

Appendix 1 - Responses to consultation on Residential Alterations and Extensions SPD

No	Name	Comment	Council Response
	English Heritage London Region		
1		The SPD criterion needs to make specific / explicit reference to the historic environment.	Accepted. The SA objective has been modified to include references to the historic environment.
2		Policy 38 is not covered by the SA but is in the SPD – should be addressed	Accepted. This policy was omitted in error and will now be included.
3		Should refer to PPG15	Accepted. Revised text : “1.4 The advice is applicable throughout the borough, including conservation areas where there is a statutory duty to preserve or enhance the special character or appearance of such areas. This document is not intended to provide specialist advice on statutory listed buildings but may be relevant in many cases. Alterations or extensions to listed buildings require separate consent for internal and external works; applicants proposing internal or external works to statutory listed buildings should consult Planning Policy Guidance Note 15 ‘Planning and the Historic Environment’ (PPG15) and the Council’s Conservation & Urban Design team.”
	GLA		
4		No comments	-
	RPS on behalf of The Haywoods Group, The James Laurence Group and Razor Investments Ltd.		
5		Guidance too prescriptive, it should be flexible to allow schemes to be judged	Not accepted. The level of detail is not considered to be too prescriptive. Residents desire clarity and certainty as to what will and will not normally be

		on their merits	acceptable.
6		The building date classifications of pre 1914 and post 1914 is too simplified	Accepted. The references to building ages. Appendix 1 has been added which explains the basic house types in Lambeth under following headings: - Early 19 th Century (Georgian). Mid 19 th Century – early 20 th Century (Victorian) Twentieth Century Contemporary (modern)
7		A restrictive approach pushes people to do their own thing under PD. Planning applications should be encouraged so that the Council can influence materials etc.	Not accepted. It is not considered that the Council has taken a restrictive approach to the guidance.
8		An impact approach should be adopted in line with the recent government consultation paper. Especially for rear extensions to dwellinghouses.	Not accepted. It is advisable not to second guess or pre-empt amendments to national planning regulations. The Council is required to proceed in line with current system.
9		Para 2.6 – end terraces and sites where adjoining properties have had large extensions might be suitable for taller extensions. Same with wrap-around extensions	Accepted. Para. 2.6 now contains: - “...Schemes for end of terrace buildings and those with unusually shaped side plots will be judged on their merits in relation to their context.....”
10		Extensions over 1 storey may be acceptable in conservation areas if well designed.	Accepted. The revised text now reads: - “2.6 In conservation areas extensions over 1 storey will normally only be appropriate if they preserve the character and appearance of the area.”
11		Rear dormers have very little wider impact and deserve a more flexible approach.	Accepted. The text has been revisited removing prescriptive references to percentages etc and placing emphasis on rear dormers: “3.8 dormers are best located on rear roof pitches and features such as chimneys and parapet walls, should not be removed or obscured by the dormers.

			<p>3.9 Irrespective of the location the following design advice normally applies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dormers should normally align with, be no wider than, and be subordinate in height to the windows on the elevation below; • The window cill should rest on the roof slope and should be around 1 metre from the attic floor level (or eaves level of the roof if the floor has been lowered) and the roof slope; • The window type should be in keeping with those on the main building; • The materials, construction detailing and form should all be carefully considered. Bulky construction detailing should be avoided; and • The dormer should sit well within the roof slope and its roof should be lower than the roof ridge.“
12		Rear mansard extensions are acceptable in Wandsworth and can be visually successful. Can't Lambeth accept them in principle?	Not accepted. Policy 36 (f) (ii) sets out the Council's approach on roof additions. A blanket acceptance in principle would be contrary to that policy.
	Vail Williams LLP		
13		Para 2.8 (residential extensions) – object to the Council's resistance of wrap-around rear extensions.	Not accepted. It is not considered that the Council has taken a restrictive approach to the guidance relating to wrap-around extensions.
14		Para 2.8 (residential extensions) – object to the Council's insistence that single storey infill extensions should be mostly glazed.	No accepted. The guidance seeks to protect the design integrity of houses with existing rear returns; a light weight appearance assists in achieving this.
15		Para 2.8 (residential extensions) – object to the Council's insistence that single storey infill extensions should have a pitched roof.	Accepted in part. It was not the intention of the guidance to insist upon a pitched roof. The text has been amended in paragraph 2.12 to avoid confusion. It now reads:- 'The roof is designed to minimise adverse impact on neighbouring properties.'

