

Committee	PLANNING COMMITTEE A	
Report Title	30-32 Stanstead Road, SE23 1BW	
Ward	Perry Vale	
Contributors	Simon Vivers	
Class	PART 1	12 April 2018

Reg. Nos. DC/17/103186

Application dated 22/08/2017

Applicant Birnbeck Housing Association

Proposal Construction of a part 2, part 3 storey building to provide 4 x 1 bedroom self-contained flats together with associated landscaping and refuse storage at 30 - 32 Stanstead Road, SE23.

Applicant's Plan Nos. 3349 – 0001 Rev P1; 3349 – 0002 Rev P1 (received 22 August 2017); Design & Access Statement Addendum (received 20 December 2017); 3349 – 0005 Rev P2 (received 22 December 2017); 3349 – 0003 Rev P3; 3349 – 0004 Rev P3; 3349 – 0006 Rev P2; 3349 – 0007 Rev P3; 3349 – 0008 Rev P3; Arboricultural Impact Assessment ref: 4528/17-02 Rev 2; Arboricultural Method Statement ref: 4528/17-03 Rev 2 (received 1 March 2018)

Background Papers

- (1) Case File LE/67/30/TP
- (2) Local Development Framework Documents
- (3) The London Plan

Designations

- (1) Local Open Space Deficiency
- (2) Not in a Conservation Area
- (3) PTAL Rating 4

Screening N/A

1.0 **Property / Site Description**

Existing Site and Location

- 1.1 The subject site is located at the corner of Stanstead Road and Rojack Road SE23, and is currently vacant.
- 1.2 The site has a frontage of approximately 14.3m to Stanstead Road, and 29.0m to Rojack Road. The site has a generally rectangular layout, but narrows towards the east along the Rojack Road frontage. The site has a slight west – east slope, with Rojack Road running downhill from Stanstead Road. The site has an area of approximately 280m².
- 1.3 The site is an open grassed area, with hedge plants spanning the eastern and southern boundaries, but is otherwise devoid of any significant vegetation. Two mature Silver Birch trees are located adjacent to the site within highways land at both road frontages.

Surrounding Context

- 1.4 The surrounding area is residential in nature with an urban terrace typology.
- 1.5 To the south of the site is 28 Stanstead Road, which forms the end of a group of five terrace properties. Further groups of terraces and semi detached pairs continue south of this point on the eastern side of the road. Terraces are also present on the western side of Stanstead Road, however the character of this side of the road is more mixed, including post war properties as well as larger three storey buildings, including the Forest Hill Hotel.
- 1.6 To the south-west is a run of terrace properties on both sides of Rojack Road, with no. 10 neighbouring the site's rear boundary, though lying at a lower ground level due to the fall in levels across the application site. To the north, on the opposite side of Rojack Road, is the rear of terraced properties with which face towards Stanstead Road.
- 1.7 Land to the west of the site (beyond Stanstead Road) is part of a railway corridor running between Forest Hill and Honor Oak.

Site Designations and Constraints

- 1.8 The site is not located within a Conservation Area or affected by an associated Article 4 Direction and is not within an area of special character. The site is not located in the vicinity of any locally or nationally listed buildings.
- 1.9 The site has a PTAL rating of 4, which indicates good accessibility to public transport, on a scale of 1 – 6 with 6 being the highest.
- 1.10 Perry Vale is a ward identified as having a local open space deficiency. However, the site is not designated Public Open Space.
- 1.11 Trees adjacent to the site are category B trees (defined as Trees of moderate quality with an estimated remaining life expectancy of at least 20 years), and are not affected by a Tree Preservation Order.

2.0 Planning History

- 2.1 The site has no known planning history, however it is shown to have contained two terrace properties until at least 1972. The reason for demolition is unknown.
- 2.2 PRE/16/002767 – Pre application advice was given regarding the subject scheme. The principle of the development was considered acceptable, noting the historic residential use of the land, lack of designation of the site as open space and surrounding residential setting. Detailed comments were given regarding materials, bulk and scale, standard of accommodation, neighbouring amenity.
- 2.3 The design has evolved over the course of the pre application advice, with the scheme at hand being the third iteration.

3.0 Background

- 3.1 The proposed scheme at Stanstead Road is part of the Council's New Homes Programme. The scheme supports the delivery of the Council's Housing Strategy 2015-2020, in particular the priority "building the homes our residents need".
- 3.2 The scheme is part of a response to a gap in housing options for adults with autism in Lewisham who are not eligible for care services under the Care Act 2014, but who are

unable to live totally independently. The gap was identified through the Housing and Autism Working Group. The group was made up of Council Officers from Housing and Joint Commissioning, representatives from Burgess Autistic Trust (BAT), and The Campaign in Lewisham for Autism Spectrum Housing (CLASH).

- 3.3 The group worked to develop a model and to find partners with the relevant experience in development and specialist housing management. The proposed model is the provision of a 4-unit supported housing scheme with communal lounge and garden which would be developed and managed by Birnbeck Housing Association and let to adults with autism. This type of accommodation would be suitable for adults with low level support needs, with support workers funded by an element of service charge covered by Housing Benefit.
- 3.4 Birnbeck Housing Association was identified as a small developing Housing Association which specialises in supported housing for people with autism, and supported housing for people with mental health issues. Birnbeck Housing Association are currently developing two similar schemes in London Borough of Barnet and London Borough of Ealing, and currently manage similar schemes in neighbouring borough Bromley.
- 3.5 At the Mayor and Cabinet meeting of 22nd March 2017, a report was considered which provided background on the need for a specialised housing scheme for people with autism in Lewisham. At this meeting, it was agreed in principal that the site at 30 to 32 Stanstead be declared surplus to the Council's requirements and that Open Space Disposal Notices be Published in relation to this site to facilitate the delivery of a small specialised housing scheme in partnership with Birnbeck Housing Association.
- 3.6 Non Planning Officers within the Council published Open Space Disposal Notices for the site identified in Appendix A in local press on 28 March 2017. Representations were to be submitted to the Council by 25 April 2017 and none were received.
- 3.7 The in principal decision made at Mayor and Cabinet level, and subsequent steps referred to above are not binding upon, or able to direct any decision that may be made by the Council as Local Planning Authority. The information given within this section are recorded for information purposes only.

