

I wish to object to this application on the following grounds:

- The proposed development would overlook neighbouring properties and gardens to a greater extent than the current building (an increased height of 1.9m)
- The proposed choice of cladding (dark metal sheeting) is unsympathetic to the character of the local area. There are no buildings anywhere in the surrounding streets with this type of cladding, and it clashes with the existing palette of materials in the current building.
- The proposed choice of cladding has a dubious degree of fire safety
- There would be demand for parking for up to 7 more vehicles on the surrounding streets, causing congestion on the P4 and 284 bus routes.
- The applicant's parking survey exaggerates the number of available parking spaces on Bexhill Road. The 'observed spaces' are very tightly packed together compared to the spacing of nearby parked vehicles on the same survey, and extend right up to the roundabout adjoining Chudleigh Road, despite the presence of traffic islands on the approach to the roundabout.
- The applicant has not provided evidence that the building's sewerage system has the capacity to cope with 3 additional flats.
- The applicant has not made any allowance for additional recycling bins for the extra three properties
- The proposed storage area for 14 cycles is too small to hold that many cycles in the proposed linear configuration. The space is only 5.8m long, i.e. allowing less than 42cm per bicycle. 65-70cm would be a more realistic figure for the bicycles that are typically parked there at present, and ideally a bit more than that to allow residents to step between cycles to lock and unlock them. TFL recommends a minimum distance of 1m between stands - see page 8 in this document: <http://content.tfl.gov.uk/lcds-chapter8-cycleparking.pdf>
- The applicant proposed to include covered cycle storage in their planning application for the existing premises, but to date has never provided this. This casts doubt on the credibility of their pledge to provide covered cycle storage in the proposed development, and consequently their compliance with DM policy 29 . Please refer to the following link on the council website: https://planning.lewisham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?keyVal=_LEWIS_DCAPR_45727&activeTab=summary

Regards,

Richard Miller,

Flat 8, The Curve Building

159a Chudleigh Road

SE4 1HD

07779549558



To whom it may concern,

I am writing to set out my objections to the planning permission application (DC/20/117809).

These are based on the following grounds:

- The proposed choice of cladding is grey zinc and there does not appear to be sufficient support to the fire safety of such material. Further, this is inconsistent with the material in any of the nearby buildings, as well as the existing part of the Curve Building. As such it is unsympathetic to the character of the local area.
- The proposed development would allow new residents to overlook neighbouring properties which are mostly houses with gardens to a much greater extent than the current building (an increased height of 1.9m)
- There would be demand for parking for up to 7 more vehicles on the surrounding streets, causing congestion on the P4 and 284 bus routes.
- The application proposed 6 additional cycle parking slots. At the moment the space (in the backyard) is around 5.8m long, which allows for c.40cm per bike if 14 bikes are to be fitted in. This does not appear to be realistic given the standard bike would need c.70cm even before considering the space allowed for residents to lock/unlock the bikes. This therefore casts doubts on the credibility of the applicant in achieving the additional parking slots pledged.
- The applicant's parking survey exaggerates the number of available parking spaces nearby, in particular on Bexhill road. The 'spaces' as defined by the survey are very tightly packed together compared to the spacing of nearby parked vehicles on the same survey, and extend right up to the roundabout, where it would be impractical to expect anyone to park due to the presence of traffic islands on the approach to the roundabout.
- The application fails to address the following issues, which would have significant impacts on the residents:
 - Why it is considered that sufficient refuse and recycling facilities can be provided in the existing storage space, which is already packed, and space would need to be given to allow extraction of the waste.
 - The capacity of the existing sewerage system which could be exceeded by adding three more (double room) flats.

Kind regards

Yijing Yang

Resident at Flat 8, the Curve Building, Chudleigh Road, London SE41HD



From:Francis Gane
Sent:07 Sep 2020 09:12:17
To:Planning@lewisham.gov.uk,
Subject:FAO: Jesenka Ozdalga - objection to the planning proposal at The Curve Building, Chudleigh Road
Attachments:

FAO: Jesenka Ozdalga

Dear Jesenka,

Below are my objections to the proposed development at the Curve Building, Chudleigh Road:

Noise

The addition of new outdoor/balcony areas for 3 new flats will increase the noise from the building which will affect everyone who uses their balcony as well as neighbouring buildings. There is often quite a lot of noise from other residents on their balconies (especially during the summer months) and the addition of more outdoor spaces will only increase the noise level.

I am aware that noise due to construction is not seen as a valid objection but myself and my girlfriend work entirely from home and will simply be unable to work/earn a living for the extended period of time that this development will be going on for. What are we expected to do during the time that construction works are going on? We have nowhere else where we can work from and our employers have moved to 100% home working policy due to covid 19.

Privacy

The plans still show a significant encroachment on the privacy of the neighbouring building across the road (161 Chudleigh Road) who have a large garden that will become very exposed. I am able to see into their garden easily from my balcony on the top floor so a balcony another 10ft above mine will be able to see even more. The updates to the plans don't address this issue significantly.

153, 155, 157, 159 Chudleigh Road also have gardens that are very likely to be overlooked by the new development which has not been addressed in the plans.

Design/Appearance

The design proposed will be a real eyesore considering the proposed construction materials. It is not in keeping with any other buildings in the area (which are all traditional masonry construction). Also, The Curve Building is already a large building that stands out in the area, and will tower over the neighbouring buildings once significant extra height is added to it.

Highway Safety

The mini roundabout connecting Bexhill & Chudleigh Roads is a very busy intersection and I have seen many near misses involving bicycles, cars and scooters as well as pedestrians crossing using the crossing section next to the roundabout. More flats will increase the number of tenants crossing this dangerous section of road.

Parking

This area has seen an increase in cars parked on Chudleigh and Bexhill Roads in the past few months and this will only be exacerbated by the new development as no new car parking spaces have been proposed on site. I often struggle to find parking near to the building. There are also no plans shown for the proposed bicycle racks and if you review the space at the back of the building, it's hard to envisage room for the proposed number of new bicycle spaces.

Bins

There are no plans for increasing the capacity of the bins. These bins are already often full to capacity and there is no room for more bins due to the slope where they are located.

I hope you will consider the above, and deny the works going ahead.

I am happy to discuss this further if necessary.

Yours Sincerely,

Francis Gane

Flat 9
The Curve Building
Chudleigh Road
SE4 1HD



We object to the additional storey to the curve as it does not fit in with the residential properties in the area also some properties will lose their privacy.

Mr and Mrs Williams 146 Chudleigh road, SE4 1EE.

Sent from my iPad

[<https://lewisham.gov.uk/-/media/cls-email-lewisham20>]<https://www.nhs.uk/conditions/coronavirus-covid-19/>>

FAO: Jesenka Ozdalga

Dear Jesenka

Re. Construction of an additional storey at The Curve Building, Chudleigh Road, SE4 1HD; Ref DC/20/117809

I am writing to submit my objection to the request for planning for the additional storey to The Curve Building. I reside at 161 Chudleigh road. The side of my property runs down Bexhill road which is immediately opposite the site.

My primary concern is the additional height and elevation of the requested application will impact on the privacy of my home. The height and relationship of this additional storey, will directly overlook my garden and impact the privacy of my family as well as that of one of my children's bedrooms which front onto Bexhill road.

I would be happy to accommodate any visits to my home or garden by Planners to consider the impact on my home.

Many thanks

A Devlet



Dear Sir/Madam,

I'm writing to oppose the application referenced in the subject on the grounds:

1. The extension on this building will not be in keeping with the residential properties in the area.
2. Our property, and that of the neighbours will have their privacy compromised.

Yours sincerely

Emma Falkner
144 Chudleigh Road
London
SE4 1EE

Sent from my iPhone

[<https://lewisham.gov.uk/-/media/cls-email-lewisham20>]<https://www.nhs.uk/conditions/coronavirus-covid-19/>>

Planning Ref: DC/20/117809

The Curve, Chudleigh Road

We have a number of serious concerns regarding the proposals made in relation to the above application.

Our objections to the proposed development are based on the following: **loss of light** to the property and garden of number 159; the **disproportionate scale** of the proposed development; the new flats **not meeting minimum space requirements** set by London Design Guide criteria for housing and **overlooking of habitable rooms** of 159 Chudleigh Road.

The loss of light to number 159 by the addition of a further storey will be extensive; with both rear bedrooms, the living room, kitchen and garden being impacted. Afternoon light to the property will be severely restricted by this additional storey; input and consultation from a Rights to Light Surveyor is being sought, to fully understand and identify the impact this development will have on 159. Further legal action will be taken, should this proposal be granted permission.

The new height of the development with an additional storey will not be in keeping with the proportions of the street; the height of the existing development lines through with the roof ridge of the 1930s residential dwellings, that make up the vast majority of the properties on Chudleigh Road. The scale of the proposed development is not in keeping with that of the rest of the street and will make for an unsightly and overbearing addition to an already foreboding development. The new storey will make the proposal 2m taller than all other buildings along Chudleigh Road, which is out of keeping with proportion and scale of the low rise residential nature of the street.

The additional storey will also give direct views into the garden, living room and rear bedrooms of 159 Chudleigh Road. This is unacceptable in planning terms; at the very least the windows to this additional storey should be in obscured glazing. The extent of the drawings provided do not accurately describe the relationship of the top floor windows to number 159, neither is the surrounding context drawn accurately enough to clearly define the impact on the neighboring properties.

The London Housing Design Guide stipulates space requirements to ensure new dwellings, provide adequate space standards to accommodate comfortable living within London. One of the requirements is for private amenity space, for a two bed flat the space requirement is for 5m² of balcony space; The additional storey to which this application pertains consists of three one bed flats, two of which have zero amenity space provided. These flats do not meet the minimum standards for living as described in the London Housing Design Guide. We would argue that this application should be refused this basis.

Len and Sarah Henry Dalrymple
159 Chudleigh Road, SE4 1HP
08/09/2020



THE LADYWELL SOCIETY

Chair: R. Smith Secretary: K. Putman

Please reply to:

47 Chudleigh Road
Ladywell Village
London, SE4 1JX

Email: WellofOurLady@gmail.com

Jesenka Ozdalga
Planning Service
Laurence House
1 Catford Road
London SE6 4RU

3rd September 2020

Dear Ms Ozdalga

DC/20/117809 The Curve Building, Chudleigh Road, SE4 1HD

I am writing on behalf of the Ladywell Society which has decided to OBJECT to this application. This application is a re-submission differing in only minor respects to application **DC/19/1151138**. Our objections are therefore similar and are set out below:

The additional storey will be an over-dominant and overbearing intrusion into the streetscape. The height will be approx. 2.5 metres (not 1.9 metres as stated in the application) higher than the current building and so tower over the surrounding early twentieth century houses. When viewed from the section of Chudleigh Road opposite the building, the extra height will be intrusive.