Clapham Society			
16		Comprehensive and welcomed	Noted
17		Latter end of the document the 'good and bad' examples suffer from the length of the sections.	Accepted. The sections have been revisited and text separated by topic to reduce length.
18		Some of the content unduly prescriptive – for example rear dormers covering no more than 50%.	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>“3.9 Irrespective of the location the following design advice normally applies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dormers should normally align with, be no wider than, and be subordinate in height to the windows on the elevation below; • The window cill should rest on the roof slope and should be around 1 metre from the attic floor level (or eaves level of the roof if the floor has been lowered) and the roof slope; • The window type should be in keeping with those on the main building; • The materials, construction detailing and form should all be carefully considered. Bulky construction detailing should be avoided; and • The dormer should sit well within the roof slope and its roof should be lower than the roof ridge.“
19		To be consistent each section should refer to what is required in conservation areas.	Accepted. A reference to conservation areas has been made in each section.
20		Text error – Para 2.8 should 'return' not read 'extension'	Not accepted. 'Return' is the correct term. However, a glossary has been added to the rear of the SPD document to explain terms.
21		Dormer extensions – 25% and 50% criteria seem excessive. Actual measurements of good completed schemes should show lower percentages.	<p>Partly Accepted. The provision of dimensions would be inappropriate. The revised text reads:</p> <p>“3.9 Irrespective of the location the following design advice normally applies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dormers should normally align with, be no wider than, and be subordinate in height to the windows on the elevation below;

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The window cill should rest on the roof slope and should be around 1 metre from the attic floor level (or eaves level of the roof if the floor has been lowered) and the roof slope; • The window type should be in keeping with those on the main building; • The materials, construction detailing and form should all be carefully considered. Bulky construction detailing should be avoided; and • The dormer should sit well within the roof slope and its roof should be lower than the roof ridge.“
22		Some comment should be made about schemes that raise the existing roof ridge.	<p>Accepted. A new paragraph has been added:</p> <p>“3.19 Proposed alterations that introduce alien roof configurations (cut-outs and add-ons) or which propose to raise the roof ridge in a manner that would adversely affect the appearance of the building or its contribution to the wider street scene are unlikely to be considered appropriate.”</p>
	Susan Sheehan, Hyde Farm Climate Action Network		
23		The document puts preservation before conservation in conservation areas. Protecting historic building techniques and buildings will be environmentally damaging in future.	<p>Noted. Re-use/preservation of existing buildings and materials is inherently sustainable. The SPD does highlight how energy conservation and renewables can be appropriately addressed generally and in conservation areas. Energy loss from heritage buildings needs to be addressed in a sympathetic manner. In addition the SPD on Sustainable Design & Construction, which was approved for consultation subsequent to the Residential Alterations and Extensions SPD, focuses on these issues in a comprehensive way. General guidance for homeowners to deal with the many issues and good practice not within the control of planning powers has been addressed in the Council’s document – “House owners guide to renewables”.</p>
24		Energy efficient / climate friendly measures need not damage appearance.	<p>Noted. However, it is not considered that the SPD is in conflict with this comment. It provides guidance on how such various specific measures can be implemented in an acceptable way compatible with planning policy.</p>
25		Policies 36 and 47 are relevant to	<p>Noted. Sustainability appraisal has been amended.</p>