4.0 Current Planning Application

- 4.1 Planning permission is sought for the construction of a part 2, part 3 storey building providing 4 x 1 bedroom self-contained flats together with associated landscaping, cycle and refuse storage.
- 4.2 The proposal would provide supported living for four persons with Aspergers, and would be managed by Birnbeck Housing Association.
- 4.3 The residential use and limited degree of care would cause the Use Class to fall within C3 (general residential), as the residents are identified as having low level support needs, and would not require permanent staff on site (if this were the case, the use would fall into Class C2 - Residential Institutions).
- 4.4 At two storey level, the proposal would be 6.8m high at Stanstead Road, and 6.8m – 7.6m at Rojack Road. The set back third storey adds 2.5m to the height. At Stanstead Road, the proposal would have a total height of 9.5m, which is 1.5m greater than the ridgeline of 28 Stanstead. The second storey would be constructed to the boundary with 28 Stanstead Road, and would be inset 1.5m from road boundaries, increasing to 2.7m at the corner.

- 4.5 The proposal would match the front building line of 28 Stanstead Road, spanning 10.0m at this frontage before curving at the corner and spanning 16.0m along Rojack Road. The rearmost 5.2m long 2 storey only section of the Rojack Road span would be set back 0.65m from the main building line. The proposal would have a 9.0m deep 66m² rear garden with patio and lower, soft landscaped sections. Conceptual perimeter landscaping has also been provided between fencing and the external edge of the building.
- 4.6 Ground and first floor elevations would be constructed in yellow stock brickwork, and the set back third floor constructed in grey coloured zinc shingles. Brick detailing would include soldier courses at the top of the second floor, also reflected in recessed brick header detailing around bronze aluminium framed windows.
- 4.7 The main building access would be provided from Stanstead Road, and would include an aluminium canopy. Secondary access would be provided to the rear garden from the building, and a flank garden entrance point is also proposed, adjacent to the site's boundary with 10 Rojack Road.
- 4.8 A dwarf brick wall and metal railing fence would be provided at boundaries adjacent to the building. Towards the rear, a timber fence would be installed above a dwarf wall to provide privacy to the rear garden.
- 4.9 Refuse storage would be provided to the side of the front entrance, behind a brick partition. Covered cycle storage would be provided within the communal open space, accessed from Rojack Road.
- 4.10 The proposal would provide 4 x 1b2p sized self-contained flats, together with a 39m² communal living area located at ground floor. Each unit would include separate rooms for bedroom, kitchen and bathroom.
- 4.11 The proposal would include 66m² communal outdoor space. There would be no dedicated private outdoor space for each unit.
- 4.12 The size and layout of the accommodation of each unit is summarised in the table below:

Table 1.1 - Accommodation

Unit type	Unit size (GIA)	Policy requirements	Room sizes (approximate)
Unit 1 - Ground Floor			
1b2p	50m ²	GIA: 50m ²	Living: 18.3 m ² Kitchen: 6.5m ² Bedroom: 11.5m ²
Unit 2 - First Floor			
1b2p	50m ²	GIA: 50m ²	Living: 18.3 m ² Kitchen: 6.5m ² Bedroom: 11.5m ²
Unit 3 – First Floor			
1b2p	50m ²	GIA: 50m ²	Living: 21.4 m ² Kitchen: 6.4m ² Bedroom: 12.0m ²
Unit 4 – Second Floor			
1b2p	51m ²	GIA: 50m ²	Living: 23.7m ² Kitchen: 5.8m ² Bedroom: 11.5m ²

- 4.13 The proposal would require the removal of the hedges running alongside the south and south western boundaries shared with 28 Stanstead Road and 10 Rojack Road. The

application also originally required the removal of a mature Silver Birch tree on the highway a short distance along Rojack Road at its junction with Stanstead Road, however following revisions this is now to be retained.

Supporting Documents

4.14 The applicant has submitted the following supporting documents:

- Design and Access Statement (including update)
- Arboricultural Impact Assessment (revised March 2018)
- Arboricultural Method Statement (revised March 2018)

5.0 Consultation

5.1 This section outlines the consultation carried out by the Council following the submission of the application and summarises the responses received. The Council's consultation exceeded the minimum statutory requirements and those required by the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement.

5.2 Adjoining occupiers, Perry Vale Ward Councillors and the Forest Hill Society were notified of the application, and a site notice was displayed. Council's Highways Department and Ecological Regeneration & Open Space Policy Manager were also consulted as part of the application.

Written Responses received from Local Residents and Organisations

5.3 52 responses were received in support of the proposal, largely around the provision of specialised Aspergers accommodation of which there is a shortfall.

5.4 29 responses were received in objection to the proposal. These were largely from residents of the immediate surrounding residential area. The main planning grounds of objection are summarised as follows:

- Loss of open space, as an area of recreation and amenity value;
- Loss of hedge within the site and Silver Birch tree at Rojack Road (Officer Note: This tree has subsequently been able to be retained as part of the proposals);
- Proposed replacement tree unsuitably located and would not compensate for loss of a mature tree;
- Lack of transparency regarding initial notification of the disposal of the land;
- Incongruous, imposing and overbearing design (including materials) which is out of character with surrounding area and terrace typology;
- Excessive height and depth, which fails to respect the scale, building lines and footprint of the adjacent terrace;
- Loss of privacy and overlooking, particularly to 10 Rojack Road, rear elevation of windows on opposite site of Rojack Road (fronting Stanstead Road) and the rear garden of 28 Stanstead road;
- Overshadowing;
- Inadequate car parking provision;

- Ecological concerns – loss of green space and vegetation together with loss of habitat for slow worms;
- More suitable sites in borough for such development (where proposal would be less cramped);
- Misleading precedents within Design & Access Statement (which emphasise that there is a stronger three storey character in the area);
- Suitability of development given subsidence of area;
- Party wall matters associated with building to flank of 28 Stanstead Road; and
- Construction impacts.

