

Objector Reference	Rep-resentation Reference	Reasons	Changes	Officer Comments
1 Jack Scherer	1	The proposals seem a reasonable planning brief that does not detract from the amenities or value of 276 Camberwell Road and allows reasonable freedom for re-development of the area. Personally I would judge that single terrace similar in height and appearance to that opposite would benefit the area. However I doubt that will occur unless part of a larger development as once explored by Sainsbury's development team.	As stated.	Noted.
2 Alex Hurst	2	I support the brief.	As stated.	Noted.

<p>3 Southwark Pensioners Centre</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Our comments would be as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) that we support the comments and proposals outlined, ii) we would add the following comments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the area is characterised by very high levels of noise (principally traffic) - the presence of two late-night drinking clubs is detrimental to the interests of residents and visitors to the area, with noise and safety concerns, and rubbish - there is a lack of metered on-street parking in the area, and arguably an excess of permit-restricted parking in Medlar Street. The very welcome disabled bays are often victim to illegal parking. <p>Hoping these comments are relevant and can be borne in mind, we thank you for this opportunity to comment.</p>	<p>As stated.</p>	<p>Noted. The brief emphasises that any new development would need to ensure that the amenities of residents can be protected.</p> <p>Any parking provision should be provided on site. Parking permits would not be issued in the case that redevelopment results in the provision of additional units.</p>
---	----------	--	-------------------	--

<p>4 Camberwell Society</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>The Society supports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The objectives and aspirations set out in Section 3; - The mix of land uses; - The mix of dwellings sought; - The requirement for high quality design and the requirement for a design statement; - The principles of the parking and transport strategy. 	<p>The Society has the following specific comments:</p> <p>Section 3 - Insert the qualifier "small businesses" after "active frontages";</p> <p>8 - Should emphasise the overriding concern for a high quality design response and preservation/enhancement of Conservation Area;</p> <p>8.1 - The proviso that the amenities of occupiers of any nearby residential flats should be protected should be strengthened.</p> <p>8.3 - The requirement for high quality design should be placed at the start of the paragraph;</p> <p>8.2 - The final sentence does not make sense as all dwellings should be fully accessible;</p> <p>8.3 - The requirement for sustainable design and construction methods and "where feasible" deleted.</p> <p>8.4 - Requirement for secure and covered parking should be strengthened and "where physical constraints allow" deleted.</p>	<p>The support is noted.</p> <p>With reference to the comments:</p> <p>Section 3 - The reference to small businesses is noted. To specify which businesses could be suitable would go beyond the scope of a planning brief. Section 1 of the brief states that should existing occupiers be displaced by development, the Council will assist them in finding new premises.</p> <p>8.1 - The brief states very clearly that the amenities of residents should be protected. This is also required by adopted and emerging policy. The suggested amendment would serve no purpose.</p> <p>8.3 - The requirement for high quality design which preserves or enhances the consevation area is referred to twice in para. 8.3 and is also one of the the two objectives in section 3. A further reference to high quality design would serve no purpose and would require a re-write of section 8.3</p> <p>8.2, 8.3 and 8.4 - The brief has been reworded to accord with emerging policies, as set out in the proposes pre-inquiry modifications.</p>
--	----------	--	--	---