

Amy Lester, Team Leader  
Chief Executive's Department  
Planning Division  
Development Management (5<sup>th</sup> Floor – hub 2)  
PO Box 64529  
London SE1P 5LX

15 September 2018

Dear Amy,

**Appendix 1 PHOTO & NOTES to accompany Comments for  
Planning Application 18/AP/0532  
(Re-consultation)**

Thank you for your notification of 31/08/18, inviting me to comment on the amended application as part of the re-consultation for **Application 18/AP/0532 at SEAVINGTON HOUSE AND GARAGES, CHAMPION HILL, LONDON SE5 8BN**

I wish to submit these photographs with accompanying notes by way of an Appendix, to substantiate and illustrate some of my comments submitted on the amended application on 6th September and previously.

Please would you publish this as a Related Document for the case, to address the misrepresentation of site and context in the Design and Access Statement and Planning Statements.

## SITE & CONTEXT: PHOTO 1

View from Champion Hill (street level) of 5-storey Appleshaw House in relation to 2 storey Seavington House, to show their relative levels, setbacks and impacts



Showing:

- a) Seavington House sits on the crest of the hill  
(TOPOGRAPHY)
- b) Appleshaw House sits on a lower level, sunken into the slope of the hill (TOPOGRAPHY)
- c) Appleshaw House is also set back much further from the street than Seavington House, behind generous green landscaping (SETBACK)

Only 4 of Appleshaw House's 5 storeys are fully visible from this vantage point, due to the building's topographical position. Its

low **LEVEL** and generous **SETBACK** , mean that it does not appear tall or overbearing **IN CONTEXT**, relative to Seavington House. In fact, it is **no higher from street level than 2 storey Seavington House**.

**5/6 storey buildings on the Seavington House site as proposed (in close proximity to the pavement edge) would appear 3 storeys TALLER from street level than adjacent, 5-storey Appleshaw House and would be far more overbearing. The applicants have taken no account of the blocks' relative topography (the steep change in level between the sites) and significant difference in setback relative to the pavement edge.**

**The proposed arrangement of 5-6 storey buildings, crammed onto the small, hilltop site of Seavington House would be unacceptably overbearing**

- a) at street level
- b) in relation to Appleshaw House and Langford Green estates, both of which are in close proximity but **DOWNHILL** from the site.
- c)

#### **SITE AND CONTEXT: PHOTO 2**

View from Dog Kennel Hill School pedestrian crossing



Showing:

- a) 3-storey Langford Green appears no taller than 2-storey Seavington House at present, due to a difference in LEVEL equal to a storey height (Langford Green sitting on the northern slope of the hill).
- b) None of the buildings at the top of the hill currently makes an impact on the skyline.

The Camberwell Society noted in its comments on the applications: 'The applicants have also sought to exaggerate the impact of the 5 storey building proposed for 1A Dog Kennel Hill by making it seem that the 1A DKH site and the application site are at the same level. In fact there is a change in level equal to a storey height between the application site and the 1A DKH

site. The cross section of block B on page 30 shows this clearly. The slope of the site makes it possible for an extra storey to be added on the downhill site of block B, alongside the site of 1A DKH. The overall effect of the development is that the two new blocks are overbearing in relation to their immediate neighbours, exacerbated by their immediate proximity to the pavement edges of Dog Kennel Hill and Champion Hill.'

It is clear that the applicants have similarly sought to exaggerate the impact of Appleshaw House (these photos show true impact on the street scene) and of Mary Seacole House and other estate buildings further away (on the eastern side of Dog Kennel Hill) to suggest that 5/6 storeys is appropriate for the application site. The lower **LEVEL** on the hill of Appleshaw House and indeed of all the estate buildings on the hill invalidates them as comparators and precedents.

Please would you acknowledge receipt of this document and confirm that it will be uploaded to the website. I am sorry I had computer/email issues on Friday which prevented me from emailing it as a clearly viewable pdf. I trust the photographs are now viewable.

Best wishes,