Local Meeting

- 5.5 Given the number of objections received, a Local Meeting was carried out in accordance with Lewisham's Statement of Community Involvement. The meeting was a drop-in session which later moved to formal (chaired) meeting during the course of the evening.
- 5.6 30 representees confirmed attended the drop-in session, which was held at Councils Offices (Town Hall), 27 November 2017. Members of CLASH (Campaign in Lewisham for Autism Spectrum Housing) also attended the meeting. Six additional responses were received in support of the application, as well as one additional response from an objector.
- 5.7 Council (Planning) officers chaired the meeting. Representatives from Birnbeck Housing Association, the architect and Council officers answered questions from objectors and supporters of the application.
- 5.8 In addition to matters detailed in written consultation responses, the following planning matters were raised by objectors:
- While the site formerly contained terrace properties, its term of vacancy has now effectively established the site as open space, regardless of not being formally designated as such;
 - Change in levels cause further harm to amenity of 10 Rojack Road (proposal sits higher, having more level direct views to its flank elevation window);
 - Proposal fails in terms of both Council policies and current London policies for city greening;
 - Publishing of disposal notice in South London Press met only bare minimum legislative notification requirements, and disadvantaged objectors.
 - Concerns over transparency, with Birkbeck involved with Lewisham Council at the outset (gifted land with assumption of grant of planning permission); and
 - Fire safety concerns due to blocking of Rojack Road during construction.
- 5.9 The following matters not related to the current consideration of the planning decision were also raised:
- Publishing of disposal notice in South London Press met only bare minimum legislative notification requirements, and disadvantaged objectors.

- Concerns over transparency, with Birkbeck involved with Lewisham Council at the outset (gifted land with assumption of grant of planning permission); and
- Fire safety concerns due to blocking of Rojack Road during construction.

5.10 It was reiterated by objectors that the use of the site for those persons with Asperger's was itself not objectionable.

5.11 The architect and applicant clarified the design and use of the property. Key aspects not summarised in plans or supporting documents were as follows:

- The proposal would be a "home for life" for Asperger's persons, and discussed the need for the proposal (and supported by CLASH).
- The third storey of the proposal is driven by the need for a communal area (which is at ground floor level), in addition to the four self-contained flats.
- The applicant outlined that while it is possible that other land may have been gifted (via lease) to the housing association, that no other site was offered.

5.12 In summary objectors identified key concerns being:

- Loss of green space
- Unsympathetic design

Highways and Transportation

5.13 No objection in principle.

Ecological Regeneration & Open Space Policy Manager

5.14 No objection in principle, however loss of habitat (namely the hedges, which are of value to local birdlife) should be offset by inclusion of a bio-diverse living roof.

5.15 Recommendation that a condition be applied which requires the applicant to employ a destructive search carried out by an ecologist prior to site clearance, coordinated alongside provisions to exclude reptiles during the construction activities.

5.16 Copies of all representations are available to Members to view.

6.0 Policy Context

Introduction

6.1 Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) sets out that in considering and determining applications for planning permission the local planning authority must have regard to:-

- (a) the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application,
- (b) any local finance considerations, so far as material to the application, and
- (c) any other material considerations.

A local finance consideration means:

- (a) a grant or other financial assistance that has been, or will or could be, provided to a relevant authority by a Minister of the Crown, or
- (b) sums that a relevant authority has received, or will or could receive, in payment of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

6.2 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) makes it clear that ‘if regard is to be had to the development plan for the purpose of any determination to be made under the planning Acts the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise’. The development plan for Lewisham comprises the Core Strategy, the Development Management Local Plan, the Site Allocations Local Plan and the Lewisham Town Centre Local Plan, and the London Plan. The NPPF does not change the legal status of the development plan.

National Planning Policy Framework

6.3 The NPPF was published on 27 March 2012 and is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. It contains at paragraph 14, a ‘presumption in favour of sustainable development’. Annex 1 of the NPPF provides guidance on implementation of the NPPF. In summary, this states in paragraph 211, that policies in the development plan should not be considered out of date just because they were adopted prior to the publication of the NPPF. At paragraphs 214 and 215 guidance is given on the weight to be given to policies in the development plan. As the NPPF is now more than 12 months old paragraph 215 comes into effect. This states in part that ‘...due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with this framework (the closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the Framework, the greater the weight that may be given)’.

6.4 Officers have reviewed the Core Strategy for consistency with the NPPF and consider there is no issue of significant conflict. As such, full weight can be given to these policies in the decision making process in accordance with paragraphs 211, and 215 of the NPPF.

Other National Guidance

6.5 On 6 March 2014, DCLG launched the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) resource. This replaced a number of planning practice guidance documents.

London Plan (March 2016)

6.6 In March 2016, the London Plan (as amended) was adopted. The new, draft London Plan was published by the Mayor of London for public consultation on 29 November 2017 (until 2 March 2018). However, given the very early stage in this process, this document has very limited weight as a material consideration when determining planning applications, does not warrant a departure from the existing policies of the development plan in this instance and is therefore not referred to further in this report. The policies of the adopted London Plan relevant to this application are:

- Policy 2.18 Green Infrastructure
- Policy 3.3 Increasing housing supply
- Policy 3.4 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 5.3 Sustainable design and construction
- Policy 6.9 Cycling
- Policy 6.13 Parking
- Policy 7.4 Local character

- Policy 7.6 Architecture
- Policy 7.18 Protecting Open Space & Addressing Deficiency
- Policy 7.21 Trees & Woodlands
- Policy 8.3 Community infrastructure levy

London Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG)

6.7 The London Plan SPG's relevant to this application are:

- Housing (2016)

Core Strategy

6.8 The Core Strategy was adopted by the Council at its meeting on 29 June 2011. The Core Strategy, together with the Site Allocations, the Lewisham Town Centre Local Plan, the Development Management Local Plan and the London Plan is the borough's statutory development plan. The following lists the relevant strategic objectives, spatial policies and cross cutting policies from the Lewisham Core Strategy as they relate to this application:

- Spatial Policy 1 Lewisham Spatial Strategy
- Core Strategy Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham

Development Management Local Plan

6.9 The Development Management Local Plan was adopted by the Council at its meeting on 26 November 2014. The Development Management Local Plan, together with the Site Allocations, the Lewisham Town Centre Local Plan, the Core Strategy and the London Plan is the borough's statutory development plan. The following lists the relevant strategic objectives, spatial policies and cross cutting policies from the Development Management Local Plan as they relate to this application:

6.10 The following policies are considered to be relevant to this application:

- DM Policy 1 Presumption in favour of sustainable development
- DM Policy 22 Sustainable design and construction
- DM Policy 24 Biodiversity, living roofs and artificial playing pitches
- DM Policy 25 Landscaping and trees
- DM Policy 29 Car parking
- DM Policy 30 Urban design and local character
- DM Policy 32 Housing design, layout and space standards
- DM Policy 33 Infill, backland, back garden and amenity area development

Supplementary Planning Document (August 2006, Updated 2012)

6.11 This document sets out guidance and standards relating to design, sustainable development, renewable energy, flood risk, sustainable drainage, dwelling mix, density, layout, neighbour amenity, the amenities of the future occupants of developments, safety and security, refuse, affordable housing, self containment, noise and room positioning, room and dwelling sizes, storage, recycling facilities and bin storage, noise insulation, parking, cycle parking and storage, gardens and amenity space, landscaping, play space, Lifetime Homes and accessibility, and materials.