		various different aspects of sustainability appraisal and this should be shown.	
26		The SPD should encourage energy efficiency and provide detailed guidance. Building extensions is a good time to consider heating needs and the installation of renewable energy. Best practice advice is available at www.parityprojects.com	Noted. A new section has been added – renewable energy systems. Issues to do with energy conservation are also addressed in various sections of the SPD and this has been strengthened. Additional text has been added in response to this comment to the introduction flagging up the importance of energy conservation in paragraph 1.3 and paragraph 1.15 and the suggested good practice reference has been added to the further information section of the SPD. In addition the SPD on Sustainable Design & Construction, which was approved for consultation subsequent to the Residential Alterations and Extensions SPD, deals with these issues and others in a comprehensive way. General guidance for homeowners deals with many of the issues and good practice not within the control of planning powers has been addressed in the Council’s document – “House owners guide to renewables”.
27		Planning permission should be required for satellite dishes in conservation areas. Enforcement fails due to lack of evidence	Noted. However, the requirements for planning permission are determined by Government through the General Permitted Development Order and this is therefore not a local decision and not a matter for the SPD. Permission is required for satellite dishes in most conservation area locations.
28		Council should encourage roof level renewable energy systems, including in conservation areas and should offer help and advice.	Accepted. Text amended to: -“6.6 Planning legislation states that within conservation areas particular consideration must be given to the impact of installations, fixed to buildings or stand alone, on the character and appearance of the area. Proposals will normally be appropriate where their form and appearance preserve the special character or appearance of the building / area or where they are not visible from a highway.” In addition the SPD on Sustainable Design & Construction, which was approved for consultation subsequent to the Residential Alterations and Extensions SPD, deals with these issues and others in a comprehensive way. General guidance for homeowners dealing with many of the issues and good practice, including that not within the control of planning powers has been addressed in the Council’s document – “House owners guide to renewables”.
29		Document discourages visible solar	Accepted in Part. Depending on their nature, scale and location solar panels

		panels in conservation areas. This is unacceptable as solar roof tiles are not visually harmful.	can be considered as visually harmful but the point has been addressed in the amended text. - "6.6 Planning legislation states that within conservation areas particular consideration must be given to the impact of renewable energy systems on the character and appearance of the area. Proposals will normally be appropriate where they are not visible from important locations and where their form and appearance preserve the special character or appearance of the building / area or where they are not visible from a highway."
30		SPD fails to promote permeable parking surfaces.	Noted. The consultation draft already referred to permeable parking surfaces. Paragraphs 7.11 & 7.12 of the proposed final version refer to the use of permeable paving and soakaways including where traditional surfaces are being used.
31		Making hardstandings should require planning permission on sustainability grounds.	Noted. However, requirements for planning permission are set out in the General Permitted Development Order (GPDO) and not a matter for local discretion and currently are not within planning control in the case of single family dwellings.
32		All hard surfaces should be rain porous.	Accepted. Emphasis of section has been changed to cover all 'hard paving' not just driveways. Paragraph 7.11 of proposed final version states: - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Securing natural drainage by using permeable paving and soakaways. Impermeable surfaces increase run off and contribute to local flooding problems."
33		Council should encourage hedges, especially fruit bearing varieties, on sustainability grounds.	Accepted. Text relating to the habitat importance of gardens has been added: - "7.2 Gardens are important for amenity, habitats and natural drainage; their importance in Lambeth is highlighted in the Lambeth Biodiversity Action Plan (Lambeth BAP). Any new development should respect amenity, habitats and natural drainage wherever possible. The value of rear gardens is increased where they collectively make up a large tract of green space. Front gardens and forecourts are particularly important as they provide a landscaped setting for the building and mediate between public and private space. The loss of soft

