transport Group - no objections raised

#### **Statutory and non-statutory organisations**

None

#### **Neighbours and local groups**

The points of objection raised during both the consultation and reconsultation process are addressed within the 'Summary of Consultation Responses' section of this report.