7.0 Planning Considerations

7.1 The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:

- Principle of Development

- Design & Scale
- Standard of accommodation
- Impact on Adjoining Properties
- Highways and Traffic Issues
- Ecology and Biodiversity

Principle of Development

- 7.2 Historic mapping indicates that the site was occupied by two terraced dwellings until at least 1972. The site is not designated Public Open Space, and is therefore not afforded protection under Core Strategy Policy 12 (Open space and environmental assets) which is generally aimed at the protection of park land and similar assets such as playing fields and allotment gardens.
- 7.3 Perry Vale is identified as having deficiency in terms of public open space, however the policy does not seek to designate residential land, but rather improve accessibility to existing defined areas of public open space.
- 7.4 As the land is to the side of an existing terrace, though upon land which might also be regarded as amenity land, it may be categorised as either an infill site or Amenity Areas. Development Management Policy 33 relates to the development of infill, backland, back garden and amenity area sites. The policy acknowledges that the protection for designated 'open space' applies a different level of protection for non-designated land, which whilst being able to be described as open space, does not perform the same wider function as designated open spaces (such a Metropolitan Open Land), and as such a different form of assessment of the benefits and harms arising from development must occur.
- 7.5 Policy DM33 states that if a site is considered suitable for development, planning permission will not be granted unless the proposed development is of the highest design quality and relates successfully and is sensitive to the existing design quality of the streetscape (and is sensitive to the setting of heritage assets where relevant). This includes the spaces between buildings which may be as important as the character of the buildings themselves, and the size and proportions of adjacent buildings. Development on these sites must meet the policy requirements of DM Policy 30 (Urban design and local character), DM Policy 32 (Housing design, layout and space standards) and DM Policy 25 (Landscaping and trees).
- 7.6 More specific to infill sites, DM Policy 33 states that development will only be permitted where they:-
1. *make a high quality positive contribution to an area;*
 2. *provide a site specific creative response to the character and issues of the street frontage typology identified in Table 2.1 Urban typologies in Lewisham and to the special distinctiveness of any relevant conservation area;*
 3. *result in no significant overshadowing or overlooking, and no loss of security or amenity to adjacent houses and gardens;*
 4. *provide appropriate amenity space in line with DM Policy 32 (Housing design, layout and space standards);*
 5. *retain appropriate garden space for adjacent dwellings;*
 6. *repair the street frontage and provide additional natural surveillance;*

7. *provide adequate privacy for the new development; and,*
8. *respect the character, proportions and spacing of existing houses.*

7.7 As the site has not become (through the course of several Local Plan reviews undertaken by Lewisham Council) designated as protected open space in the period since 1972, the specific benefits arising from the proposed development must be weighed against the impact of development upon the function and value of the site in its current form. The visual and ecological impact is addressed within the following sections, but in regard to the principal of the loss of open (albeit unprotected) land in a residential area, given its limited size and contribution to the function and character of the local area, its use as residential accommodation is considered to be able to adequately support the principle of development.

7.8 If assessed against the requirements applied to Amenity Areas, within DM33, the considerations applied are:

D. Amenity areas

9. Proposals for new residential development on amenity areas of landscaped open space

attached to existing residential development will only be permitted where they:

a. repair or re-provide active street frontages

b. increase natural surveillance

c. retain existing private rear gardens where they are provided

d. retain adequate amenity space for the existing development according to the requirements of DM Policy 32 (Housing design, layout and space standards)

e. provide no significant loss of privacy and amenity, and no loss of security for adjoining residential development and private back gardens and

f. provide adequate privacy for the new development.

7.9 The reinstatement of residential use on the site is considered to be acceptable in principle, making use of an area of previously developed land, though the detailed requirements of other policy, and in particular DM33, must then be considered. With this in mind, the Council would only accept a design which would be of the highest quality and relates successfully to the existing streetscape and responds to the above requirements.

Design

7.10 Paragraph 63 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that 'in determining applications, great weight should be given to outstanding or innovative designs which help raise the standard of design more generally in the area'. Paragraph 64 states that 'permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions'.

7.11 Urban design is a key consideration in the planning process. Part 7 of the NPPF makes it clear that national government places great importance on the design of the built environment. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people. The

NPPF states that it is important to plan positively for the achievement of high quality and inclusive design for all development, including individual buildings, public and private spaces and wider area development schemes.

7.12 London Plan Policies 7.1-7.7 (inclusive) and Core Strategy Policy 15 reinforce the principles of the NPPF setting out a clear rationale for high quality urban design.

7.13 DM Policy 30 supports the Core Strategy as it requires planning applications to demonstrate a site-specific response which creates a positive relationship with the existing townscape whereby the height, scale and mass of the proposed development relates to the urban typology of the area and requires developments to be of a high design quality.

7.14 In more detail, DM Policy 30 states:-

An adequate response to the following detailed matters will be required in planning applications to demonstrate the required site specific design response:

- a. *the creation of a positive relationship to the existing townscape, natural landscape, open spaces and topography to preserve and / or create an urban form which contributes to local distinctiveness such as plot widths, building features and uses, roofscape, open space and views, panoramas and vistas including those identified in the London Plan, taking all available opportunities for enhancement*
- b. *height, scale and mass which should relate to the urban typology of the area as identified in Table 2.1 Urban typologies in Lewisham*
- c. *layout and access arrangements. Large areas of parking and servicing must be avoided*
- d. *how the scheme relates to the scale and alignment of the existing street including its building frontages*
- e. *the clear delineation of public routes by new building frontages, with convenient, safe and welcoming pedestrian routes to local facilities and the public transport network, including meeting the needs of less mobile people and people with young children*
- f. *the quality and durability of building materials and their sensitive use in relation to the context of the development. Materials used should be high quality and either match or complement existing development, and the reasons for the choice of materials should be clearly justified in relation to the existing built context*
- g. *details of the degree of ornamentation, use of materials, brick walls and fences, or other boundary treatment which should reflect the context by using high quality matching or complementary materials*
- h. *how the development at ground floor level will provide activity and visual interest for the public including the pedestrian environment, and provide passive surveillance with the incorporation of doors and windows to provide physical and visual links between buildings and the public domain*
- i. *new development must be sustainably designed and constructed in compliance with Core Strategy Policies 7 and 8*
- j. *where there is an impact on a heritage asset a statement will be required that describes the significance of the asset, including its setting, and an assessment of the impact of the proposals upon that significance.*