			landscaping should therefore be avoided wherever possible.”
34		Water butts should be encouraged	Noted. However, this is a matter more appropriately dealt with by other documents as this is not within planning control or related to UDP policies and therefore not appropriate for a SPD.
35		Bike parking should be encouraged in front gardens	<p>Partly Accepted. Policy 17 (iv) of UDP refers to the provision of secure cycle storage, though depending on their size, location materials used and subsequent maintenance, their appearance can have a harmful impact on amenity. It would not be appropriate to encourage front garden bike stores in all cases. The text has been revised to reflect this: -</p> <p>“7.9 Bicycles should preferably be stored at the rear of the property or inside as cycle storage in front gardens can be a harmful visual intrusion as well as being easily accessible to criminals. Cycle storage sheds in front gardens require planning permission. The acceptability of proposals will depend on their impact. Factors determining this are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The size of the shed, the building and the garden where it is to be located; • Its location; • Level of screening; and • The nature of the materials used.”
36		There is no justification for retaining single glazing in conservation areas as there have been substantial improvements in the design and appearance of replacement double glazed sash windows.	Not accepted. There is a strong argument on sustainability grounds to retain existing windows not just on aesthetic grounds. Paragraph 10.4 sets out the reasons for this and states where repair or upgrading is not possible replacements should match the style and materials of the original as much as possible. Paragraph 10.5 indicates various ways that energy saving can be achieved while retaining existing windows of character by draught proofing, use of internal shutters or internal secondary glazing.
37		FENSA should be mentioned for replacement windows	Accepted in part. The draft SPD stated that the replacement of windows require separate consent under Building Regulations, the text in paragraph 10.7 has been amended to make requirements clearer: - “New and replacement windows have to comply with thermal insulation standards as set out in the Building

			Regulations and to meet these standards new windows will usually need to be double glazed.” FENSA is a certification process which exempts the need for Building Control approval and is a detailed matter relating to Building Regulations and not the planning process. It is referred to in the Council document – House owners guide to renewables.
38		‘preserve’ is wrongly used on 5.13. conservation is not preservation.	Not accepted. The Government set requirement for conservation areas in Planning Policy Guidance 15 (Planning and the Historic Environment) and confirmed in the High Court is to ‘preserve or enhance’. However, paragraph 10.8 has been amended and now reads: “Many of Lambeth’s buildings are part of formal terraces or groups which share common window detailing. Similarly the windows of individual flats are often identical within the whole block. Any replacement window should accurately replicate the detailing and form of the originals; powder coated aluminium or plastic (PVCu) replacements therefore may not be acceptable, especially in conservation areas where accurate like-for-like replacements will normally be required in order to preserve the character and appearance of the area.”
39		6.7 useful to specify sustainable materials	Noted. It is considered that the SPD deals with these issues in a way that is appropriate to level of planning controls and the purpose and content of this particular SPD. Paragraphs 11.7 and 11.9 refer to and encourage the re-use of existing materials the use of materials of materials from sustainable sources. This is a matter more appropriate to the Council’s publication – House owners guide to renewables and this deals with this in greater detail.
40		6.13 Utility suppliers should be controlled – their installations on houses are damaging	Agreed. However, unfortunately this is not within planning powers to control.
41		6.7 Council could advise on sustainable materials	Partly accepted. The SPD encourages the use of sustainable materials in paragraph 11.9 in a way that is considered appropriate to the content matter of the SPD and planning powers. However, this is a matter more appropriate to the Council’s publication – House owners guide to renewables and this deals with this in greater detail.
42		6.7 Council should require suppliers in	Not accepted. This is beyond the Council’s controls and not within the remit of