Despite the proposed new storey being set further back, it will increase the over-looking of the houses opposite (161 Chudleigh Road) and their gardens (especially 161 and 163 Chudleigh Road). The gardens of 159 and 157 Chudleigh Road will also be overlooked more than at present.

The application states that grey metal cladding will be used. As the rest of the building is painted white, this will be incongruous and inappropriate. There must also be a safety question mark over most claddings post Grenfell

Although not a planning issue, concern was expressed whether the current building and its foundations could support the weight of an additional storey. Anecdotally, the ground appears to be shifting as cracks in building fabric, and other evidence of movement, are appearing in adjacent buildings. It was felt that an independent structural survey of the block of flats should be carried out and that the Council's relevant officers should be advised of the concerns.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R. Smith', with a long, sweeping underline that extends to the right.

Robert Smith
Chair

cc. K. Putman (Secretary) The Ladywell Society

Warden, Lee

From: Templeton, Eleanor
Sent: 19 October 2020 13:37
To: Ozdalga, Jesenka
Subject: RE: The Curve building, Chudleigh Road, DC/20/117809

Hi Jesenka,

The applicant has resubmitted the parking survey carried out in July 2020 (Ref. 20035/N02) with some amendments to the data in order to address the concerns raised in Highways comments dated 24th September 2020. These are shown below in italics.

The Lambeth Methodology states that the survey should be carried out within a 200m radius of the development. The survey has extended the 200m in several directions and failed to include one road (Glynde Road). There are other anomalies in the table of figures. Significantly, it is claimed that a total of 17 vehicles could potentially park on Bexhill Road outside the block. Although there are no restrictions, it would not be safe to do so on either side within 15m of the mini roundabout and uncontrolled crossing. The inclusion of stretches of road beyond 200m, where there may be spaces, would decrease the overall parking stress percentage giving a skewed result.

Technical Note 20035/N02 quotes the Lambeth Methodology, "Since people are unlikely to stop half way along a road at an imaginary 200/500m line so the survey should be extended to the next junction or shortened to the previous one, or taken to a suitable location along a road." This point is agreed, but in some cases the survey has been extended or shortened to a suitable junction and in some cases, it has not. It would have been preferable if the scope had been agreed with Highways in advance. The omission of Glynde Road has been acknowledged. The capacity figures have been amended on Chudleigh Road and Bexhill Road to take into account approximately 15m on each arm of the mini roundabout where it would not be safe to park and which should have been discounted from the survey.

There are still anomalies in the table of figures and the translation of the map based information to the tabular information. Although it is not agreed that there is a very low level of parking stress, it is accepted that there were 4 available spaces on Chudleigh Road to the south of the block and 6-7 on the opposite side, with a limited number in the surrounding roads. **On balance it is accepted that the potential number of cars parking on-street as a result of the proposed additional three 1 bed flats is not likely to result in an unacceptable level of parking stress.**

As a point of clarification, under the Intend to Publish London Plan the maximum off-street parking allowance for a PTAL 3 inner London borough is 0.25 spaces per flat. Consequently, no new off-street parking spaces should be allowed for the 3 new flats and the purpose of carrying out a parking survey is to establish whether any overspill parking on-street is likely to result in high parking stress for existing residents.

Regards
Eleanor

Eleanor Templeton
Development Officer

Resources & Regeneration

London Borough of Lewisham
Laurence House, 1 Catford Road
London SE6 4RU

Tel: 020 8314 2582

eleanor.templeton@lewisham.gov.uk

www.lewisham.gov.uk

From: Ozdalga,Jesenka
Sent: 12 October 2020 15:14
To: Templeton, Eleanor
Subject: FW: The Curve building, Chudleigh Road, DC/20/117809

Hi Eleanor,

Please find further revision of transport statement for this application.

As we are planning on taking it to the committee, we need to make sure that all points are satisfactory from our side regarding highways and servicing.

Thank you.

Jesenka

From: Colin Sharpe [<mailto:Colin@architects-plus.co.uk>]
Sent: 09 October 2020 12:15
To: Ozdalga,Jesenka
Cc: Carlo Camicia (carlo.camicia@dpsproperty.com)
Subject: RE: The Curve building, Chudleigh Road, DC/20/117809

Hello Jesenka,

Thank you for that, we have responded to the bin storage issue previously showing we have proposed what the Lewisham refuse department have advised. However there is space for more bins if required within the existing enclosure so not an issue really

We attach here a technical Note from Pulsar addressing the Highways officers comments so hopefully is self explanatory. Your officer does start off saying that technically we do not need additional parking anyway. The parking stress survey shows a very low level of parking stress even with the revisions so this should not be a reason for refusal.

Regards,
Colin

Colin Sharpe

BA(Hons) Dip Arch RIBA

For and on behalf of



The Grange

Market Square

Westerham

TN16 1HB

Tel. +44 1959 561 078

E-mail: c.sharpe@architects-plus.co.uk

The information contained in this message is confidential and is intended for the addressee only. If you received this message in error or there are any issues regarding this email, then please notify the originator immediately. The unauthorised use, disclosure, copying or alteration of this message is strictly forbidden. The thoughts and views expressed in this email are those of the sender and not necessarily those of Architects Plus. This mail and any attachments have been scanned for viruses. Architects plus will not be liable for direct, special, indirect or consequential damages arising from alterations of the contents of this message by a third party or as a result of any virus being passed on. If you have any queries regarding this email please contact office@architects-plus.co.uk

From: Ozdalga,Jesenka [<mailto:Jesenka.Ozdalga@lewisham.gov.uk>]

Sent: 09 October 2020 09:39

To: Colin Sharpe

Subject: RE: The Curve building, Chudleigh Road, DC/20/117809

Hi,

Council does not publish content of objections.

I will summarise for you below. I will also double check if we are allowed to send you over objection letters with redacted personal details.

Hope this is helpful.

Best regards,

Jesenka

Objections summary:

Inconsistencies in plans and documents:

- In section 16 it says there are currently 8 x 1 bed and 3 x 2 bed flats and the proposed building (section 15) will be 6 x 1 bed and 8 x 2 bed. In fact the existing building is 3 x 1 bed and 8 x 2 bed
- The site plan of the existing car park and amenity space is wrong, The "existing" plan of the building says there are 6 car parking places – however there are in fact 7. The plan given to the residents and on the communal notice boards clearly shows the 7 spaces and the flats they are allocated

to. The wall separating the garden from the car park is not as shown on the plans and the small flight of stairs is also incorrectly placed.

- The D&A Statement refers to the buses travelling down nearby Crofton Park Road. This is, in fact a residential street linking Manwood Road with Codrington Hill/Stillness Road, along which buses do not travel. The applicant may be referring to Brockley Grove.

Car parking issues:

- Proposed on street parking available outside the block in Bexhill Road is unsafe for parking
- The applicant's parking survey exaggerates the number of available parking spaces on Bexhill Road

Design issues:

- The addition of the extra storey, with grey zinc cladding will make it over-dominant and over-bearing in the area particularly in relation to the houses in the lower part of Chudleigh Road opposite the building (ie 138- 152 and 161-167)
- Is cladding fire safe and appropriate material?
- not in keeping with any other buildings in the area (which are all traditional masonry construction).
- The height will be approx. 2.5 metres (not 1.9 metres as stated in the application) higher than the current building and so tower over the surrounding early twentieth century houses

Layout issues:

- Flat 12 has living room above bedroom of the flat below, and vice versa, potential disturbance.
- The additional storey to which this application pertains consists of three one bed flats, two of which have zero amenity space provided These flats do not meet the minimum standards for living as described in the London Housing Design Guide.

Impact on neighbouring amenity:

- significant encroachment on the privacy of the neighbouring building across the road (161 Chudleigh Road) and gardens of 157 and 159. The updates to the plans don't address this issue significantly.
- Loss of light at garden at 159
- The extent of the drawings provided do not accurately describe the relationship of the top floor windows to number 159, neither is the surrounding context drawn accurately enough to clearly define the impact on the neighboring properties.

Cycle parking:

- There are no plans shown for the proposed bicycle racks and if you review the space at the back of the building, it's hard to envisage room for the proposed number of new bicycle spaces.
- The applicant proposed to include covered cycle storage in their planning application for the existing premises, but to date has never provided this. This casts doubt on the credibility of their pledge to provide covered cycle storage in the proposed development

Bins:

- There are no plans for increasing the capacity of the bins. These bins are already often full to capacity and there is no room for more bins due to the slope where they are located.

Lack of structural survey to demonstrate that building can carry additional load.

Lack of construction management plan.

Lack of evidence that the building's sewerage system has the capacity to cope with 3 additional flats.

From: Colin Sharpe [<mailto:Colin@architects-plus.co.uk>]
Sent: 09 October 2020 08:30
To: Ozdalga,Jesenka
Subject: RE: The Curve building, Chudleigh Road, DC/20/117809

Hello Jesenka,
Can we see the objections please as they are not posted on the councils website.
Thank you
Colin

Colin Sharpe

BA(Hons) Dip Arch RIBA

For and on behalf of



The Grange

Market Square

Westerham

TN16 1HB

Tel. +44 1959 561 078

E-mail: c.sharpe@architects-plus.co.uk

The information contained in this message is confidential and is intended for the addressee only. If you received this message in error or there are any issues regarding this email, then please notify the originator immediately. The unauthorised use, disclosure, copying or alteration of this message is strictly forbidden. The thoughts and views expressed in this email are those of the sender and not necessarily those of Architects Plus. This mail and any attachments have been scanned for viruses. Architects plus will not be liable for direct, special, indirect or consequential damages arising from alterations of the contents of this message by a third party or as a result of any virus being passed on. If you have any queries regarding this email please contact office@architects-plus.co.uk

From: Ozdalga,Jesenka [<mailto:Jesenka.Ozdalga@lewisham.gov.uk>]
Sent: 01 October 2020 13:21
To: Colin Sharpe
Subject: FW: The Curve building, Chudleigh Road, DC/20/117809

Hi,

I have sent an email yesterday. Please see below.

Best regards,
Jesenka

From: Ozdalga,Jesenka
Sent: 30 September 2020 12:45
To: 'office@architects-plus.co.uk'
Subject: The Curve building, Chudleigh Road, DC/20/117809

Hi,

I am writing to inform you that this application has received 13 objections and 1 objection from Ladywell Society.

Therefore, it is above the threshold of 10 objections and local meeting must be held. I would like to inform you that Council IT team is working on setting up the appropriate technology for local meetings to come forward. Therefore, we would have to inform you that until that process is in place, we would not be able to do any further work on this application. Unfortunately, I am not able to provide accurate time scale for this. Following local meeting, the proposal would go to the planning committee. Again, depending on backlog of committee cases, I am not able to provide time scale on that.

