

DC/14/88392 – REAR OF 110, WOOD VALE, LONDON, SE23 3DY

The construction of 7, three bedroom houses incorporating balconies, roof gardens accessed via metal staircases from the floor below and solar panels, at Land to the R/O 110 Wood Vale SE23, together with associated landscaping, car parking spaces for 7 cars, refuse and cycle stores.

Dear Mr. Whittington,

I am writing on behalf of the Forest Hill Society to object to this planning application.

The Forest Hill Society is the local amenity society for the area covered by SE23 and have around 400 members. The society is keen to ensure that the area develops in a positive way that supports the economic, environmental and social well-being of the people that live and work in it. Generally we try to be positive about changes to the area and proposals for improvements, however in some cases it is necessary for us to raise concerns about proposals as part of the planning process.

There are a number of concerns we have with this application:

1. Internal Layout

The layout of units 5 and 6 causes some concern, with kitchens and dining rooms located on different floors. This is poor quality use of internal space and does not sensibly meet the needs of future residents of these houses. This is contrary to Lewisham Council policy HSG 5.

We are also concerned about the provision of cycle storage in some of the units. Units 4,5,6, and 7 have access to the cycle store only through the garage/car port. This is likely to be problematic if a car is parked as the space is not wide enough to provide adequate access without fear of scrapping the bike on the car and manoeuvring the bike into the cycle storage area.

2. Outlook and Natural Lighting

The Daylight & Sunlight Report included in the application considers the impact the development will have on surrounding properties, but provides no detail of the standard of outlook or daylight to the proposed houses. We would draw the officer's attention to bedroom 2 in Unit 7 which has a tiny window, and also in unit 7 there is no daylight to the kitchen, other than through the dining room and through a covered car port. It is our opinion that the outlook from the bedroom, kitchen and dining room and inadequate as a result of poor design and over-development. This is contrary to Lewisham Council policy HSG 5.

HSG 5 Layout and Design of New Residential Development

The Council expects all new residential development to be attractive, to be neighbourly and to meet the functional requirements of its future inhabitants. The Council will, therefore, only permit new residential development which:

(a) provides a satisfactory level of privacy, outlook and natural lighting with appropriate provision of private amenity space;

3. External Amenity Space

All houses are 3 bed family houses, but two have no external amenity space while the others are limited to roofs accessed by spiral staircases, and probably including solar panels. None meet the 9m depth required by planning guidelines, and the access via spiral staircases is unlikely to be

'readily accessible' and suitable for families with young children. This is contrary to Lewisham Council policy HSG 7.

HSG 7 Gardens

The Council will seek in all new dwellings the provision of a readily accessible, secure, private and useable external space. Family dwellings should be provided with their own private garden area. Normally, a minimum garden depth of 9 metres will be required.

4. Density of the Proposed Development

The standard London Density Matrix for residential development is shown below. We believe that the site has a PTAL rating of 2 as, although it is close to a bus route, it is some distance from a train station.

The size of the site is given as 0.075 ha, with the proposed 7 units this is equal to a density of 93 units/ha. And with at least 28 habitable rooms this is equal to a density of at least 373 hr/ha. Based on the housing stock in the immediate vicinity of the site this is clearly a suburban location, and based on this the density on this site is greater than would be expected on a site of this nature and in this location.

Table 3A.2 Density matrix (habitable rooms and dwellings per hectare)

	Setting	Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL)		
		0 to 1	2 to 3	4 to 6
Indicative Average Dwellings size	Suburban	150 - 200 hr/ha	150 - 250 hr/ha	200 - 350 hr/ha
	3.8 - 4.6 hr/unit	35 - 55 u/ha	35 - 65 u/ha	45 - 90 u/ha
	3.1 - 3.7 hr/unit	40 - 65 u/ha	40 - 80 u/ha	55 - 115 u/ha
	2.7 - 3.0 hr/unit	50 - 75 u/ha	50 - 95 u/ha	70 - 130 u/ha
	Urban	150 - 250 hr/ha	200 - 450 hr/ha	200 - 700 hr/ha
	3.8 - 4.6 hr/unit	35 - 65 u/ha	45 - 120 u/ha	45 - 185 u/ha
	3.1 - 3.7 hr/unit	40 - 80 u/ha	55 - 145 u/ha	55 - 225 u/ha
	2.7 - 3.0 hr/unit	50 - 95 u/ha	70 - 170 u/ha	70 - 260 u/ha
	Central	150 - 300 hr/ha	300 - 650 hr/ha	650 - 1100 hr/ha
	3.8 - 4.6 hr/unit	35 - 80 u/ha	65 - 170 u/ha	140 - 290 u/ha
	3.1 - 3.7 hr/unit	40 - 100 u/ha	80 - 210 u/ha	175 - 355 u/ha
	2.7 - 3.0 hr/unit	50 - 110 u/ha	100 - 240 u/ha	215 - 405 u/ha

Source: Greater London Authority

Although the use of this land for housing is reasonable, the density appears to be too great given the constraints of the site. We would recommend that the council refuse permission for this scheme.