		its area to sell only wood from sustainable sources	planning powers.
43		6.16. should recommend good books on sustainable building / maintenance	Noted. However, this is a matter more appropriate to the Council's publication – House owners guide to renewables which provides various references and sources of information. Also the SPD on Sustainable Design and Construction provides references to further sources of information.
	Russ Curlew, Building Design Consultant		
44		No objection	Noted.
	Mr M Bayley, local resident		
45		The document is well written and well illustrated	Noted.
46		Support maximum depth of 3 m for extensions on terrace d houses	Noted.
47		Support resistance of full width extensions	Noted.
48		Notification letter should mention to the consultees on applications that the UDP and SPD documents are available. This will discourage people from objecting to schemes that meet policy.	Noted. Not accepted. Relevant planning documents are listed on the Council web site. This is not a matter of the SPD.
	INTERNAL Lambeth Parks & Greenspaces		
49		'Private Gardens' are covered by a Habitat Action Plan in the Lambeth Biodiversity Action Plan (Lambeth BAP). Guidance should always to be to try and retain existing gardens, and to improve their visual and ecological quality rather than have them lost or replaced with something quite different.	Accepted. Paragraph added to reflect this: "7.2 Gardens are important for amenity, habitats and natural drainage; their importance in Lambeth is highlighted in the Lambeth Biodiversity Action Plan (Lambeth BAP). Any new development should respect amenity, habitats and natural drainage wherever possible. The value of rear gardens is increased where they collectively make up a large tract of green space. Front gardens and forecourts are particularly important as they provide a landscaped setting for the building and mediate between public and private space. The loss of soft landscaping should therefore be avoided wherever possible."

50		<p>Green roofs are a great way to add to and extend the amount of green coverage of Lambeth and London, rather than a direct swap for what is already there.</p> <p>Green (sedum roofs) have their place and ecological benefits, however they should not be used to justify building over a garden. It's difficult to see them as a like-for-like replacement for a garden which will already have its own ecological assembly of plant and animal species as well as horticultural qualities.</p>	<p>Accepted. For clarity the text on green roofs has been moved to the 'roofs' section. The following text has also been included: -</p> <p>"3.20 Living roofs should not be considered an adequate mitigation for the loss of rear gardens; each has its own unique ecological character."</p>
	INTERNAL – Planning Division, Development Control		
51		Fully glazed infill extensions may not comply with building regulations regarding heat loss/energy efficiency.	<p>Accepted. Para 2.12 now reads: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "The new work has a mostly glazed or visually lightweight form,"
52		Fig.16 and fig. 19 appear to contradict advice given on p.14. 'Usually two small dormers are preferable to a single larger dormer'	Accepted. Revisit all illustrations when text content is finalised.
53		Guidance on hip to gable roof extensions would be useful.	Not accepted. This is already mentioned in Para. 3.13 of the consultation draft document and is still in 3.13 of the final draft version.
54		1m set back seems too prescriptive.	<p>Accepted. Reference to 1m has been removed. Text in Para 2.16 now reads:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Be set back from the front building line;"
55		Fig 7 – not much between the two examples – both likely to be acceptable	Accepted. Revisit all illustrations when document text is confirmed.

56		Some reference should be made to dummy roof pitches on extensions	Accepted. Para 2.16 now includes: “Dummy roof slopes (those concealing a flat roof) should have a sufficient size and pitch to give them design integrity.”
57		Fig 8 looks like a studio flat extension – prefer another illustration to show set-back.	Accepted. Revisit all illustrations when document text is confirmed.
58		Page 10 – where plot / host buildings allow an extension need not be subservient – for example where a new house can be added to an existing row	Accepted. Para 2.15. “...Schemes for end of terrace buildings and those with unusually shaped side plots will be judged on their merits in relation to their context. “
59		What about stairwell dormers where rear returns join main roof?	Not accepted. Sufficient guidance already provided.
60		3.3 Fig 11 should not show a dormer.	Accepted. Revisit all illustrations when document text is confirmed.
61		Should discourage front dormers.	Accepted. Revised text now reads: - “3.8 With the exception of mansard roofs, dormers were not a feature of residential development in Lambeth before the late 19 th Century. Their introduction requires a careful approach to ensure compatibility with the main building and their wider context and for that reason dormers are best located on rear roof pitches and features such as chimneys and parapet walls should not be removed or obscured by the dormers.”
62		We should avoid complicated percentages in guidance – too difficult to calculate	Accepted. Revised text now reads: - “3.3 Rooflights are the most sympathetic way of providing daylight to a habitable attic space as they follow the line of the roof. In most instances proposed rooflights should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be subordinate features on the roof; and • Align with, or reflect the window pattern of the building below. “
63		Rooflight section should mention PD rights	Not Accepted. In light of proposed changes to planning regulations all references to PD have been removed.
64		3.7 fig 14 the illustrated dormer is too	Accepted. Revisit all illustrations when document text is confirmed.