Loss of Openness

- 7.15 The site is currently open and makes some contribution to the immediate townscape through its absence of built form. However, the site is also considered to convey a negative visual impact, appearing as an unplanned void in the streetscapes of the adjoining roads, a sense emphasised through the awkward and cluttered (and highly visible) appearance of the current flank wall to no.28 Stanstead Road. Whilst open, the site is not considered to convey a significantly positive impact on the character of the area, to a degree that outweighs the benefit of restoring the built form previously present on the site. The development is considered to be compliant in regard to the applicable parts of Policy DM33 (9) in this regard.
- 7.16 It is considered that a high quality built form, within a development retaining a degree of openness, can adequately mitigate the loss of openness arising.

Scale & Massing

- 7.17 The proposal would have flat roofs, with a two-storey height of between 6.8m – 7.6m (due to changes in ground levels) then increasing a further 2.5m at third storey (second floor) to a maximum height of 9.5m.
- 7.18 The proposal is split in its massing, with the second floor being inset 1.45 from road frontages (increasing to increasing to 2.8m at the corner of the site). This attribute of the design breaks the continuity of the terrace and the proposed building itself, but allows the overall scale and massing of the of the proposal to relate successfully to the surrounding context.
- 7.19 At two storey level the proposal would sit 1.25m above the eave height of adjacent terrace and at third storey it would sit 1.5m above its ridgeline. While exceeding the height of the terrace, the overall scale of the proposal is acceptable, largely through the three storey height being achieved in a sympathetically stepped form.
- 7.20 The difference in roof form would be noticeable from longer views within Stanstead and Rojack Roads, through the flat roof contrasting with the slope of the terrace, however in the context of an identifiably modern and contemporary development this roof form is acceptable, and contributes to the proposals distinctiveness.
- 7.21 The proposal would have a greater depth than what would have been established by the original terraces, evident by the eastern part of the proposal projecting between 3.0m – 4.6m beyond the main, two storey rear building line of 28 Stanstead Road, however a minimum garden depth of 9.0m would remain which is in keeping with the urban terrace typology and not appear over developed.

Architectural Details

- 7.22 The massing approach would be enhanced through the different use of external materials, with ground and first floor constructed of brick, and the second / roof level floor clad with zinc shingles. The contrast in materials together with the second floor setback allows for the uppermost floor to be successfully read as a subservient element to the building below.
- 7.23 The proposal provides a design which responds well to both street frontage, effectively turning the corner in a curved form from Stanstead Road to Rojack Road, and providing a high quality and well-articulated fenestration which takes subtle but distinctive cues from the adjacent terraces (largely in the form of soldier course detailing between floors and at upper level and recessed brick panels). Additionally, the dual active frontages provide passive surveillance and activity on both public frontages.

7.24 The main entrance at Stanstead Road would be provided with an aluminium canopy, and would have a planter bed to the southern side, and recessed bin storage to the northern side. From this point a dwarf brick wall with metal railings would wrap around the building, before becoming a dwarf wall with timber screening fence 2.0 – 2.3m in height. The proposed fencing is well detailed, and provides an acceptable compromise between an active frontage and privacy from street views to the rear garden.

7.25 In detailed terms, materials are summarised as follows:

- Yellow buff facing brick (both fence and main building)
- Reinzink PrePATINA blue grey or similar coloured shingles
- PPC aluminium composite doors and windows RAL 1019 (bronze) or similar at ground and first floor
- PPC aluminium composite windows RAL 7045 (grey) or similar at ground and first floor
- Downpipes and railing fence RAL 1019 or similar

7.26 While the materials are considered to be generally acceptable and would contribute to a high quality scheme, it is recommended that conditions of approval require further details in relation to both key materials, as well as detailed drawings of key design elements (including sections) to ensure that the scheme is developed to the requisite high quality. In particular, further details are necessary to ensure that the appropriate reveal depths of windows and architectural recesses is incorporated.

Trees and Landscaping

7.27 Conceptual landscaping has been shown, which includes perimeter planting. It is recommended that a condition is applied to the decision which requires the approval of further details to ensure that this element of the scheme is developed to a high quality.

7.28 Two Silver Birch trees sited at both Stanstead Road and Rojack Road will be retained. The applicant has submitted an Arboricultural Impact Assessment and an Arboricultural Method Statement, both which demonstrate that the proposal can be carried out in a manner which will not be harmful to the long term health of the adjacent trees. Limited root pruning will occur to the Rojack Road street tree.

7.29 The applicant will be required to adhere to the protection mechanisms as proposed under the Arboricultural Method Statement, which in particular prescribes methods for construction of the boundary fencing where in the root protection zone of the tree situated at Rojack Road, as well as pruning methods.

Design Summary

7.30 In summary, the proposal is considered to represent a high quality, contemporary design that would respect and compliment the character of the surrounding area. The development is appropriate in scale, height and massing, that acknowledges the general form of development within the immediate area.

7.31 The development therefore comprises a scheme of sufficiently high visual quality to restore the 'void' in the streetscapes following the removal of the pre-existing built form, albeit in a way that retains some degree of openness. The development therefore has a positive visual impact.

Housing

a) *Mix*

- 7.32 The proposal would compromise 4 x 1b2p units. Of relevance to the scale of the proposal, Core Strategy Policy 1 requires that an appropriate mix of housing is provided within a development, having regard to the following criteria:
- a. the physical character of the site or building and its setting
 - b. the previous or existing use of the site or building
 - c. access to private gardens or communal garden areas for family dwellings
 - d. the likely effect on demand for car parking within the area
 - e. the surrounding housing mix and density of population
 - f. the location of schools, shops, open space and other infrastructure requirements.