As from the planning considerations, at this stage, I would ask for further details with regards to Highways and servicing. I would include below comments from our highways officer. Please provide those clarifications.

Highways comments:

Car park:

The existing block of 11 flats has undercroft parking for 6 cars. As a PTAL 3 area, the additional development of 3 flats would not attract any off street parking. The allowance under the Intend to Publish London Plan is 0.25 spaces per flat. The proposal should therefore be car free.

In order to establish whether the potential for further on street parking arising from the 3 new flats would result in an unacceptable level of parking stress, a parking survey is necessary.

This has been provided, but the data is found to be flawed. The Lambeth Methodology states that the survey should be carried out within a 200m radius of the development. The survey has extended the 200m in several directions and failed to include one road (Glynde Road). There are other anomalies in the table of figures. Significantly, it is claimed that a total of 17 vehicles could potentially park on Bexhill Road outside the block. Although there are no restrictions, it would not be safe to do so on either side within 15m of the mini roundabout and uncontrolled crossing. The inclusion of stretches of road beyond 200m, where there may be spaces, would decrease the overall parking stress percentage giving a skewed result. Should the application be considered for approval, a new parking survey would be required.

Also, please note that many objections include a note that the current building actually has 7 parking spots. Please clarify.

Cycle parking

Under Policy T5 of the ITPLP, 1.5 covered secure cycle parking spaces should be provided for each 1 bed flat. This equates to an additional 4-5 spaces. There is an existing cycle store providing 11 spaces (one for each flat). This is, in fact, less than the requirement under the previous version of the London Plan which was 2 spaces per 2 bed flat. It is suggested that, as a minimum, a new store for 16 spaces should be provided. Ideally, this would be increased to 24 to make up the shortfall.

The storage area shown on the Proposed Plan is not wide enough to accommodate the 14 cycles proposed. If using Sheffield stands inside a store, there would need to be a minimum of 1m between stands. It is also unclear how the

store is accessed as there is a level change at the rear of the block. There must be step free access. A scaled drawing and product details should be supplied.

Refuse/recycling

The Proposed Plan shows 2 x 1240l Eurobins and 3 smaller wheelie bins. Google Streetview April 2019, shows that there are already 2 Eurobins and 2 wheelie bins supplied for 11 flats. The quota should be increased to 3 wheelie bins for recycling and 3 additional for refuse. There would appear to be sufficient space in the existing storage area to accommodate this. Please provide details. A condition ensuring that no bins are left on the highway after collection is required.

Construction Management Plan

A CMP would be required, including details of how safe access for pedestrians to the car park and rear of the block is to be maintained and a Communications Statement explaining how the residents will be kept informed of the works programme. However, this could be added as condition to the committee report.

I will also prepare summary of the objection as well and we will discuss on whether there is any other amendments that could be made in order to address those concerns.

Hope this is helpful.

Best regards,

Jesenka Ozdalga
Planning Officer

Planning Service
Laurence House
1 Catford Road
Catford, London
SE6 4RU

020 8314 3530
E-mail: jesenka.ozdalga@lewisham.gov.uk
Website: www.lewisham.gov.uk

We are able to offer a choice of Planning Advice Services before submitting a planning application. Please access this webpage link <https://www.lewisham.gov.uk/myservices/planning/apply-for-planning-permission/get-planning-advice/Pages/default.aspx>

DISCLAIMER

This message is confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity it is addressed to. If you have received it in error, please contact the sender and delete the e-mail. Please note that we may monitor and check emails to safeguard the Council network from viruses, hoax messages or other abuse of the Council's systems. To see the full version of this disclaimer please visit the following address: <http://www.lewisham.gov.uk/AboutThisSite/EmailDisclaimer.htm>

For advice and assistance about online security and protection from internet threats visit the "Get Safe Online" website at <http://www.getsafeonline.org>

DISCLAIMER

This message is confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity it is addressed to. If you have received it in error, please contact the sender and delete the e-mail. Please note that we may monitor and check emails to safeguard the Council network from viruses, hoax messages or other abuse of the Council's systems. To see the full version of this disclaimer please visit the following address: <http://www.lewisham.gov.uk/AboutThisSite/EmailDisclaimer.htm>

For advice and assistance about online security and protection from internet threats visit the "Get Safe Online" website at <http://www.getsafeonline.org>

From:David Wilson

Sent:30 Nov 2020 07:49:17

To:Planning@lewisham.gov.uk,

Subject:The Curve Building, Chudleigh Road, SE4 Planning Application (LE/826/159/TP)

Attachments:

Dear Sir,

Thank you for your letter dated 25 November 2020. Your reference DC/20/117809.

I wish to object to the revised plans for the development on this site due to the following reasons –

1. Two balconies to the rear of the building will create an intrusion into the privacy of my residence;
2. An additional storey on the building will also create an intrusion into the privacy of my residence.

Kind regards,

David Wilson
153 Chudleigh Road
London
Se4 1HP

This e-mail and any attachment are confidential and contain proprietary information, some or all of which may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the author immediately by telephone or by replying to this e-mail, and then delete all copies of the e-mail on your system. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not use, disclose, distribute, copy, print or rely on this e-mail.

Whilst we have taken reasonable precautions to ensure that this e-mail and any attachment has been checked for viruses, we cannot guarantee that they are virus free and we cannot accept liability for any damage sustained as a result of software viruses. We would advise that you carry out your own virus checks, especially before opening an attachment.

EY refers to the global organization, and may refer to one or more, of the member firms of Ernst & Young Global Limited, each of which is a separate legal entity. Ernst & Young Global Limited, a UK company limited by guarantee, does not provide services to clients.

The UK firm Ernst & Young LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales with registered number OC300001 and is a member firm of Ernst & Young Global Limited. A list of members' names is available for inspection at 1 More London Place, London, SE1 2AF, the firm's principal place of business and its registered office. Associate Partners are not members of Ernst & Young LLP. Ernst & Young LLP is a multi-disciplinary practice and is authorised and regulated by the Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales, the Solicitors Regulation Authority (authorisation number 614947), the Financial Conduct Authority (registration number 196203) and other regulators. Further details can be found at https://www.ey.com/en_uk/legal-statement



We object to additional storey and revised plans to two balconies to the rear of the proposed additional storey to the curve. The balconies will not affect my property but it will affect the privacy to the properties nearest to the curve. And also does not fit in with the residential properties in the area.

Sent from my iPad

> On 9 Sep 2020, at 17:46, Evadney Williams <eve.williams53@hotmail.co.uk> wrote:

>

> We object to the additional storey to the curve as it does not fit in with the residential properties in the area also some properties will loose their privacy.

> Mr and Mrs williams 146 Chudleigh road, se4 1EE.

>

> Sent from my iPad



THE LADYWELL SOCIETY

Chair: R. Smith Secretary: K. Putman

Please reply to:

47 Chudleigh Road
Ladywell Village
London, SE4 1JX

Email: WellofOurLady@gmail.com

Jesenka Ozdalga
Planning Service
Laurence House
1 Catford Road
London SE6 4RU

11th December 2020

Dear Ms Ozdalga

DC/20/117809 The Curve Building, Chudleigh Road, SE4 1HD

I am writing on behalf of the Ladywell Society in response to your letter of 25th and your email of 26th November 2020.

The Society confirms its OBJECTION to this application, as set out in my earlier letter of 3rd September 2020

Yours sincerely,

Robert Smith
Chair

cc. K. Putman (Secretary) The Ladywell Society

Flat 11
The Curve Building
159a Chudleigh Road
London
SE4 1HD

Lewisham Council
Planning Service
3/F Laurence House
1 Catford Road
Catford
London SE6 4RU

F.A.O. Jesenka Ozdalga

13th December 2020

Dear Ms Ozdalga,

Re: Objection to Updated Planning Application: One additional vertical storey to The Curve Building: Your Ref: DC/20/117809, Property Ref. LE/826/159/TP

I refer to your letter dated 25th November 2020 notifying the near neighbours that the above Planning Application has been updated to address inconsistencies in the initial submission. I have reviewed the updated information and confirm that my fundamental concerns detailed in my letters dated 5th February 2020 regarding the previous planning application and subsequently 5th September 2020 regarding this application have still not been satisfactorily addressed. My previous comments, therefore, still stand and, as the Co-owner of Flat 11, The Curve Building, I wish to repeat my objection to this updated planning application.

I have set out in bold below against each of my previous concerns what difference, if any, the updated information has made or not:

- The Curve Building is already the most prominent structure in the neighbourhood and adding an additional storey will only make the building even more prominent. The new Design and Access Statement from Architects Plus presented with the Planning Application states that The Curve Building is "*not set within a range of 2 storey dwellings but stands alone on Bexhill Road with the railway embankment to the side of the building. We are hence not affecting a regular street-scene and is entirely in keeping with this situation*"; which still attempts to imply that the building is isolated and stands alone. This is clearly not correct, as can be seen from the photos attached below, providing a truer representation of the street-scene than the photo presented in the new Design & Access Statement. As the attached photos show, The Curve Building is located on a multi-road junction roundabout, on a busy bus route, nestled amongst a mix of existing 2 storey semi and detached properties built from different eras. This proposed development will make the building stand out even further and will definitely disrupt the regular street-scene, as it will be 2 storeys higher than any other building in the neighbourhood.

My previous concerns above have not been addressed, are still valid and stand.

- The repeated statement in the Design and Access Statement that the additional storey will only add a 1.9m height to the existing roofline is misleading, as this is only at the higher end of the building. The actual fact is that an additional storey is being added to nearly all of the existing footprint, so there is an overall increase in height of at least 3.0m to the existing building and sightlines. The proposed development will overlook neighbouring properties and gardens to a greater extent than the current building. In particular, Nos. 153, 155, 157, 159 & 161 Chudleigh Road have gardens that will be overlooked by the new flats. The front balcony may have been removed from the scheme but there will still be a loss of privacy through increased overlooking from the multiple higher additional windows at the front. Adding an additional storey will make the building even taller and more intrusive on the neighbourhood.

My previous concerns above have not been addressed, are still valid and stand. In fact, the Proposed Cross Section drawing no. 19890 PL 104 Rev.D clearly demonstrates that the new top flats will overlook No. 161 Chudleigh Road to a much greater extent than the existing top floor flats and most of its garden and some of the house interior would be visible. Furthermore, the reintroduction of balconies to each of the new flats, albeit at the rear, exacerbates the loss of privacy and intrusion to the near neighbours. I also highlight

adding balconies has resulted in the proposed new flats having an internal living space only just above the absolute recommended minimum of 50m² stipulated in the Government guidelines.

