
Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 4/5/6 February 2014

Unaccompanied site visit made on 3 February 2014, accompanied site visit made on 6 March

by John Wilde C.Eng M.I.C.E.

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 1 April 2014

Appeal Ref: APP/C5690/A/13/2204610
483-485 New Cross Road, London, SE14 6TQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Kitewood Estates Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Lewisham.
 - The application Ref DC/13/83322, dated 25 April 2013, was refused by notice dated 28 June 2013.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a part four/part six storey building for 44 apartments; 265sqm B1/A2/A1 use and public realm.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a part four/part six storey building for 44 apartments; 265sqm B1/A2/A1 use and public realm at 483-485 New Cross Road, London, SE14 6TQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref DC/13/83322, dated 25 April 2013, subject to the conditions contained within the attached schedule.

Procedural matters

2. The development was originally refused on three grounds. The second of these related to highway matters and that reason for refusal has, in the eyes of the Council, been overcome by the suggested imposition of a condition preventing servicing from Watson's Street and the submission of drawing L411-100A which alters the servicing arrangements for the building. I have been given no reason to arrive at a different view to that of the Council and will not therefore refer further to this issue.
3. The third reason for refusal concerned the status of the footpath area included within the application boundary. The Council have now accepted the status of this land and withdrawn this reason for refusal. Once again I have no grounds for arriving at a different conclusion and will not refer to this reason for refusal again. There was therefore one outstanding issue at the start of the Inquiry as given below.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and the adjacent heritage assets.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is a corner plot, currently containing a car wash/valeting operation and a car repair yard. The properties immediately to the east and south are all within the Deptford High Street Conservation Area. Two of the properties to the south, the Zion Chapel and the Royal Albert public house, are Grade II listed. Close to the Zion Chapel is the Addey and Stanhope School which has been identified as meeting the Council's criteria for local listing based on its architectural quality and contribution to the townscape.
6. The Zion Chapel, Royal Albert pub and the adjacent Iyengar Yoga Institute are all relatively low-rise buildings (2/3 storey) and are set back from the rear of the footway. The Addey and Stanhope School is also set back from the rear of the footway behind a brick wall but is a taller building of about 3/4 storeys. The school also has a relatively recent more modern addition attached to its east side. This addition is tall and extends to the rear of the footway. When approached along New Cross Road from the west it is a dominant feature due to its height, more modern appearance and positioning.
7. The properties directly to the east of the appeal site are Edwardian and Victorian buildings with heights of up to four storeys including mansard roofs. To the west of the site on the north side of New Cross Road is another four storey building whilst further to the west is a modern five storey building. The upper storey of both of these buildings is contained within a mansard feature. Opposite the appeal site on the west side of Watson's Street is a terrace of two storey Victorian Cottages.
8. These are the buildings to which the proposed building would directly relate. Further afield the conservation area contains a variety of architectural styles and heights of buildings, including the seven storey Mereworth Mansions at its eastern end and three storey modern properties in Deptford High Street. There is therefore no over riding commonality that defines the conservation area in terms of architectural styling or heights of buildings. If anything it is the difference in heights, even in adjacent buildings, that is a feature of the area.
9. The Council have a document entitled the Deptford Urban Design and Development Framework (UDDF). This document was commissioned by the Council to provide guidance on the future development of Deptford and developed through consultation with local residents and stakeholders. Whilst not forming part of the development plan therefore, the document is a material consideration in my deliberations.
10. The UDDF highlights an opportunity for a *'signature' building at the corner of Watson's Street and New Cross Road, up to six storeys in height (corner only) to provide a built gateway feature to Deptford*. The UDDF also informs that *there should be a maximum of five storey development along the New Cross Road frontage and a maximum of four storey development along Watson's Street frontage close to New Cross Road, falling to three storeys at the junction with Comet Street to reflect the domestic scale of existing cottages fronting Watson's Street in this location*.
11. An artist's impression contained within the UDDP shows a cylindrical tower structure of six storeys with a height of 22m at the corner of New Cross Road and Watson's Street, with four storeys extending along the new Cross Road frontage. The Watson's Street frontage is shown as having four storeys where

it leaves the tower with the fourth storey being set back. The heights of the tower element and the elevation fronting Watson's Street are shown as those that would allow the sun to reach the residential elements of the properties opposite, assuming a minimum footway width of 2m.