7.33 Noting the location and previous use of the site, the re-provision of family sized unit would usually be required, however in this instance the proposal has a bespoke mix suited to the intended use.

b) *Standard of Residential Accommodation*

- 7.34 Policy 3.5 'Quality and design of housing developments' of the London Plan requires housing developments to be of the highest quality internally, externally and in relation to their context. This policy sets out the minimum floor space standards for new houses relative to the number of occupants and taking into account commonly required furniture and spaces needed for differing activities and circulation, in line with Lifetime Home Standards.
- 7.35 In addition, the DM Policy 32 also seeks to provide accommodation of a good size, a good outlook, with acceptable shape and layout of rooms, with main habitable rooms receiving direct sunlight and daylight, and adequate privacy. There will be a presumption that residential units provided should be dual aspect, and any single aspect dwellings provided will require a detailed justification as to why a dual aspect dwelling is not possible and a detailed demonstration that adequate lighting and ventilation can be achieved.
- 7.36 Nationally described space standards were released in March 2015 to replace the existing different space standards used by local authorities. It is not a building regulation and remains solely within the planning system as a new form of technical planning standard.
- 7.37 As shown in Table 1.1, plans confirm that all the units would meet or exceed minimum standards. All units accord with the minimum gross internal area (GIA) and bedroom dimension requirements for a 1b2p layout. All units would also have a floor to ceiling height of 2.45m, which comfortably exceeds the minimum 2.3m standard.
- 7.38 Standard 26 / 27 of the London Plan Housing SPG sets out the baseline requirements for private open space. The standard requires a minimum of 5sqm to be provided for 1-2 person dwellings and an extra 1sqm for each additional occupant. The minimum depth for all external space is 1500mm. No private external space would be provided, however the proposal would include a 39m² internal communal space / area as well as a 66m² communal outdoor space, which is acceptable.
- 7.39 All units would be dual aspect and thus offered acceptable levels of outlook, and all units would receive adequate levels of access to daylight and sunlight. The first floor level unit

towards the rear would be predominately north facing, is on balance acceptable in this regard with a south eastern window servicing its living area, and also being acceptable in other standard of accommodation respects.

- 7.40 All units would be afforded acceptable levels of privacy between each unit and from adjoining occupiers. In particular, the windows at street frontages suitably set away and aided by fencing to provide defensible space. An overlooking opportunity from 10 Rojack Road would occur towards the common area and garden, however this is within acceptable limits for a residential setting, and would not be harmful to future residents (amenity impacts of views towards 10 Rojack Road are discussed further on in this report).
- 7.41 In terms of standard of accommodation, the proposal is therefore acceptable.

Highways and Traffic Issues

a) Access, servicing and parking

- 7.42 The proposal would have its main pedestrian entrance at Stanstead Road, and a secondary pedestrian entrance to the garden at Rojack Road.
- 7.43 The site has a PTAL rating of 4, which identifies a good level of accessibility to public transport. The site is within close proximity to Forest Hill Station (overground and national railway services) and number of bus routes along the south circular road and is therefore considered to be well connected to surrounding public transport routes.
- 7.44 The proposed development is to be car free. A Transport Survey or Parking Management Plan have not been submitted, however they would not normally be required for a proposal of this scale given the application proposes the re-provision of a relatively low intensity residential use, which is of a scale which would not give rise to a harmful level of parking demand. The specific intended occupiers of the proposed scheme would require visits by support workers, however given the relatively small size of the scheme, this would not give rise to unacceptable impacts on the surrounding network. It should be noted that the car free nature is considered to be appropriate for the wider C3 residential use sought, and has not been adjudged as acceptable only on the basis of the current proposed occupation type.
- 7.45 The parking strategy is considered to be in accordance with Core Strategy 14, DM Policy 29 and London Plan Policy 6.13.

b) Cycle Parking

- 7.46 London Plan standards and DM Policy 29 require secure cycle parking provision at the rate of 1 cycle space per 1 bed unit. The required provision for this scheme would therefore be 4 spaces. Cycle parking for 4 cycles in a Sheffield stand form is shown in the rear garden under a canopy in close proximity to the gate.
- 7.47 Cycle parking is in accordance with the London Plan Policy 6.9 and DM Policy 29 and is acceptable.

d) Refuse

- 7.48 Refuse storage is proposed to be located at ground floor level adjacent to the front entrance and will service all proposed units. .

- 7.49 The design of includes a brick surround to the northern and western side which integrates with boundary treatment, and would effectively shield and formalise the storage area.

Impact on Adjoining Properties

- 7.50 Development Management Policy 33 requires that development within street frontages and on street corners will only be permitted where they result in no significant overshadowing or overlooking, and no loss of security or amenity to adjacent houses and gardens.

a) Impact on 28 Stanstead Road

- 7.51 As the proposal would be situated to the northern side of 28 Stanstead Road, and would therefore not impact on this property in terms of loss of daylight/sunlight or overshadowing.

- 7.52 At the rear, the proposal, by virtue of the wedge shaped plot, has a rear elevation set a different angle than the adjoining property on Stanstead Road. This angled rear, combined with a stepped rear elevation, extends between 3.0m – 4.6m beyond the rear building line of the outrigger of 28 Stanstead Road in a stepped form set away from the shared property boundary by between 1.6m – 2.3m. As such, the greatest point of projection past the outrigger (4.6m) is set well away from the rear elevation and garden to no.28. The layout of 28 Stanstead Road (double storey rear projection at northern boundary with lean-to, L-shaped rear dormer with built up northern flank) is such that rooms within the building are not orientated towards the site, and the side return area at the southern boundary. The massing proposed would not exert a material impact upon the rear garden of no.28.

- 7.53 In terms of privacy and overlooking, the proposal would introduce a first floor window serving the living room of the rearward flat, which would cause some overlooking towards the rear garden. It is considered to be appropriate to require this window to be obscure glazed and of restricted opening, in order to avoid harmful levels of overlooking to the garden of no.28 Stanstead Road. This shall be secured by condition.

- 7.54 The existing boundary screening adjacent to the ground floor level rear terrace is of a sufficient height to avoid overlooking towards 28 Stanstead Road, though it is considered appropriate to require this to be set out as part of the landscaping condition.

b) Impact on 10 Rojack Road

- 7.55 The proposed building would be situated between 11.5m – 13.2m from the western side flank elevation of 10 Rojack Road. Given the extent of separation and 10 Rojack Road sitting to the east, the proposal would not cause any harm to this property in terms of loss of daylight/sunlight or overshadowing.