- The proposed choice of cladding (grey metal panelling) is unsympathetic to the character of the local area and will look out of place. It does not “*mimic the darker roof covering colours on most pitched roof houses*” as claimed in the Statement, as the surrounding houses have traditional clay or slate roof tiling. There are no buildings anywhere nearby in the surrounding streets with this type of cladding, which is more commonly used for industrial buildings. The houses in the immediate neighbourhood are mostly constructed with a masonry or rendered external finish. In addition, the further statement in the application that “*The proposal ties in with the existing contemporary building style and utilises the same material palette*” is also misleading. The grey metal panelling is in stark contrast to the mixed brickwork and white painted render finish of the existing building’s external façade.

Even though I am sure the proposed development will be constructed to the latest Building Regulations’ requirements, the use of metal cladding with timber framing will create an increased fire risk and safety issues for the building. As you are aware, the consequences of using metal cladding on residential buildings was demonstrated tragically in the recent Grenfell Tower disaster. For this reason alone, I object strongly to this proposed development.

My previous concerns above have not been addressed, are still valid and stand.

- I appreciate that the traffic survey included with the application is supposed to be independent, but I believe that the survey data showing no cars parked outside of The Curve Building on Bexhill Road on both nights and photos of empty streets are not representative of the usual situation, which is shown by the attached photo. It is not unusual for me to be unable to park right outside the building. The proposed development could potentially add 3 to 6 cars from residents, with additional cars for visitors, to park on the streets outside, which are on busy bus routes.

Furthermore, the traffic report shows 17no. observed spaces in Bexhill Road immediately in front of The Curve Building in their Zones 23 & 31. It is clear from the photos attached below that cars are not able to park on both sides of the road right up to the roundabout, so the data is not representative of the actual parking spaces available in Bexhill Road. On this basis, I would question some of the other data and overall findings of the report.

I acknowledge that the error in the Parking survey regarding the number of observed spaces in Bexhill Road near the roundabout has now been rectified. However, I maintain that it is also not safe or conducive to proper traffic flow for cars to park on both sides of Bexhill Road as shown and, for that reason, cars do not park on both sides. My previous concerns related to the Parking survey not being representative of the normal situation are still valid and stand.

- As I stated in my previous objection letter, the Freeholder proposed to include covered cycle storage in their planning application for the existing premises, but to date, has never provided this. This casts doubt on the credibility of their pledge to provide a new covered cycle storage in the proposed development, and consequently their compliance with DM Policy 29.

Furthermore, I would question the feasibility of installing a 14-cycle covered storage in the space shown on the layout plan, which is only 5.8m long. This means that each bicycle will only have a space of 41.4cms, as opposed to the usual 63cms. Constructed correctly, the new cycle store will need to be 3 metres longer, which will impinge further into the existing amenity area.

I acknowledge that the error in the area required for the covered cycle storage has been rectified. However, based on my above calculations, I simply do not believe that it is possible to park 4no. cycles in the additional store shown in the Side Bay 1 with the limited space available there. My previous concerns above relating to the credibility of the Freeholder’s pledge are still valid and stand.

- The new application claims that “*The Refuse department have been consulted and adequate refuse and recycling facilities can be provided in the existing storage area at the front of the building*”. This is a dubious claim as the ground slopes too steeply in the existing area to allow more space for recycling bins and the existing bins are often full to capacity.

My previous concerns above have not been addressed, are still valid and stand.

- The Statement repeats one of the main justifications for this proposed development being to overcome an existing, consistent rain ingress issue on the current top 2nd floor. As I own a top floor flat, this is an issue of great importance to me. However, the Freeholder has recently arranged for the problematic areas to be re-roofed, which hopefully will rectify the issues in the long-term. I would again highlight that building an additional storey above is not the easiest or simplest way to resolve this issue, which can be solved by a properly executed repair or re-roof of part or whole of the area.

My previous comments above still stand.

- I understand that noise from construction works is not deemed a valid comment to a planning application in accordance with your guidelines. However, in these unprecedented times of the Covid-19 pandemic, more people are being forced to work from home and will continue to do so in the future. Indeed, I am aware of a number of existing residents of The Curve Building who work from home, including my own son who is currently residing in Flat 11. Thus, existing residents having to suffer a prolonged period of noisy construction works during the working week will have a critical impact on their well-being and ability to work from home. I implore you to consider this detrimental factor as well, when making your decision to this application.

My previous concerns above still stand.

I trust that the above objection and further comments will be taken into full consideration in the Planning Service’s decision as to whether or not to grant this application, which I urge you not to accept for the above reasons.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Francis Thurley', written in a cursive style.

Mr Francis Thurley



The Curve Building nestled amongst 2 storey houses; Proposed development will be 2 storeys higher than neighbouring houses



The Curve Building nestled amongst 2 storey houses; Proposed development will be 2 storeys higher than neighbouring houses

Cars are not able to park on both sides of Bexhill Road as shown in Parking survey



Cars parked outside The Curve Building on a normal day



Cars are not able to park on both sides of Bexhill Road as shown in Parking survey

Please find attached my objections to the above amended planning application.



Lewisham Council
Planning Service
3/F Laurence House
1 Catford Road, Catford
London SE6 4RU

F.A.O. Jesenka Ozdalga

16th December 2020

Dear Ms Ozdalga,

Re: Objection to Updated Planning Application: One additional vertical storey to The Curve Building: Your Ref: DC/20/117809, Property Ref. LE/826/159/TP

As the Co-owner of Flat 11, The Curve Building, I have received the aforementioned notice and I have the following observations and comments:

- I completely concur with all my husband's comments (Mr Francis Thurley) detailed in his letter dated 13th December 2020 sent to the Planning Service and submit them as my own.
- Although I respect Lewisham Council's government dwelling targets, I believe that the main justification for this application cited in the Design and Access Statement to help the Council achieve these targets is misplaced. The detrimental impact that this proposed development will have on the visual appearance of the neighbourhood, the loss of privacy of adjacent residences and added traffic and parking difficulties in the vicinity does not warrant this application. This is exacerbated by the fact that the revised application has reduced the number of new dwellings created from 2,2,1 bed flats to 1,1,1 bed flats, thus reducing this application's contribution to the Council's achievement of targets even further, whilst not reducing the proposed development's detrimental impact on the neighbourhood.

Further, notwithstanding that an error in the Parking Survey has now been rectified, I still maintain that parking on both sides of Bexhill Road is both unsafe and impractical for proper traffic flow including buses. I also note that the updated application now includes two balconies to the rear. This will not only have an impact on overlooking neighbours (and also 161 Chudleigh Road to the front), but reduces the internal square metre living space to just above minimum Government guidelines. My previous concerns above have not been addressed, are still valid and stand.

- I object to the applicant publishing in their application my current address as being in Hong Kong, which appears to imply that I am just an overseas investor. I would like to clarify that I am not an overseas investor and I do co-own Flat 11. Our son currently resides there and I will be returning to the UK at the end of this year to take up residence, therefore, I have a keen interest in this latest planning application. Under current Covid pandemic government guidelines, I may have to spend some of my time working from home. If this application were to be granted, notwithstanding a great number of other reasons for objecting, it will have a huge impact on my well-being and, further, in the lease I may be unable to continue a "peaceful enjoyment of premises".

Our daughter has also recently moved in with our son into Flat 11 (which will mean I have to find other accommodation). However, I remain very concerned for their mental health and well-being, particularly as London goes into Tier 3 lockdown and they will both need to work from home. My previous concerns above have not been addressed, are still valid and stand.

I trust that the above objection and comments will be taken into full consideration in the Planning Service's decision as to whether or not to grant this application, which I urge you not to accept for the above reasons.

Yours sincerely,

Gail Thurley

Mrs Gail Thurley

16.05.2020

Planning Ref: DC/20/117809

The Curve, Chudleigh Road

We still have the same serious concerns regarding the proposals made in relation to the above application as previously submitted.

Our objections to the proposed development are based on the following: **loss of light** to the property and garden of number 159; the **disproportionate scale** of the proposed development; the new flats **not meeting minimum space requirements** set by London Design Guide criteria for housing and **overlooking of habitable rooms** of 159 Chudleigh Road.

The loss of light to number 159 by the addition of a further storey will be extensive; with both rear bedrooms, the living room, kitchen and garden being impacted. Afternoon light to the property will be severely restricted by this additional storey; input and consultation from a Rights to Light Surveyor is being sought, to fully understand and identify the impact this development will have on 159. Further legal action will be taken, should this proposal be granted permission.

The new height of the development with an additional storey will not be in keeping with the proportions of the street; the height of the existing development lines through with the roof ridge of the 1930s residential dwellings, that make up the vast majority of the properties on Chudleigh Road. The scale of the proposed development is not in keeping with that of the rest of the street and will make for an unsightly and overbearing addition to an already foreboding development. The new storey will make the proposal 2m taller than all other buildings along Chudleigh Road, which is out of keeping with proportion and scale of the low rise residential nature of the street.

The additional storey will also give direct views into the garden, living room and rear bedrooms of 159 Chudleigh Road. This is unacceptable in planning terms; at the very least the windows to this additional storey should be in obscured glazing. The extent of the drawings provided do not accurately describe the relationship of the top floor windows to number 159, neither is the surrounding context drawn accurately enough to clearly define the impact on the neighboring properties.

The London Housing Design Guide stipulates space requirements to ensure new dwellings, provide adequate space standards to accommodate comfortable living within London. One of the requirements is for private amenity space, for a two bed flat the space requirement is for 5m² of balcony space; The additional storey to which this application pertains consists of three one bed flats, two of which have zero amenity space provided. These flats do not meet the minimum standards for living as described in the London Housing Design Guide. We would argue that this application should be refused on this basis.

Len and Sarah Henry Dalrymple
159 Chudleigh Road, SE4 1HP
16/12/2020

For the attention of Jesenka Ozdalga

I would like to repeat my objection to the latest iteration of this proposed development. These were my objections last time - most have either not been addressed, or remain insufficiently addressed.