		big – contrary to the advice in the text.	
65		Above fig 14 links in with fig 17 – this needs to be Accepted. It is unclear.	Accepted. Revisit all illustrations when document text is confirmed.
66		Dormers percentages references very confusing for users.	<p>Accepted. References to percentages etc. deleted and replaced with:</p> <p>“3.9 Irrespective of the location the following design advice normally applies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dormers should normally align with, be no wider than, and be subordinate in height to the windows on the elevation below; • The window cill should rest on the roof slope and should be around 1 metre from the attic floor level (or eaves level of the roof if the floor has been lowered) and the roof slope; • The window type should be in keeping with those on the main building; • The materials, construction detailing and form should all be carefully considered. Bulky construction detailing should be avoided; and • The dormer should sit well within the roof slope and its roof should be lower than the roof ridge.”
67		If the text discourages the use of one large dormer – the illustration on fig 14 is misleading	Accepted. Fig 14 removed. Revisit all illustrations when document text is confirmed.
68		Size of dormer should be proportionate to the roof and the size / location of the windows on elevations	<p>Accepted. Amended text now reads:</p> <p>“3.9 Irrespective of the location the following design advice normally applies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dormers should normally align with, be no wider than, and be subordinate in height to the windows on the elevation below; • The window cill should rest on the roof slope and should be around 1 metre from the attic floor level (or eaves level of the roof if the floor has been lowered) and the roof slope; • The window type should be in keeping with those on the main building; • The materials, construction detailing and form should all be carefully considered. Bulky construction detailing should be avoided; and

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The dormer should sit well within the roof slope and its roof should be lower than the roof ridge.”
69		Sympathetic dormers should have set-ins already without need to specify dimensions. Perhaps addressed by a cill height.	<p>Accepted. References to set-backs have been removed. Revised text now reads:</p> <p>“3.9 Irrespective of the location the following design advice normally applies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dormers should normally align with, be no wider than, and be subordinate in height to the windows on the elevation below; The window cill should rest on the roof slope and should be around 1 metre from the attic floor level (or eaves level of the roof if the floor has been lowered) and the roof slope; The window type should be in keeping with those on the main building; The materials, construction detailing and form should all be carefully considered. Bulky construction detailing should be avoided; and The dormer should sit well within the roof slope and its roof should be lower than the roof ridge.”
70		Fig 17 is unclear.	Accepted. Revisit all illustrations when document text is confirmed.
71		Roof extension design advice needs more thought. A number of designs other than mansards may be appropriate.	<p>Accepted. Revisit design advice on mansards. New paragraphs have been added: -</p> <p>“3.17 Additional storeys require a considered approach to ensure they are well integrated with the main building. Building straight up off the existing front and rear elevations (or flanks if exposed) is unlikely to be successful. Subservient additions with reasonable set-backs to reduce bulk are advisable.</p> <p>3.18 Contemporary design approaches may be acceptable on ‘stand alone’ buildings and modern buildings or in locations where there is no unifying built form or building height. In these circumstances the design and detailing will be expected to be of an appropriately high quality and responsive to its context. .”</p>
72		Should SPD not resist loss of historic roofs in conservation areas?	Accepted. Revised text reads:

			“3.16 In conservation areas mansards may not be appropriate if they would result in the loss of contributory roof forms or cause harm to the main building / wider character and appearance.”
73		Fig 19 is the wrong illustration.	Accepted. Revisit all illustrations when document text is confirmed.
74		Satellite dish planning advice needs to be more comprehensive	Not Accepted. In the light to changes to PD all advice on the need for planning permission has been removed.
75		Renewable energy – this section is useful	Noted.
76		4.3 should we leave the permissions advice out given potential Amendments to PD legislation?	Not accepted. The SPD should reflect the current planning requirements at time of approval.
77		‘classified roads’ need to be mentioned in cross-over text in relation to the need for planning permission	Not Accepted. In the light to changes to PD all advice on the need for planning permission has been removed.
78		Fig 24 – refers to structures being at least 5m from rear of house. It should justify this by stating that any closer is likely to have an impact on neighbour amenity	Accepted. The amended text now reads: “7.13.... Setting back by at least 1m from all boundaries and preferably 5m from the rear building line of the main house will minimise the visual impact on adjoining properties and the surroundings.”
79		Garden subdivision requires a mention as Policy 17 (v) seeks to retain rear gardens without subdivision.	Accepted. New paragraph reads: “7.7 Where possible gardens should be retained without subdivision.”
80		Page 21 – the figures don’t actually show bin stores.	Accepted. Revisit all illustrations when document text is confirmed.
81		Para 4.13 should mention need for planning permission.	Not Accepted. In the light to changes to PD all advice on the need for planning permission has been removed.
82		Figs 28 – 30 ticks and crosses	Accepted. Revisit all illustrations when document text is confirmed.
83		Front light wells should only acceptable if an ‘established feature’ of the street scene / immediate locality. The text is unclear in this regard.	Accepted. A new section has been created to improve the layout and use of the document. Text now reads: “8.7 New excavations in front gardens may be acceptable where: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• basement areas/ lightwells are part of the established character of the

			<p>street.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A significant portion of the garden space in a small garden is retained at ground level to allow for adequate screen planting and boundary enclosures. • The design details complement the appearance of the dwelling in terms of window design and proportion. • The lightwell is suitably protected to comply with Building Regulations. In places where railing enclosures are deemed unacceptable grilles of structural glazing may present an alternative.”
84		No advice provided on light well enclosure and glazing.	<p>Accepted. Revised text reads:</p> <p>“8.7 New excavations in front gardens may be acceptable where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • basement areas/ lightwells are part of the established character of the street. • A significant portion of the garden space in a small garden is retained at ground level to allow for adequate screen planting and boundary enclosures. • The design details complement the appearance of the dwelling in terms of window design and proportion. • The lightwell is suitably protected to comply with Building Regulations. In places where railing enclosures are deemed unacceptable grilles of structural glazing may present an alternative.”
85		Is there any conflict with residential conversions SPD with regard basement lightwells?	<p>Not accepted. No conflict – light wells not mentioned in conversions SPD.</p>
86		Guidance should not resist PVCu solely on environmental grounds.	<p>Accepted. Revised text has removed reference to environmental grounds:</p> <p>“10.8 Many of Lambeth’s buildings are part of formal terraces or groups which share common window detailing. Similarly the windows of individual flats are often identical within the whole block. Any replacement window should accurately replicate the detailing and form of the originals; powder</p>

			coated aluminium or plastic (PVCu) replacements therefore may not be acceptable, especially in conservation areas where accurate like-for-like replacements will normally be required in order to preserve the character and appearance of the area.”
87		The document provides no guidance on the appropriateness, or otherwise, of changes to existing basement areas at front of houses.	Accepted. New paragraphs read: “8.4 The infilling of existing light wells and basement areas should normally be avoided on design grounds. 8.5 Generally, roofing over or enclosure of existing basement areas and lightwells harm the appearance of buildings and should be avoided.”
88		A 1m side space between boundary and first floor extension in suburban locations is a clear way of ensuring side space is retained.	Accepted. Revised text now reads: “2.15 Infilling a gap to the side of a building with an extension can have a significant visual impact as it can significantly change the character of buildings in the street scene. Schemes for end of terrace buildings and those with unusually shaped side plots will be judged on their merits in relation to their context. The effect of all extensions on the amenity of neighbouring properties should always be considered. “2.16 A side extension should normally: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be subsidiary to the main dwelling in scale, height and position; • Be set back from the front building line; • Maintain a 1m gap between the completed structure and the side boundary to avoid visual terracing and maintain side space between properties; and • Designed so that the roof design is compatible with that of the main building or adhere to an established design in the surrounding area. N.B Dummy roof slopes (those concealing a flat roof) should have a sufficient size and pitch to give them design integrity.”
89		Is the symmetry of semidetached buildings important when considering	Not Accepted. Symmetry is one consideration but can’t be overriding of no alterations to semidetached properties would be deemed acceptable.