- 7.56 The flank elevation of 10 Rojack Road includes a lean-to style side infill extension at ground level with a glazed roof and a first floor level window directly overlooking the subject site.

- 7.57 The proposal would not give rise to any of concern overlooking to the ground floor level glazed roof, given the acceptable separation distance between elevations and the height and orientation of the glazed roof (i.e. facing towards the sky and not providing for a direct view).

- 7.58 At ground floor level the proposal would have a set of doors off the common area and 3.3m deep rear terrace, sitting a maximum of 1.3m above ground level at that point. A

single door would be located to the southern side adjacent to the boundary, in the recessed part of the rear elevation, and a window above this point at first floor level. Due to changes in levels between the sites, the ground floor level doors of the proposal would lie at a level between the ground and first floor levels of 10 Rojack Road, which possesses a first floor flank window facing the application site.

7.59 The Council's Residential Standards SPD provides that the minimum distance between habitable rooms on the main rear elevation and the rear boundary, or flank wall of adjoining development should normally be 9 metres or more. These guidelines will be interpreted flexibly depending on the context of the development. In this instance the distance between rear elevation doors and windows exceeds this distance. Given that policy compliant separation distances would be provided between no.10 and the proposed building, the arrangement is suitable and would not cause unreasonable harm to this occupier in terms of loss of privacy / increased overlooking. Windows are not proposed within the rearmost first floor elevation of the proposed building, so whilst the scheme meets the relevant standards in regard to privacy / overlooking distances, there are a minimal level of openings within the proposed building in relatively close proximity to the flank of no.10, and these openings primarily serve the ground floor communal area leading onto the communal open space, so the scheme exerts the minimal reasonable impact in this area.

7.60 The rear facing second floor (roof) level windows are sited approximately 16.0m from the flank elevation of 10 Rojack Road, and therefore are not considered harmful to this occupier.

7.61 The rear terrace would be sited approximately 8.2m from 10 Rojack Road, and though at an effectively elevation position in relation to ground levels at no.10, such that the terrace would lie between ground and first floor levels at no.10, is nonetheless considered to be sited a sufficient distance away from the shared boundary to not cause excessive harm to the amenity of this occupier.

c) Impact on properties north and north-east of the site (36 – 42 Stanstead Road and 9 Rojack Road)

7.62 The proposal would have some views towards the front elevation of 9 Rojack Road. In the context of a front elevation, this would not be considered harmful. As the site is north east of this property, the proposal would not give rise to any loss of daylight/sunlight or overshadowing.

7.63 The Rojack Road elevations of the proposal would be situated a minimum of approximately 16.0m from the nearest rear windows of properties to the north, fronting Stanstead Road.

7.64 The Residential Standards SPD does not provide specific guidance for a relationship where a front elevation faces towards a rear elevation. In this instance the separation distance would be set by the road width. In the context of a wide public space and rear elevations which are currently viewable from public areas, this separation distance is acceptable.

7.65 The proposal would not cause any unreasonable overshadowing to properties to the north, given the separation distances between the road which would be maintained.

7.66 Biodiversity

7.67 Development Management Policy 24 states that the Council will require all new development to take full account of biodiversity and geodiversity in development design,

ensuring the delivery of benefits and minimising of potential impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity.

7.68 The proposal would require removal of the hedge plants (Elaeagnus) located at the boundaries shared with 10 Rojack Road and 28 Stanstead Road. While it is noted that this hedge would provide a biodiversity value (particularly to bird species), it is not a protected element which in isolation would preclude the development.

7.69 Slow worms have been identified within the site during the assessment process. All reptile species receive some level of protection and the Local Authority has a duty to ensure that reasonable measures need to be taken to avoid the incidental killing or injuring of common lizards, slow-worms, adders and grass snakes in the context of development activities. In order to ensure compliance with the relevant legislation, it is necessary that the best practice guidance be implemented. It is therefore recommended that a condition is employed which requires employ a destructive search carried out by an ecologist prior to site clearance, coordinated alongside provisions to exclude reptiles.

7.70 As outlined under the design part of this report, the proposal originally sought to remove the Silver Birch tree located on Rojack Road frontage, however negotiations have occurred to secure its retention, and employ suitable construction techniques within its root protection area. While largely retained for its amenity value to the streetscene, its retention also has value in terms of biodiversity.

8.0 Local Finance Considerations

8.1 Under Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), a local finance consideration means:

- (a) A grant or other financial assistance that has been, or will or could be, provided to a relevant authority by a Minister of the Crown; or
- (b) Sums that a relevant authority has received, or will or could receive, in payment of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

8.2 The weight to be attached to a local finance consideration remains a matter for the decision maker.

8.3 The Mayor of London's CIL is therefore a material consideration. CIL is payable on this application.

9.0 Community Infrastructure Levy

9.1 The proposed development is CIL liable.

10.0 Equalities Considerations and Human Rights

10.1 The Equality Act 2010 (the Act) introduced a new public sector equality duty (the equality duty or the duty). It covers the following nine protected characteristics: age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation.

10.2 In summary, the Council must, in the exercise of its function, have due regard to the need to:

- (a) eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act;
- (b) advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not;

(c) Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

10.3 The duty continues to be a “have regard duty”, and the weight to be attached to it is a matter for the decision maker, bearing in mind the issues of relevance and proportionality. It is not an absolute requirement to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance equality of opportunity or foster good relations.

10.4 The Equality and Human Rights Commission has recently issued Technical Guidance on the Public Sector Equality Duty and statutory guidance entitled “Equality Act 2010 Services, Public Functions & Associations Statutory Code of Practice”. The Council must have regard to the statutory code in so far as it relates to the duty and attention is drawn to Chapter 11 which deals particularly with the equality duty. The Technical Guidance also covers what public authorities should do to meet the duty. This includes steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The guidance does not have statutory force but nonetheless regard should be had to it, as failure to do so without compelling reason would be of evidential value. The statutory code and the technical guidance can be found at: <http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/legal-and-policy/equality-act/equality-act-codes-of-practice-and-technical-guidance/>

10.5 The Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) has previously issued five guides for public authorities in England giving advice on the equality duty:

1. The essential guide to the public sector equality duty
2. Meeting the equality duty in policy and decision-making
3. Engagement and the equality duty
4. Equality objectives and the equality duty
5. Equality information and the equality duty

10.6 The essential guide provides an overview of the equality duty requirements including the general equality duty, the specific duties and who they apply to. It covers what public authorities should do to meet the duty including steps that are legally required, as well as recommended actions. The other four documents provide more detailed guidance on key areas and advice on good practice. Further information and resources are available at: <http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/advice-and-guidance/public-sector-equality-duty/guidance-on-the-equality-duty/>

10.7 The planning issues set out above do not include any factors that relate specifically to any of the equalities categories set out in the Act, and therefore it has been concluded that there is no impact on equality.