- The proposed development would overlook neighbouring properties and gardens to a greater extent than the current building (an increased height of at least 1.9m)
Not addressed, particularly for the back gardens of 161/163 Chudleigh Road
- The proposed choice of cladding (dark metal sheeting) is unsympathetic to the character of the local area. There are no buildings anywhere in the surrounding streets with this type of cladding, and it clashes with the existing palette of materials in the current building.
Not addressed
- The proposed choice of cladding has a dubious degree of fire safety
Not addressed
- There would be demand for parking for up to 7 more vehicles on the surrounding streets, causing congestion on the P4 and 284 bus routes.
Not addressed
- The applicant's parking survey exaggerates the number of available parking spaces on Bexhill Road. The 'observed spaces' are very tightly packed together compared to the spacing of nearby parked vehicles on the same survey, and extend right up to the roundabout adjoining Chudleigh Road, despite the presence of traffic islands on the approach to the roundabout.
Even the reduced number of spaces suggested in the new survey is unrealistic given the level of traffic and the space needed for buses to pass by.
- The applicant has not provided evidence that the building's sewerage system has the capacity to cope with 3 additional flats.
Addressed
- The applicant has not made any allowance for additional recycling bins for the extra three properties
Not addressed - there isn't space for any more bins in the existing area because the ground slopes too steeply, and the existing bins are already frequently full to capacity.
- The proposed storage area for 14 cycles is too small to hold that many cycles in the proposed linear configuration.
Not addressed - the proposed new area to the side of the building for 4 cycles is only 162cm across, allowing even less space per cycle than the previously proposed storage.
- The applicant proposed to include covered cycle storage in their planning application for the existing premises, but to date has never provided this. This casts doubt on the credibility of their pledge to provide covered cycle storage in the proposed development, and consequently their compliance with DM policy 29 . Please refer to the following link on the council website: https://planning.lewisham.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?keyVal=_LEWIS_DCAPR_45727&activeTab=summary
Not addressed

Regards,

Richard Miller,

Flat 8, The Curve Building

159a Chudleigh Road

SE4 1HD

07779549558



For the attention of Jesenka Ozdalga

I would like to repeat my objection to the latest iteration of this proposed development (DC/20/117809).

This is based on the following grounds:

- The proposed choice of cladding is grey zinc and there does not appear to be sufficient support to the fire safety of such material. Further, this is inconsistent with the material in any of the nearby buildings, as well as the existing part of the Curve Building. As such it is unsympathetic to the character of the local area. **The safety issue has not been addressed in the updated application and could have a profound impact on the residents in the Curve Building and in the nearby houses. The updated planning application considers that the grey colour “mimic the darker roof covering colours on most pitched roof houses” and “ties in with the existing contemporary building style and utilises the same material palette”.** This is however not the case and very different from the design of the houses in this area. Further the Curve Building at the moment is a mix of red brick and white surface already and dark grey is not consistent with this.
- The proposed development would allow new residents to overlook neighbouring properties which are mostly houses with gardens to a much greater extent than the current building (an increased height of 1.9m). **This has not been addressed in the updated application.**
- There would be demand for parking for up to 7 more vehicles on the surrounding streets, causing congestion on the P4 and 284 bus routes. **The new parking survey still failed to address that level of existing traffic in this area**
- The application proposed 6 additional cycle parking slots. At the moment the space (in the backyard) is around 5.8m long, which allows for c.40cm per bike if 14 bikes are to be fitted in. This does not appear to be realistic given the standard bike would need c.70cm even before considering the space allowed for residents to lock/unlock the bikes. This therefore casts doubts on the credibility of the applicant in achieving the additional parking slots pledged. **This has not been addressed - the proposed new area to the side of the building for 4 cycles is only 162cm across, and therefore allows c.40 cm per bike which is not sufficient.**
- The applicant's parking survey exaggerates the number of available parking spaces nearby, in particular on Bexhill road. The 'spaces' as defined by the survey are very tightly packed together compared to the spacing of nearby parked vehicles on the same survey, and extend right up to the roundabout, where it would be impractical to expect anyone to park due to the presence of traffic islands on the approach to the roundabout. **The new parking survey still failed to address that level of existing traffic in this area and the fact that this is a bus route and additionally has large vans passing by, either for delivery or construction (e.g. loft conversion in the nearby residential area).**
- The application fails to address the following issues, which would have significant impacts on the residents:
 - Why it is considered that sufficient refuse and recycling facilities can be provided in the existing storage space, which is already packed, and space would need to be given to allow extraction of the waste. **The current bin storage area is not on a flat surface, and therefore any additional bins may not be realistic and could be a safety hazard as they would be on a steep slope. The current bins, especially the recycling bins are often on a full capacity at the moment, and would not be able to cope with additional flats in the building.**

Kind regards

Yijing Yang

Resident at Flat 8, the Curve Building, Chudleigh Road, London SE41HD



Warden, Lee

From: Templeton, Eleanor
Sent: 05 January 2021 18:20
To: Ozdalga,Jesenka
Subject: RE: The Curve building, Chudleigh Road, DC/20/117809

Hi Jesenka,

Happy New Year to you!

I can confirm that details of proposed cycle storage given on Revision D of Dwg no. 19890 PL 102 are acceptable.

Regards
Eleanor

Eleanor Templeton
Development Officer

Housing, Regeneration & Public Realm
London Borough of Lewisham
Laurence House, 1 Catford Road
London SE6 4RU

Tel: 020 8314 2582

eleanor.templeton@lewisham.gov.uk

www.lewisham.gov.uk

From: Ozdalga,Jesenka
Sent: 04 January 2021 13:08
To: Templeton, Eleanor
Subject: FW: The Curve building, Chudleigh Road, DC/20/117809

Hi Eleanor,

Hope this email finds you well and happy new year!

Would you please have a quick look at revised drawings submitted with this application?

I think you already commented that potential parking overspill is acceptable, and provision of bin storage seem of sufficient capacity.

Would you please have a look at cycle storage? There were some discrepancies in existing drawings, but that is now fixed.

Thanks.
Jesenka

From: Ozdalga,Jesenska
Sent: 12 October 2020 15:14
To: Templeton, Eleanor
Subject: FW: The Curve building, Chudleigh Road, DC/20/117809

Hi Eleanor,

Please find further revision of transport statement for this application.

As we are planning on taking it to the committee, we need to make sure that all points are satisfactory from our side regarding highways and servicing.

Thank you.

Jesenska

From: Colin Sharpe [<mailto:Colin@architects-plus.co.uk>]
Sent: 09 October 2020 12:15
To: Ozdalga,Jesenska
Cc: Carlo Camicia (carlo.camicia@dpsproperty.com)
Subject: RE: The Curve building, Chudleigh Road, DC/20/117809

Hello Jesenska,

Thank you for that, we have responded to the bin storage issue previously showing we have proposed what the Lewisham refuse department have advised. However there is space for more bins if required within the existing enclosure so not an issue really

We attach here a technical Note from Pulsar addressing the Highways officers comments so hopefully is self explanatory. Your officer does start off saying that technically we do not need additional parking anyway. The parking stress survey shows a very low level of parking stress even with the revisions so this should not be a reason for refusal.

Regards,
Colin

Colin Sharpe

BA(Hons) Dip Arch RIBA

For and on behalf of

architects plus 

The Grange

Market Square

Westerham

TN16 1HB

Tel. +44 1959 561 078

E-mail: c.sharpe@architects-plus.co.uk

The information contained in this message is confidential and is intended for the addressee only. If you received this message in error or there are any issues regarding this email, then please notify the originator immediately. The unauthorised use, disclosure, copying or alteration of this message is strictly forbidden. The thoughts and views expressed in this email are those of the sender and not necessarily those of Architects Plus. This mail and any attachments have been scanned for viruses. Architects plus will not be liable for direct, special, indirect or consequential damages arising from alterations of the contents of this message by a third party or as a result of any virus being passed on. If you have any queries regarding this email please contact office@architects-plus.co.uk

From: Ozdalga,Jesenka [<mailto:Jesenka.Ozdalga@lewisham.gov.uk>]

Sent: 09 October 2020 09:39

To: Colin Sharpe

Subject: RE: The Curve building, Chudleigh Road, DC/20/117809

Hi,

Council does not publish content of objections.

I will summarise for you below. I will also double check if we are allowed to send you over objection letters with redacted personal details.

Hope this is helpful.

Best regards,

Jesenka

Objections summary:

Inconsistencies in plans and documents:

- In section 16 it says there are currently 8 x 1 bed and 3 x 2 bed flats and the proposed building (section 15) will be 6 x 1 bed and 8 x 2 bed. In fact the existing building is 3 x 1 bed and 8 x 2 bed
- The site plan of the existing car park and amenity space is wrong, The "existing" plan of the building says there are 6 car parking places – however there are in fact 7. The plan given to the residents and on the communal notice boards clearly shows the 7 spaces and the flats they are allocated to. The wall separating the garden from the car park is not as shown on the plans and the small flight of stairs is also incorrectly placed.
- The D&A Statement refers to the buses travelling down nearby Crofton Park Road. This is, in fact a residential street linking Manwood Road with Codrington Hill/Stillness Road, along which buses do not travel. The applicant may be referring to Brockley Grove.

Car parking issues:

- Proposed on street parking available outside the block in Bexhill Road is unsafe for parking
- The applicant's parking survey exaggerates the number of available parking spaces on Bexhill Road

Design issues:

- The addition of the extra storey, with grey zinc cladding will make it over-dominant and over-bearing in the area particularly in relation to the houses in the lower part of Chudleigh Road opposite the building (ie 138- 152 and 161-167)
- Is cladding fire safe and appropriate material?
- not in keeping with any other buildings in the area (which are all traditional masonry construction).
- The height will be approx. 2.5 metres (not 1.9 metres as stated in the application) higher than the current building and so tower over the surrounding early twentieth century houses

Layout issues:

- Flat 12 has living room above bedroom of the flat below, and vice versa, potential disturbance.
- The additional storey to which this application pertains consists of three one bed flats, two of which have zero amenity space provided These flats do not meet the minimum standards for living as described in the London Housing Design Guide.

Impact on neighbouring amenity:

- significant encroachment on the privacy of the neighbouring building across the road (161 Chudleigh Road) and gardens of 157 and 159. The updates to the plans don't address this issue significantly.
- Loss of light at garden at 159
- The extent of the drawings provided do not accurately describe the relationship of the top floor windows to number 159, neither is the surrounding context drawn accurately enough to clearly define the impact on the neighboring properties.

Cycle parking:

- There are no plans shown for the proposed bicycle racks and if you review the space at the back of the building, it's hard to envisage room for the proposed number of new bicycle spaces.
- The applicant proposed to include covered cycle storage in their planning application for the existing premises, but to date has never provided this. This casts doubt on the credibility of their pledge to provide covered cycle storage in the proposed development

Bins:

- There are no plans for increasing the capacity of the bins. These bins are already often full to capacity and there is no room for more bins due to the slope where they are located.

Lack of structural survey to demonstrate that building can carry additional load.

Lack of construction management plan.

Lack of evidence that the building's sewerage system has the capacity to cope with 3 additional flats.

From: Colin Sharpe [<mailto:Colin@architects-plus.co.uk>]

Sent: 09 October 2020 08:30

To: Ozdalga,Jesenka

Subject: RE: The Curve building, Chudleigh Road, DC/20/117809

Hello Jesenka,

Can we see the objections please as they are not posted on the councils website.