		alterations?	
90		The document should mention stairs from upper floors into gardens.	Accepted. New paragraphs read: “7.14 Direct access from the upper floor to the rear garden via an external staircase is often desirable to residents but can have an adverse impact on the amenity and security of neighbouring property. External staircases should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be of an appropriate form, design and scale for the building, • Avoid excessive rearward projection; and • Be positioned to avoid / minimise overlooking into neighbouring properties and gardens.”
91		Is there a certain % of rear gardens – no more than 50% or 30% should be covered in structures?	Not Accepted. Policy 36 (j) (i) resists development of an excessive portion of rear garden.
92		The whole issue of using former shops as residential units requires some design guidance.	Accepted. Advice has been transferred across from the draft Shopfronts and Signage SPD into a new Section 9 ‘Shop Conversions’
93		Document would benefit from a glossary	Accepted. Glossary has been added at rear of SPD.
94		The guidance on shop conversions to residential use would be best amplified in this SPD document as that is where most customers will look for it	Accepted. Advice has been transferred across from the draft Shopfronts and Signage SPD into a new Section 9 ‘Shop Conversions’
95		References to pre and post 1914 buildings confusing	Accepted. Appendix 1 has been created explaining Lambeth’s common building forms – Georgian, Victorian Twentieth Century and Contemporary.
96		Page 7 – fig 4 the illustration does not reflect the ‘light weight’ infill advice and extensions shown not ideal in design terms.	Accepted. Revisit all illustrations when document text is confirmed.
97		The document should discourage the use of roof areas as terraces where the use would give rise to unacceptable	Accepted. A new section on terraces and balconies has been provided for clarity. It includes:

		levels of overlooking/loss of privacy/noise/disturbance etc.	"4.1 Due to the high residential density in most of Lambeth terrace and balcony additions to existing buildings are often unacceptable because of their harm on the amenity of neighbouring property. Terraces and balconies will only be supported where there is no adverse impact on the amenity of adjoining property and no harm caused to the appearance of the building."
98		The document might refer to the use of planning conditions to prevent the use of roofs as terraces.	Not accepted. This level of detail is unnecessary in an SPD.
	INTERNAL Crime Prevention / Design Officer		
99		Should refer to important 'secured by design' minimum standards for windows / doors and ironmongery etc.	Accepted. Reference to 'secured by design standards' has been added a bullet point.
100		Add a security sub section with link to 'Secure by Design' web page.	Accepted. Secure by Design' web link and officer contact details have been added to 'Other Contacts' section.
101		Add local advice is available from the local CPDA at design / pre-app stage	Accepted. Incorporated into 'Other Contacts section.
	INTERNAL – Councillor Diana Morris		
102		We need to make sure that all the info required regarding a particular type of extension can be found in the one section relating to that type of development.	Accepted. The document content has been reorganised to present the information as clearly as possible.
103		Sustainable issues are a concern for constituents. Are they adequately addressed?	Accepted. Sustainability is addressed in depth within the SPD on Sustainable Design and Construction. References are included where appropriate in the context of the specific purpose of the SPD in relation to permeable paving, renewable energy systems, windows and the use of sustainable materials.
104		Regarding extensions that do not need planning permission, it would be a good idea to remind potential developers of the importance of consulting with neighbours and trying to come to some agreement.	Accepted. This advice has been emphasised in Paragraph 1.8.

105		It would also be a good idea to refer to the owner's responsibilities under the party wall legislation.	Not accepted. This is beyond the remit of a planning guidance document.
-----	--	---	--