11.0 Human rights implications

11.1 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.

11.2 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.

12.0 **Conclusion**

- 12.1 This report has considered the proposals in the light of adopted development plan policies and other material considerations including information or representations relevant to the environmental effects of the proposals.
- 12.2 It is considered that the principle of the development in this instance is acceptable, that the scale of the proposed development is acceptable, that the building has been designed to respond to the context, and that the development would provide a high standard of accommodation for future occupiers while not adversely impacting on the amenity of adjoining occupiers.
- 13.0 **RECOMMENDATION: GRANT PERMISSION** subject to the following conditions:

Conditions

1. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date on which the permission is granted.

Reason: As required by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the application plans, drawings and documents hereby approved and as detailed below:

14.0 3349 – 0001 Rev P1; 3349 – 0002 Rev P1 (received 22 August 2017); Design & Access Statement Addendum (received 20 December 2017); 3349 – 0005 Rev P2 (received 22 December 2017); 3349 – 0003 Rev P3; 3349 – 0004 Rev P3; 3349 – 0006 Rev P2; 3349 – 0007 Rev P3; 3349 – 0008 Rev P3; Arboricultural Impact Assessment ref: 4528/17-02 Rev 2; Arboricultural Method Statement ref: 4528/17-03 Rev 2 (received 1 March 2018)

Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved documents, plans and drawings submitted with the application and is acceptable to the local planning authority.

3. (a) Notwithstanding the details hereby approved, no development shall commence until the following has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:
 - 1:10 detailed section drawings of street facing windows and doors including window surrounds and recesses and entrance canopy;
 - samples (via sampleboard) of brickwork, mortar and zinc shingles; and
 - specifications (via schedule) of windows and doors, boundary fencing and paving including RAL colour where necessary.
 - Details of the form and level of obscure glazing to the first floor rear window.

- (b) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order that the local planning authority may be satisfied as to the external appearance and detailed treatment of the proposal and to comply with Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham of the Core Strategy (June 2011) and Development Management Local Plan (November 2014) DM Policy 30 Urban design and local character.

4. Details of refuse storage shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development, excluding works of ground preparation and foundation construction. The refuse storage shall thereafter be provided prior to occupation of the development and retained thereafter.

Reason: In order that the local planning authority may be satisfied with the provisions for recycling facilities and refuse storage in the interest of safeguarding the amenities of neighbouring occupiers and the area in general, in compliance with Development Management Local Plan (November 2014) Development Management Policy 30 Urban design and local character and Core Strategy Policy 13 Addressing Lewisham waste management requirements (2011).

5. (a) A minimum of 4 secure and dry cycle parking spaces shall be provided within the development in accordance with drawings 3349 - 0003 Rev P3 and 3349 - 0007 Rev P3.
- (b) All cycle parking spaces shall be provided and made available for use prior to occupation of the development and maintained thereafter.

Reason: In order to ensure adequate provision for cycle parking and to comply with Policy 14: Sustainable movement and transport of the Core Strategy (2011).

6. (a) A scheme of hard and soft landscaping (including details of any boundary treatment, material and height, trees or hedges to be retained and proposed plant numbers, species, location and size of trees and tree pits) and details of the management and maintenance of the soft landscaping for a period of five years shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to occupation of the development.
- (b) All planting, seeding or turfing shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the completion of the development, in accordance with the approved scheme under part (a). Any trees or plants which within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species. Hard landscaping shall be provided prior to first occupation of the development and retained thereafter.

Reason: In order that the local planning authority may be satisfied as to the details of the proposal and to comply with Core Strategy Policy 12 Open space and environmental assets, Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham of the Core Strategy (June 2011), Development Management Policy 25 Landscaping and trees and Development Management Policy 30 Urban design and local character of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).

7. Notwithstanding the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order), no plumbing or pipes, other than rainwater pipes recessed as shown in drawing 3349 - 0007 Rev P3 shall be permitted on street facing elevations.

Reason: In order that the local planning authority may be satisfied with the details of the proposal and to accord with Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham of the Core Strategy (June 2011) and Development Management Policy 30 Urban design and local character of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).

8. The use of the flat roofs hereby approved shall be as set out in the application and no

development or the formation of any door providing access to the roof shall be carried out, nor shall the roof area be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area.

Reason: In order to prevent any unacceptable loss of privacy to adjoining properties and the area generally and to comply with Policy 15 High Quality design for Lewisham of the Core Strategy (June 2011) and Development Management Policy 32 Housing design, layout and space standards of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).

9. a) The detailed design for each dwelling hereby approved shall meet the required standard of the Approved Document M of the Building Regulations (2015) as specified in the schedule below:

Unit reference number	Approved Document M (2015) Access Requirement	Dwelling type
All units	M4(2)	Accessible and adaptable

(b) No development shall commence above ground level until details of and written confirmation from the appointed building control body has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority to demonstrate compliance with part (a).

(c) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the details approved under part (b)

Reason: In order to ensure an adequate supply of accessible housing in the Borough in accordance with Policy 1 Housing provision, mix and affordability and Policy 15 High quality design for Lewisham of the Core Strategy (June 2011) and DM Policy 32 Housing design, layout and space standards of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).

10. (a) A destructive search for reptiles shall be carried out by a suitably qualified ecologist registered with the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) prior to works commencing (other than those works associated with the destructive search).

(b) Evidence of compliance with part (a) shall be submitted to and approved by the Council prior to the commencement of any development within the site.

Reason: To comply with Policies 5.10 Urban greening, and 7.19 Biodiversity and access to nature conservation in the London Plan (2016), Policy 12 Open space and environmental assets of the Core Strategy (June 2011), and DM Policy 24 Biodiversity, living roofs and artificial playing pitches of the Development Management Local Plan (November 2014).

Informatives

Positive and Proactive Statement: The Council engages with all applicants in a positive and proactive way through specific pre-application enquiries and the detailed advice available on the Council's website. On this particular application, positive discussions took place which resulted in further information being submitted.