Thank you

Colin

Colin Sharpe

BA(Hons) Dip Arch RIBA

For and on behalf of



The Grange

Market Square

Westerham

TN16 1HB

Tel. +44 1959 561 078

E-mail: c.sharpe@architects-plus.co.uk

The information contained in this message is confidential and is intended for the addressee only. If you received this message in error or there are any issues regarding this email, then please notify the originator immediately. The unauthorised use, disclosure, copying or alteration of this message is strictly forbidden. The thoughts and views expressed in this email are those of the sender and not necessarily those of Architects Plus. This mail and any attachments have been scanned for viruses. Architects plus will not be liable for direct, special, indirect or consequential damages arising from alterations of the contents of this message by a third party or as a result of any virus being passed on. If you have any queries regarding this email please contact office@architects-plus.co.uk

From: Ozdalga,Jesenska [<mailto:Jesenska.Ozdalga@lewisham.gov.uk>]

Sent: 01 October 2020 13:21

To: Colin Sharpe

Subject: FW: The Curve building, Chudleigh Road, DC/20/117809

Hi,

I have sent an email yesterday. Please see below.

Best regards,
Jesenska

From: Ozdalga,Jesenska

Sent: 30 September 2020 12:45

To: 'office@architects-plus.co.uk'

Subject: The Curve building, Chudleigh Road, DC/20/117809

Hi,

I am writing to inform you that this application has received 13 objections and 1 objection from Ladywell Society.

Therefore, it is above the threshold of 10 objections and local meeting must be held. I would like to inform you that Council IT team is working on setting up the appropriate technology for local meetings to come forward. Therefore, we would have to inform you that until that process is in place, we would not be able to do any further work on this application. Unfortunately, I am not able to provide accurate time scale for this. Following local meeting, the proposal would go to the planning committee. Again, depending on backlog of committee cases, I am not able to provide time scale on that.

As from the planning considerations, at this stage, I would ask for further details with regards to Highways and servicing. I would include below comments from our highways officer. Please provide those clarifications.

Highways comments:

Car park:

The existing block of 11 flats has undercroft parking for 6 cars. As a PTAL 3 area, the additional development of 3 flats would not attract any off street parking. The allowance under the Intend to Publish London Plan is 0.25 spaces per flat. The proposal should therefore be car free.

In order to establish whether the potential for further on street parking arising from the 3 new flats would result in an unacceptable level of parking stress, a parking survey is necessary.

This has been provided, but the data is found to be flawed. The Lambeth Methodology states that the survey should be carried out within a 200m radius of the development. The survey has extended the 200m in several directions and failed to include one road (Glynde Road). There are other anomalies in the table of figures. Significantly, it is claimed that a total of 17 vehicles could potentially park on Bexhill Road outside the block. Although there are no restrictions, it would not be safe to do so on either side within 15m of the mini roundabout and uncontrolled crossing. The inclusion of stretches of road beyond 200m, where there may be spaces, would decrease the overall parking stress percentage giving a skewed result. Should the application be considered for approval, a new parking survey would be required.

Also, please note that many objections include a note that the current building actually has 7 parking spots. Please clarify.

Cycle parking

Under Policy T5 of the ITPLP, 1.5 covered secure cycle parking spaces should be provided for each 1 bed flat. This equates to an additional 4-5 spaces. There is an existing cycle store providing 11 spaces (one for each flat). This is, in fact, less than the requirement under the previous version of the London Plan which was 2 spaces per 2 bed flat. It is suggested that, as a minimum, a new store for 16 spaces should be provided. Ideally, this would be increased to 24 to make up the shortfall.

The storage area shown on the Proposed Plan is not wide enough to accommodate the 14 cycles proposed. If using Sheffield stands inside a store, there would need to be a minimum of 1m between stands. It is also unclear how the store is accessed as there is a level change at the rear of the block. There must be step free access. A scaled drawing and product details should be supplied.

Refuse/recycling

The Proposed Plan shows 2 x 1240l Eurobins and 3 smaller wheelie bins. Google Streetview April 2019, shows that there are already 2 Eurobins and 2 wheelie bins supplied for 11 flats. The quota should be increased to 3 wheelie bins for recycling and 3 additional for refuse. There would appear to be sufficient space in the existing storage area to accommodate this. Please provide details. A condition ensuring that no bins are left on the highway after collection is required.

Construction Management Plan

A CMP would be required, including details of how safe access for pedestrians to the car park and rear of the block is to be maintained and a Communications Statement explaining how the residents will be kept informed of the works programme. However, this could be added as condition to the committee report.

I will also prepare summary of the objection as well and we will discuss on whether there is any other amendments that could be made in order to address those concerns.

Hope this is helpful.

Best regards,

Jesenka Ozdalga
Planning Officer

Planning Service
Laurence House
1 Catford Road
Catford, London
SE6 4RU

020 8314 3530

E-mail: jesenka.ozdalga@lewisham.gov.uk

Website: www.lewisham.gov.uk

We are able to offer a choice of Planning Advice Services before submitting a planning application. Please access this webpage link <https://www.lewisham.gov.uk/myservices/planning/apply-for-planning-permission/get-planning-advice/Pages/default.aspx>

DISCLAIMER

This message is confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity it is addressed to. If you have received it in error, please contact the sender and delete the e-mail. Please note that we may monitor and check emails to safeguard the Council network from viruses, hoax messages or other abuse of the Council's systems. To see the full version of this disclaimer please visit the following address: <http://www.lewisham.gov.uk/AboutThisSite/EmailDisclaimer.htm>

For advice and assistance about online security and protection from internet threats visit the "Get Safe Online" website at <http://www.getsafeonline.org>

DISCLAIMER

This message is confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity it is addressed to. If you have received it in error, please contact the sender and delete the e-mail. Please note that we may monitor and check emails to safeguard the Council network from viruses, hoax messages or other abuse of the Council's systems. To see the full version of this disclaimer please visit the following address: <http://www.lewisham.gov.uk/AboutThisSite/EmailDisclaimer.htm>

For advice and assistance about online security and protection from

internet threats visit the "Get Safe Online" website at <http://www.getsafeonline.org>

I would like clarification on the following please:

1. As the Parking Surveys of the local streets have been shown to be inaccurate and out-of date given that there are now more cars parked overnight, will there be another survey to ascertain whether the loss of a parking space on the site and the introduction of three additional flats will cause difficulty in parking?
2. A Planning Notice has not been displayed either on or adjacent to the building. This means that some local people may be unaware of the application. I would request that a notice is displayed (as required for a statutory consultation) and a decision is deferred until after a reasonable time after the display of the Notice.
3. The shed for the cycle storage is out of proportion and would be an eyesore. Other more compact storage units are available (and can be seen on nearby streets) and should be recommended to the applicant.

Thank you.

Geoffrey Thurley
Flat 6, The Curve
Chudleigh Road
SE4 1HD



Frances Cornish
9 Coombe Court
Hayne Road
Beckenham BR3 4XD

franceselc@yahoo.com

14th December 2020

Jesenka Ozdalga
Planning Officer
London Borough of Lewisham
Laurence House
1 Catford Road
LONDON SE6 4RU

Dear Madam,

DC/20/117809 The Curve Building, Chudleigh Road, SE4 1HD As Amended

I am aware of this small block of flats as I pass it regularly and also have friends who live there, and wish to object to this application for the following reasons :-

Yet again, to date I have not seen the public notice for this application on display either on the building or adjacent lamppost etc. This means other local residents will not be aware of it and so are unable to comment as only people that have previously commented will have been notified of this new/amended application.

There does not appear to be a new/amended application form available on the planning website. The applicant says he has made the necessary correction but who knows?

Although I appreciate there is a shortage of housing in the Borough of Lewisham – the proposed building of three 1 bed, 2 person flats will do little or nothing to alleviate this situation. They are not suitable for people with children and being on the 3rd floor of a building with no lift, they are not aimed at the more mature person who may wish to downsize. They are not being built as affordable so will, no doubt, ended up being purchased by buy to let landlords and there will be a constant turn over of tenants who show little or no interest in the block and surrounding area.

The proposed cycle store seems to be very high and would be especially unsightly for anyone looking out of the ground floor bedroom windows. .

The parking survey that has been provided is now more than 6 months old – having been a regular visitor to the present block I personally have found it much harder to park. I am aware that in the last couple of months 2 additional cars have been purchased by residents in the local area – thus increasing the present demand for spaces.

The block is currently a prominent building, fairly recently repainted, so a bright white well maintained façade. The addition of the extra storey, with grey zinc cladding will I think, make it over-dominant and over-bearing in the area particularly in relation to the houses in the lower part of Chudleigh Road opposite the building (ie 138- 152 and 161-167)

The proposed balconies/terraces will be at the rear of the building and set back from the block. As these will be positioned over existing bedrooms, there may be additional late night noise/ barbeque or cigarette smoke disturbing existing residents below. Similarly the proposed balcony/terrace for the flat being called 12 will be very close to the railway line – not relaxing and pleasant when a train goes past and you can't hear yourself speak!

If this additional floor must be built, why are the applicants not being asked to add a green /living roof or even solar panels which could supply the common parts of the block?

Have the necessary investigations and tests been undertaken to see if the existing building can take the weight of the proposed additional storey? Has this information been provided to the Council?

Has a detailed building schedule been made – what are the logistics for the delivery of building materials etc, bearing in mind the position of the block in relation to the road junction, roundabout and bus route and the inconvenience to the existing residents?

For these reasons I believe the application should be rejected.

Yours faithfully

Frances Cornish

Geoffrey Thurley
Flat 6 The Curve Building
159A Chudleigh Road
London SE4 1HD
020 8690 3590
g_thurley@yahoo.com

Jesenka Ozdalga
Planning Officer
London Borough of Lewisham
Laurence House
1 Catford Road
LONDON SE6 4RU

11th December 2020

Dear Ms Ozdalga,

DC/20/117809 The Curve Building, Chudleigh Road, SE4 1HD with added documents

In objecting to this application, I would like to mention that I am a tenant of one of the flats and I am not related to any other resident or leaseholder, although we have the same surname.

When I wrote the original objection, in September 2020, the public notice for this application had not been displayed on either the building or adjacent lamppost etc. Three months on there is still no notice. This deprives neighbours in Chudleigh Road and surrounding streets, who have not received either of your letters, of knowledge of the application and so of making representations about it.

In the new Design & Access Statement, the architect insists that there are only six parking spaces. This is incorrect, as the attached photograph of the parking plan, until recently displayed on noticeboards in the block, and in the attached photograph of the numbered bays (7) shows. The new plan shows six bays, which are allocated to individual flats; any visitors and vehicles belonging to occupants of other flats have to be parked on the street. Although the spaces are underused at the moment, does not mean that new occupants (several of the flats are rented and a potential transient population) will not have cars and will therefore either park in their allocated spaces or on the street.

