

DULWICH COMMUNITY COUNCIL REPORTS

Item No.	Classification: Open	Date: June 3 2009	Meeting Name: Dulwich Community Council
Report title:		Dulwich Supplementary Planning Document – further comments on representations received so far and key issues to discuss	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		This covers East Dulwich, Village and College wards as well as the area to the west of Peckham Rye.	
From:		Alison Squires, Planning Policy Team Leader	

KEY ISSUES TO DISCUSS

At the Dulwich Community Council on the 1 April 2009, the Chair agreed that Planning Policy would feedback on comments received up to the 18 May on the Dulwich SPD. Two comments were received: from the Dulwich Society and Burbage Road Residents Association. These comments are tabled below, with initial officer comments on the comments received.

The main issues to discuss at the Dulwich Community Council, arising from these comments and from discussions at the previous Dulwich Community Council are:

1. Specific sites, including:
 - a. Dulwich Police Station
 - b. Velodrome site
 - c. Dulwich Hospital
 - d. S G Smith site
 - e. Kings College site
2. The area covered by the SPD and whether it should follow the DCC boundary
3. Lordship Lane shops and frontage class percentages
4. Urban/suburban densities
5. The description of the Dulwich area
6. The threshold for subdivision of large houses into flats.
7. Paving over drives and the links to flooding
8. Traffic congestion
9. The links to the Core Strategy

COMMENTS RECEIVED

This is a summary of comments received from the Dulwich Society and Burbage Road Residents Association and our initial observations on the comments.

1. Dulwich Society

COMMENT RECEIVED	PLANNING POLICY RESPONSE
Section 2.2 The SPD should be amended to recognise that East Dulwich does not fall within the Dulwich Estate	The SPD can be changed to reflect this.
Section 2.2 (paragraph 2) should be amended to state that the Dulwich Estate also requires a licence "for the removal or cutting back of trees, the alterations to the design of front and rear gardens and the installation of front drives"	The SPD can be changed to reflect this.

Section 2.3 reference to overground trains is negative and there is no distinction between East Dulwich (which is well served by public transport) and other parts of Dulwich	The SPD can be changed to reflect this
Section 3.1 the reference to buildings of up to ten storeys should be removed	This has already been removed from the SPD after Planning Committee.
Section 3.5 needs to take into account the considerable flooding problems experienced in parts of Dulwich and any new development should seek to minimise additional load on the existing drainage system	Comments to follow at Dulwich Community Council based on changes to the General Permitted Development Order. The Core Strategy and Sustainable Design and Construction SPD also covers drainage.
Section 3.6 the sentence "development might be appropriate to upgrade or improve buildings on site or provide new facilities to ensure the viability of the site in exceptional circumstances" should be replaced with "refurbishment will be appropriate to upgrade or improve buildings on site but should be restricted to the existing built area on the site"	This could be changed to say both of this.
Section 3.8 There should be protection against the demolition of existing medium sized properties on large sites and replacement with larger properties	This could be changed in the SPD.
Section 3.9 Paragraph 2 is inaccurate and requires clarification regarding the Schools for the Future programme	Officers will seek further clarification on this.
Section 3.9 should refer to the large number of private sports clubs in the area and the fact that several of the public schools allow local residents to use their sports facilities	This could be changed in the SPD
Section 3.10 should refer specifically to the problem with congestion linked to private schools in the area. New development proposals should require a green travel plan	. The SPD already considers schools specifically however the SPD could be amended to state the requirement for a green travel plan to be submitted with any new proposal.
Section 3.13 should encourage proposals that will integrate the Kingswood Estate area into Dulwich as a whole	The SPD could be changed to reflect this.
Section 3.15 (paragraph 2) should be changed to say "Any proposals for this site should only be ancillary to its use as a venue for cycling. Any development should be restricted to the current built area on the site, reflecting the site's Metropolitan Open Land status in the Southwark Plan. In addition any development proposals should not have a negative impact on the residential amenity of the existing surrounding properties. New buildings should be of good design and generally restricted to a single storey."	This could be made more clear in the SPD, that the development must be ancillary to the use of the site as a velodrome and that development must be linked to this.
S G Smith Site should be considered as an opportunity site in the SPD for redevelopment that is primarily residential with emphasis on the possibility of providing sheltered accommodation for the elderly	Officers will look into including this site. More information to be obtained on this site.
The SPD should also restrict redevelopment of the Kings College Site to residential or educational uses once Kings College leave	Officers will look into including this site. More information to be obtained on this site.

2. Burbage Road Residents Association

COMMENT RECEIVED	PLANNING POLICY RESPONSE
It is beyond the expressed purpose of the SPD to anticipate a specific future proposal for the Herne Hill Velodrome site therefore the sentence in section 3.15 "Proposals for this site could include a health or leisure facility with ancillary offices and hospitality uses" should be deleted	It could be made more clear in the SPD that all uses will be ancillary and linked to the main use as a velodrome and as Metropolitan Open Space
Section 3.15 should make clear that any proposed development with additional functions on the site must satisfy Policy 1.8 and 5.1 of the Southwark Plan. In particular it should be stated that development will not be permitted unless a need can be demonstrated and the site is accessible by a choice of means of transport.	The SPD could be amended to reflect this.
The Herne Hill Velodrome site has a low PTAL and therefore the SPD should state that a sustainability assessment will be required that sets out how sustainable transport options will be available for site users	All planning applications must submit of sustainability assessment that will consider the impacts of the proposed development on traffic and parking in the area. This could be set out in the SPD.
The SPD wording should be amended to reflect the principles of development on the site in relation to MOL	The SPD could be amended to reflect this.
The proposal to "increase footpaths and cycleways from the site into the surrounding areas" is inconsistent with advice in Southwark's Designing Out Crime	. Improving links between the Velodrome and the surrounding area will seek to promote safe walking routes and improve the access to and from the site without adding to congestion problems in the surrounding area.
Paragraph 15 of the SPD should refer to amenity as set out in Policy 3.1 of the Southwark Plan as opposed to the more qualified concept of residential amenity	Residential amenity as referred to in the SPD is not restrictive and refers to all aspects of residential life.
The SPD should refer to the fact the Herne Hill Velodrome is within Dulwich Village Conservation Area and that any development proposal must demonstrate that a high priority has been given to the objective of preserving or enhancing the character of the conservation area	The SPD could be changed to reflect this.