



**Re: Application DC/09/70987, 139 Sunderland Road**

Dear Mr. Whittington,

On behalf of the Forest Hill Society I wish to object to this planning application.

**1. Character of the Building:**

The existing building is one of a set of four large houses on Sunderland Road which together make a significant positive impact on the area. The Forest Hill Society has discussed with officers and with local residents the prospect of setting up a conservation area in this location to preserve excellent examples of Christmas houses and other large residential houses, of which this is one. Had it not been for a shortage of staff within Lewisham planning department, we believe that this area would now be a conservation area and this building would be protected. Although this building is clearly not in a conservation area we would like the council to consider the positive nature of the existing building within the context of the local area. The loss of this building would have a detrimental effect on any future plans to create a conservation area in this location. We believe that this development is contrary to **council policy HSG 9 b**: “The conversion of dwellings will not be permitted where: ...  
(b) the character of the buildings or neighbourhood ... would be adversely affected”

**2. Details of the planning application:**

There are conflicting details in the planning application which need to be clarified regarding the types of units and the number of parking spaces.

- a. Section 10 of the planning application form states that there will be 8nr, two bedroom flats built on the site, however, the designs and letter I received from you state that there will be 6nr, two bedroom flats, 1nr one bedroom flat, and 1nr three bedroom flat.
- b. Similar confusion arises between the Design and Access statement, paragraph D1.2 which describes four car parking spaces, and the proposed floor plans which show only three car parking spaces.

We ask that these details are clarified prior to any consideration of this application as the discrepancies in this outline planning application could result in an absence of family dwellings, contrary to council policy HSG6.

**3. Family Dwellings:**

The existing building is a large family dwelling with nine bedrooms. Council policy HSG6 recognises the shortage of houses with more than three bedrooms: *“In terms of family accommodation Lewisham suffers from a shortage of larger housing units, particularly 3+ bed properties, as indicated by the mismatch between household size and the size of dwelling in Table H2. Provision of family housing is therefore particularly valuable in Lewisham.”* Although this development includes a single 3 bedroom flat, this does not make up for the loss of a large family house. As such this application is contrary to **council policy HSG6**.

**4. Design and Environmental impact:**

Flats 1 and 2 have no natural light or ventilation for the kitchens and only flat 8 has a bathroom with natural light and ventilation. This is contrary to **council policy HSG 5 a and e** which state that “The Council will, therefore, only permit new residential development which:  
a) provides a satisfactory level of privacy, outlook and natural lighting ...  
e) would encourage energy and natural resource efficiency”

5. **Parking:**

There are four car parking spaces in front of the building, this will require the removal of the front wall and the lowering of the curb in front of the entire property. We do not believe this is a good design when considering pedestrian safety, particularly with a primary school within 200 metres on this side of Sunderland Road.

From the plans you will see that there is a lamppost and a tree directly in front of the property as well as a road hump. These obstacles will make parking in front of the property difficult. This design should be carefully considered to prevent damage to cars, lamppost, or to a lovely mature Plane tree, which forms an important part of the character on this tree lined avenue.

Google Street View shows the details we have mentioned:

<http://maps.google.com/?ie=UTF8&ll=51.435551,-0.047035&spn=0,359.922752&t=h&z=14&layer=c&cbll=51.435667,-0.04709&panoid=C4grpWXCGLr53MHZTrYFg&cbp=12,131.27379556719882,,0,0.5078999886719614>

6. **Cycle Storage:**

Cycle storage has been designated in a small area of the passageway leading to the rear garden. We do not believe this is an acceptable position for the number of cycles that should be encouraged in such a development. This is contrary to **council policy TRN 14** which requires parking for one cycle for each unit in such a development. Although it is difficult to tell from the floor plans, there does not appear to be any shelter for the cycles as their storage area is beyond the scope of higher floors. We would like to see cycle storage for up to 8 cycles in a dry area within the development.

7. **Internal Layout:**

There are a significant number of doors on the ground floor for residents of high levels. All residents wishing to go to the higher levels will need to access the front door, the door to the lobby, the door to the lift lobby, the door to the stairs, and the door at the top of the stairs. In total this is six doors, including their own front door. This is an excessive number of doors for people with shopping or moving furniture. We hope that the developers give consideration to the necessity for all of these doors.

For the reasons stated above we hope that you will reject this application.