The D&A, in section 7, says that the three additional units will add “much needed housing to the borough”. Lewisham’s need, as articulated by the Council, is for “family housing” preferably of three bedrooms or more, with two bedrooms acceptable if necessary. Single bedroom flats are being included in many of the new builds in the centre of Lewisham, leading to a possible oversupply. One bed flats attract a transient population into the borough, so exacerbating the pressure on services and restricting the potential supply of family-orientated accommodation.

Although the architect agrees that parking on Bexhill Road is “indeed unsafe”, the Parking Survey still shows vacant spaces on the road outside the building. The 8th/9th July maps have been amended from those submitted in September, reducing “spaces” on the on the west side from 10 to 6, and from 7 to 5 on the east side. This gives the impression that these unsuitable spaces are included in the “parking stress” calculations, thus reducing the parking “problem”. The stress should be recalculated excluding these “unsafe” spaces. I have attached two photographs of vehicles having to cross the centre line to skirt cars parked on the west side.

In recent weeks, ie since the surveys, the number of cars parked in “upper” Chudleigh Road and in Elsiemaud Road has increased. I feel that street parking should be resurveyed to give a current view

of the situation, and to recognise how a possible increase of eight cars would impact the situation. Until then I think it can be said that the parking requirement has not been satisfied.

The block is currently a prominent building; with the additional storey it will render it over-dominant in the streetscape, particularly in relation to the houses in the arm of Chudleigh Road opposite the building. It is disingenuous of the applicant to suggest that it's overall height is only 1.9m higher than the current building. While accepting that the fenestration is now more acceptable, and that the additional storey will be set further back, it will still be overbearing on the neighbourhood.

While accepting the architect's assurance that acoustically, the third storey will not cause disturbance to the bedrooms on the second storey, there is potential disturbance from occupants sitting out on the balconies/terraces (the term seems interchangeable here) including on the two additional balconies. Disturbance could include the hearing of voices and transmission of smoke from cigarettes etc. This should be deemed unacceptable as the residents underneath may not be able to enjoy a peaceful (or healthy) night's sleep.

The proposed main bicycle store is, at 2.5m., excessive in height. There is no explanation as to why such a high structure is needed. This would be immediately opposite the bedrooms of two of the ground floor flats and would be an unwelcome sight. The elevation drawings also state that the weatherboarding of the doors is "to match fencing". As there is no fencing on the site, I wonder how this description has been arrived at. I would request that the applicant builds a lower and less-intrusive type of bicycle store.

I trust you will take my comments into consideration when determining this application.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely

Geoffrey Thurley

Warden, Lee

From: David Wilson <dwilson6@uk.ey.com>
Sent: 11 September 2020 13:26
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application: Curve Building, Chudleigh Road/Bexhill Road

Dear Sir,

Planning Reference no.: DC/20/117809

I object to the construction of penthouse flats for the above mentioned property on the following grounds:

1. The building in terms of size and nature will not be in keeping with the residential properties in the surrounding area;
2. My property will have my privacy compromised.

Kind regards,

David Wilson
153 Chudleigh Road
London
SE4 1HP

This e-mail and any attachment are confidential and contain proprietary information, some or all of which may be legally privileged. It is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the author immediately by telephone or by replying to this e-mail, and then delete all copies of the e-mail on your system. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not use, disclose, distribute, copy, print or rely on this e-mail.

Whilst we have taken reasonable precautions to ensure that this e-mail and any attachment has been checked for viruses, we cannot guarantee that they are virus free and we cannot accept liability for any damage sustained as a result of software viruses. We would advise that you carry out your own virus checks, especially before opening an attachment.

EY refers to the global organization, and may refer to one or more, of the member firms of Ernst & Young Global Limited, each of which is a separate legal entity. Ernst & Young Global Limited, a UK company limited by guarantee, does not provide services to clients.

The UK firm Ernst & Young LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales with registered number OC300001 and is a member firm of Ernst & Young Global Limited. A list of members' names is available for inspection at 1 More London Place, London, SE1 2AF, the firm's principal place of business and its registered office. Associate Partners are not members of Ernst & Young LLP. Ernst & Young LLP is a multi-disciplinary practice and is authorised and regulated by the Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales, the Solicitors Regulation Authority (authorisation number 614947), the Financial Conduct Authority (registration number 196203) and other regulators. Further details can be

found at https://www.ey.com/en_uk/legal-statement



Flat 11
The Curve Building
159a Chudleigh Road
London
SE4 1HD

Lewisham Council
Planning Service
3/F Laurence House
1 Catford Road
Catford
London SE6 4RU

F.A.O. Jesenka Ozdalga

8th September 2020

Dear Ms Ozdalga,

Re: Objection to Planning Application: One additional vertical storey to The Curve Building: Your Ref: DC/20/117809, Property Ref. LE/826/159/TP

As the Co-owner of Flat 11, The Curve Building, I have received the aforementioned notice and I have the following observations and comments:

- I completely concur with all my husband's comments (Mr Francis Thurley) detailed in his letter dated 5th September 2020 sent to the Planning Service and submit them as my own.
- Although I respect Lewisham Council's government dwelling targets, I believe that the main justification for this application cited in the Design and Access Statement to help the Council achieve these targets is misplaced. The detrimental impact that this proposed development will have on the visual appearance of the neighbourhood, the loss of privacy of adjacent residences and added traffic and parking difficulties in the vicinity does not warrant this application. This is exacerbated by the fact that the revised application has reduced the number of new dwellings created from 2,2,1 bed flats to 1,1,1 bed flats, thus reducing this application's contribution to the Council's achievement of targets even further, whilst not reducing the proposed development's detrimental impact on the neighbourhood.
- I object to the applicant publishing in their application my current address as being in Hong Kong, which appears to imply that I am just an overseas investor. I would like to clarify that I am not an overseas investor and I do co-own Flat 11. Our son currently resides there and I will be returning to the UK at the end of this year to take up residence, therefore, I have a keen interest in this latest planning application. Under current Covid pandemic government guidelines, I may have to spend some of my time working from home. If this application were to be granted, notwithstanding a great number of other reasons for objecting, it will have a huge impact on my well-being and, further, in the lease I may be unable to continue a "peaceful enjoyment of premises".

I trust that the above objection and comments will be taken into full consideration in the Planning Service's decision as to whether or not to grant this application, which I urge you not to accept for the above reasons.

Yours sincerely,

Gail Thurley

Mrs Gail Thurley



THE LADYWELL SOCIETY

Chair: R. Smith Secretary: K. Putman

Please reply to:

47 Chudleigh Road
Ladywell Village
London, SE4 1JX

Email: WellofOurLady@gmail.com

Jesenska Ozdalga
Planning Service
Laurence House
1 Catford Road
London SE6 4RU

3rd September 2020

Dear Ms Ozdalga

DC/20/117809 The Curve Building, Chudleigh Road, SE4 1HD

I am writing on behalf of the Ladywell Society which has decided to OBJECT to this application. This application is a re-submission differing in only minor respects to application **DC/19/1151138**. Our objections are therefore similar and are set out below:

The additional storey will be an over-dominant and overbearing intrusion into the streetscape. The height will be approx. 2.5 metres (not 1.9 metres as stated in the application) higher than the current building and so tower over the surrounding early twentieth century houses. When viewed from the section of Chudleigh Road opposite the building, the extra height will be intrusive.

Despite the proposed new storey being set further back, it will increase the over-looking of the houses opposite (161 Chudleigh Road) and their gardens (especially 161 and 163 Chudleigh Road). The gardens of 159 and 157 Chudleigh Road will also be overlooked more than at present.

The application states that grey metal cladding will be used. As the rest of the building is painted white, this will be incongruous and inappropriate. There must also be a safety question mark over most claddings post Grenfell

Although not a planning issue, concern was expressed whether the current building and its foundations could support the weight of an additional storey. Anecdotally, the ground appears to be shifting as cracks in building fabric, and other evidence of movement, are appearing in adjacent buildings. It was felt that an independent structural survey of the block of flats should be carried out and that the Council's relevant officers should be advised of the concerns.

Robert Smith
Chair

cc. K. Putman (Secretary) The Ladywell Society

Jesenka Ozdalga, Planning Case Officer
Planning Consultation Response 24th September 2020
Eleanor Templeton, Transport Policy and Development



Planning Reference and Address:

DC/20/117809 THE CURVE BUILDING, CHUDLEIGH ROAD, LONDON, SE4 1HD

Rcvd. Date: 18th August 2020

Proposal: The construction of an additional storey at The Curve Building, Chudleigh Road SE4 to provide 3, one bedroom self-contained flats, together with the provision of 6 additional cycle spaces.

Insufficient Detail

Car parking

The existing block of 11 flats has undercroft parking for 6 cars. As a PTAL 3 area, the additional development of 3 flats would not attract any off street parking. The allowance under the Intend to Publish London Plan is 0.25 spaces per flat. The proposal should therefore be car free.

In order to establish whether the potential for further on street parking arising from the 3 new flats would result in an unacceptable level of parking stress, a parking survey is necessary.

This has been provided, but the data is found to be flawed. The Lambeth Methodology states that the survey should be carried out within a 200m radius of the development. The survey has extended the 200m in several directions and failed to include one road (Glynde Road). There are other anomalies in the table of figures. Significantly, it is claimed that a total of 17 vehicles could potentially park on Bexhill Road outside the block. Although there are no restrictions, it would not be safe to do so on either side within 15m of the mini roundabout and uncontrolled crossing. The inclusion of stretches of road beyond 200m, where there may be spaces, would decrease the overall parking stress percentage giving a skewed result.

Should the application be considered for approval, a new parking survey would be required.

Cycle parking

Under Policy T5 of the ITPLP, 1.5 covered secure cycle parking spaces should be provided for each 1 bed flat. This equates to an additional 4-5 spaces. There is an existing cycle store providing 11 spaces (one for each flat). This is, in fact, less than the requirement under the previous version of the London Plan which was 2 spaces per 2 bed flat. It is suggested that, as a minimum, a new store for 16 spaces should be provided. Ideally, this would be increased to 24 to make up the shortfall.

The storage area shown on the Proposed Plan is not wide enough to accommodate the 14 cycles proposed. If using Sheffield stands inside a store, there would need to be a minimum of 1m between stands. It is also unclear how the store is accessed as

there is a level change at the rear of the block. There must be step free access. A scaled drawing and product details should be supplied.

Refuse/recycling

The Proposed Plan shows 2 x 1240l Eurobins and 3 smaller wheelie bins. Google Streetview April 2019, shows that there are already 2 Eurobins and 2 wheelie bins supplied for 11 flats. The quota should be increased to 3 wheelie bins for recycling and 3 additional for refuse. There would appear to be sufficient space in the existing storage area to accommodate this. A condition ensuring that no bins are left on the highway after collection is required.

Construction Management Plan

A CMP would be required, including details of how safe access for pedestrians to the car park and rear of the block is to be maintained and a Communications Statement explaining how the residents will be kept informed of the works programme.

S278 works

In order to ensure that unsafe parking does not take place outside the block entrance on Bexhill Road, waiting and loading restrictions would be required.

Flat 11
The Curve Building
159a Chudleigh Road
London
SE4 1HD

Lewisham Council
Planning Service
3/F Laurence House
1 Catford Road
Catford
London SE6 4RU

F.A.O. Jesenka Ozdalga

5th September 2020

Dear Ms Ozdalga,

Re: Objection to Planning Application: One additional vertical storey to The Curve Building: Your Ref: DC/20/117809, Property Ref. LE/826/159/TP

As the Co-owner of Flat 11, The Curve Building, I have received the aforementioned notice, and I wish to object to this revised planning application as it has not addressed my concerns detailed in my letter dated 5th February 2020 regarding the previous planning application, as follows:

- The Curve Building is already the most prominent structure in the neighbourhood and adding an additional storey will only make the building even more prominent. The new Design and Access Statement from Architects Plus presented with the Planning Application states that The Curve Building is “*not set within a range of 2 storey dwellings but stands alone on Bexhill Road with the railway embankment to the side of the building. We are hence not affecting a regular street-scene and is entirely in keeping with this situation*”; which still attempts to imply that the building is isolated and stands alone. This is clearly not correct, as can be seen from the photos attached below, providing a truer representation of the street-scene than the photo presented in the new Design & Access Statement. As the attached photos show, The Curve Building is located on a multi-road junction roundabout, on a busy bus route, nestled amongst a mix of existing 2 storey semi and detached properties built from different eras. This proposed development will make the building stand out even further and will definitely disrupt the regular street-scene, as it will be 2 storeys higher than any other building in the neighbourhood.
- The repeated statement in the Design and Access Statement that the additional storey will only add a 1.9m height to the existing roofline is misleading, as this is only at the higher end of the building. The actual fact is that an additional storey is being added to nearly all of the existing footprint, so there is an overall increase in height of at least 3.0m to the existing building and sightlines. The proposed development will overlook neighbouring properties and gardens to a greater extent than the current building. In particular, Nos. 153, 155, 157 & 159 Chudleigh Road have gardens that will be overlooked by the new flats. The front balcony may have been removed from the scheme but there will still be a loss of privacy through increased overlooking from the multiple higher additional windows at the front. Adding an additional storey will make the building even taller and more intrusive on the neighbourhood.
- The proposed choice of cladding (grey metal panelling) is unsympathetic to the character of the local area and will look out of place. It does not “*mimic the darker roof covering colours on most pitched roof houses*” as claimed in the Statement, as the surrounding houses have traditional clay or slate roof tiling. There are no buildings anywhere nearby in the surrounding streets with this type of cladding, which is more commonly used for industrial buildings. The houses in the immediate neighbourhood are mostly constructed with a masonry or rendered external finish. In addition, the further statement in the application that “*The proposal ties in with the existing contemporary building style and utilises the same material palette*” is also misleading. The grey metal panelling is in stark contrast to the mixed brickwork and white painted render finish of the existing building’s external façade.

Even though I am sure the proposed development will be constructed to the latest Building Regulations’ requirements, the use of metal cladding with timber framing will create an increased fire risk and safety issues for the building. As you are aware, the consequences of using metal cladding on residential buildings was demonstrated tragically in the recent Grenfell Tower disaster. For this reason alone, I object strongly to this proposed development.

- I appreciate that the traffic survey included with the application is supposed to be independent, but I believe that the survey data showing no cars parked outside of The Curve Building on Bexhill Road on both nights and photos of empty streets are not representative of the usual situation, which is shown by the attached photo. It is not unusual for me to be unable to park right outside the building. The proposed development could potentially add 3 to 6 cars from residents, with additional cars for visitors, to park on the streets outside, which are on busy bus routes.

Furthermore, the traffic report shows 17no. observed spaces in Bexhill Road immediately in front of The Curve Building in their Zones 23 & 31. It is clear from the photos attached below that cars are not able to park on both sides of the road right up to the roundabout, so the data is not representative of the actual parking spaces available in Bexhill Road. On this basis, I would question some of the other data and overall findings of the report.

- As I stated in my previous objection letter, the Freeholder proposed to include covered cycle storage in their planning application for the existing premises, but to date, has never provided this. This casts doubt on the credibility of their pledge to provide a new covered cycle storage in the proposed development, and consequently their compliance with DM Policy 29.

Furthermore, I would question the feasibility of installing a 14-cycle covered storage in the space shown on the layout plan, which is only 5.8m long. This means that each bicycle will only have a space of 41.4cms, as opposed to the usual 63cms. Constructed correctly, the new cycle store will need to be 3 metres longer, which will impinge further into the existing amenity area.

- The new application claims that "*The Refuse department have been consulted and adequate refuse and recycling facilities can be provided in the existing storage area at the front of the building*". This is a dubious claim as the ground slopes too steeply in the existing area to allow more space for recycling bins and the existing bins are often full to capacity.
- The Statement repeats one of the main justifications for this proposed development being to overcome an existing, consistent rain ingress issue on the current top 2nd floor. As I own a top floor flat, this is an issue of great importance to me. However, the Freeholder has recently arranged for the problematic areas to be re-roofed, which hopefully will rectify the issues in the long-term. I would again highlight that building an additional storey above is not the easiest or simplest way to resolve this issue, which can be solved by a properly executed repair or re-roof of part or whole of the area.
- I understand that noise from construction works is not deemed a valid comment to a planning application in accordance with your guidelines. However, in these unprecedented times of the Covid-19 pandemic, more people are being forced to work from home and will continue to do so in the future. Indeed, I am aware of a number of existing residents of The Curve Building who work from home, including my own son who is currently residing in Flat 11. Thus, existing residents having to suffer a prolonged period of noisy construction works during the working week will have a critical impact on their well-being and ability to work from home. I implore you to consider this detrimental factor as well, when making your decision to this application.

I trust that the above objection and comments will be taken into full consideration in the Planning Service's decision as to whether or not to grant this application, which I urge you not to accept for the above reasons.

Yours sincerely,



Mr Francis Thurley



The Curve Building nestled amongst 2 storey houses; Proposed development will be 2 storeys higher than neighbouring houses



The Curve Building nestled amongst 2 storey houses; Proposed development will be 2 storeys higher than neighbouring houses

Cars are not able to park near roundabout on Bexhill Road as shown in traffic survey



Cars parked outside The Curve Building on a normal day



Cars are not able to park near roundabout on Bexhill Road as shown in traffic survey

Geoffrey Thurley
Flat 6 The Curve Building
159A Chudleigh Road
London SE4 1HD
020 8690 3590
g_thurley@yahoo.com

Jesenka Ozdalga
Planning Officer
London Borough of Lewisham
Laurence House
1 Catford Road
LONDON SE6 4RU

3rd September 2020

Dear Ms Ozdalga,

DC/20/117809 The Curve Building, Chudleigh Road, SE4 1HD

In objecting to this application, I would like to mention that I am a tenant of one of the flats and I am not related to any other resident or leaseholder, although we have the same surname.

At the time of writing, the public notice for this application has not been displayed on either the building or adjacent lamppost etc. This deprives neighbours in Chudleigh Road and surrounding streets, who have not received your letter, of knowledge of the application and so of making representations about this application.

Six of the flats have allocated parking spots (plus one visitor spot, so a total of seven, not six as shown on the plan) so other residents with cars would, indeed, need to park them in adjoining streets; whether residents with their own spots prefer also to do this, as is suggested in the D&A statement, is a moot point.

The Parking Survey for the area is flawed, in that it includes the section of Bexhill Road outside the building as suitable for parking. The survey has ignored the traffic island at the junction with Chudleigh Road, and the hatched triangle leading up to the island. Parking opposite the triangle is not possible, as moving traffic would have to move into the hatched area and, if approaching the island, would be out of alignment with the approach to the junction. It would be possible to park under the railway bridge, but this would cause traffic to veer onto the other side of the road to get past. If cars parked on both sides of the road, then the road would be reduced to, in effect, a single track road. As buses serve this road (as recognised by the bus stops) this could cause jams, as it is reckoned that only one way "working" could occur.

The survey calculates that there are a total of 22 spaces which would be available on the length of Bexhill Road surveyed. However, 17 of these are on the section of Bexhill Road outside the block. The survey also shows that the sections of Chudleigh and Elsiemaud Road were nearly full of parked cars.

If every flat were to have one car, that would be an excess of eight vehicles over what can be accommodated within the allocated parking area on the site. Recently there were five vehicles in the parking area, although the norm is four, so cannot be said to be underused. It is felt, therefore, that the parking requirement has not been satisfied.

It is noted that the letter informing me of the application says that six additional cycle spaces will be provided, but the Design & Access Statement refers to three additional spaces.

The D&A Statement refers to the buses travelling down nearby Crofton Park Road. This is, in fact a residential street linking Manwood Road with Codrington Hill/Stillness Road, along which buses do not travel. The applicant may be referring to Brockley Grove; the error suggests that not enough attention to detail has been exercised.

The block is currently a prominent building; with the additional storey it will render it over-dominant in the streetscape, particularly in relation to the houses in the arm of Chudleigh Road opposite the building. It is disingenuous of the applicant to suggest that it's overall height is only 1.9m higher than the current building.

The elevations do not show where the grey metal cladding would be on the building. Although a fashionable material at the moment, it is, however an inappropriate form of cladding for this building which looks smart with white walls as at present. It is to be expected that sunlight would reflect off the cladding, thus emphasising its prominence. Since the Grenfell Tower tragedy, all forms of cladding are under review, so zinc cladding might not be considered safe anyway.

Although the additional flats have been designed to adhere to the national minimum space standards, they are at the minimum, rather than allowing extra space to be more acceptable for living. It is also noted that the living/dining/kitchen area and the balcony of the flat next to the railway line are on top of the bedrooms of the flat underneath. This should be deemed unacceptable as the residents underneath may not be able to enjoy a peaceful night's sleep.

Not supplied in the documents is a building works schedule. Because the building is occupied, the applicant should have, in my view, supplied a schedule in order to inform residents of the timescale and impact on our lives.

I trust you will take my comments into consideration when determining this application.

Thank you.

Yours sincerely

Geoffrey Thurley