12. The proposed building would be part four and part six storey. The six storey section would extend about 20m along both Watson's Street and New Cross Road, although over half of this length the sixth storey would be set back by about 1.8m. The proposed building would therefore breach the guidelines in the UDDP by having greater than five storeys along the New Cross Road frontage and greater than four storeys along the Watson's Street frontage. It is the extra height, particularly the sixth story, and its extent and massing that forms the basis of the Council's concern.
13. However, as I have just stated, a considerable section of the sixth storey of the proposed building along both the New Cross Street and Watson's Street frontages would be set back, leaving only a relatively short section without the set back. The set back sections would also be finished in a lighter coloured brick, which would further reduce their impact, and would prevent the building from being read as a solid six storeys. Furthermore, the front elevation of the proposed building along Watson's Street would be set back over 5m further than the design envisaged in the UDDP.
14. English Heritage has made comments on the proposed scheme. They comment that *the consideration of scale, materials and architectural rhythm shows that the context has been carefully considered*. However, they then express concerns regarding *the massing of the development* which they say would be *undesirably prominent in the street scene*. They go on to suggest that the set back of the top stories on both Watson's Street and New Cross Road should be increased. This they consider *would reduce its visual impact and prevent the building from dominating views into the conservation area and detracting from its setting*.
15. This to me seems to be somewhat at odds with the aim of the UDDF which identified an opportunity to contribute *a signature building to provide a built gateway feature to Deptford*. I take the meaning of a signature building in this context to equate to a landmark building. A landmark building is defined in By Design¹ as *a building or structure that stands out from its background by virtue of height, size or other aspect of design*. To my mind, notwithstanding the comments of EH, this is exactly what the proposed design would achieve. I note that By Design also makes clear that *relating new development to the general pattern of building heights should not preclude a degree of variety to reflect particular circumstances*.
16. The scheme was also put before the Council's Design Panel (DP). They expressed concern that the massing on New Cross Road was too great and that the four storeys along Watson's Street would dominate the two storey cottages on the other side of the road, resulting in a negative impact on the latter's setting in the street scene. In respect of this latter point I have previously noted that the front elevation of the proposed building at this point would be set over 5m further back than the design envisaged in the UDDF.

¹ By Design: Urban design in the planning system: towards better practice (CABE 2000)

17. As regards the impact of the proposed building along New Cross Road, the dominating feature along this stretch of road is currently the extension to the Addey and Stanhope School. This is seen from the west along New Cross Road with the high rise Seager Tower above and beyond it. Views along or across New Cross Road also constitute the primary relationship between the proposed building and the conservation area.
18. It seems to me that anything of a lesser height or mass than that proposed would be dominated by the existing school extension and therefore fail in its aim of becoming a signature building. Whilst accepting that the length of the highest part of the proposed building would be greater than the tower shown in the UDDF, I note that the maximum height of the proposed building would be about 3.5m lower than the tower. I also note that whilst the proposed building would be higher than the adjacent buildings to the east, such changes in height and roof type are not uncommon in the conservation area. The Council themselves accept that the character of the conservation area is derived from the *variety of buildings of different ages, styles, forms and heights that reflect the piecemeal character of development over the centuries*.
19. I now turn to the relationship between the proposed building and the adjacent listed buildings, and in doing so am mindful of the test given in Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act). This makes clear that *in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses*.
20. The Zion Chapel and Royal Albert pub are situated on the south side of New Cross Road. The chapel is set back a considerable distance and is seen between its narrow side wings. Due to its setback it cannot be seen in long distance views in either direction along New Cross Road. Its frontage is visible from Watson's Street but this view would not in my opinion be harmed by the proposed building, as the height of the latter would not be overtly apparent in such relatively short distance views. Overall, I consider that the proposed development would not harm the adjacent conservation area, and would preserve the setting of the listed buildings, in full accordance with the expectations of the relevant section of the Act.
21. The proposed development would not therefore conflict with policy 15 of the Core Strategy or policies URB 3 and HSG 5 of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP). Policy 15 seeks to ensure, amongst other things, that development conserves and enhances the borough's heritage assets. Policy URB 3 seeks to ensure that schemes are compatible with, or complement the scale and character of existing development. Policy HSG 5 requires residential development to be attractive and to comply with the urban design and conservation policies within the UDP. Nor would the proposed development conflict with policies in the London Plan designed to enhance the quality of local places, maintain local character and enhance the public realm.
22. I note that an alternative scheme of five storeys, recently submitted by the appellants for contractual reasons, would be likely to find favour with officers. This other scheme is not however before me, and I have to arrive at a conclusion on the one that is before me based on information supplied during

the Inquiry and my own observations, irrespective of what officers may consider in respect of the alternative submission.

Other matters

23. During the Inquiry I was supplied with a signed and dated Unilateral Undertaking (UU) which would facilitate the provision of the required Affordable Housing and also contributions towards education, health and public realm improvements to mitigate the effects of the development. Whilst the appellant has not contested the required contributions it is still incumbent upon me to assess them against regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).
24. CIL regulation 122 makes clear that it is unlawful for a planning obligation to be taken into account in a planning decision on a development that is capable of being charged CIL if the obligation does not meet all of the following tests. These are that the obligation is necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, is directly related to the development, and is fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
25. To justify the need for the contributions the Council have furnished me with a document that, for each of the contributions, gives the policy justification as well as demonstrating the need for and the quantum of the contribution. In light of this information I conclude that the required contributions accord with the tests and can be taken into account in this decision.
26. I note that concern has been expressed by agents acting for the Deptford Reach drop-in centre for adults with regard to the juxtaposition of the proposed development and the proposed new building on the Deptford Reach site. The new Deptford Reach building would be four storeys with the top three storeys set back from the boundary with the proposed development that is the subject of this decision. Light to the ground floor rooms of the new Deptford Reach building would be provided by roof lights and none of these rooms would be residential.
27. The communal garden area serving the proposed development would be between the respective elevations and the Council have no concern with the relationship of the two proposed buildings taking into account the distances between the elevations and their design with reference to the Councils Supplementary Planning Document relating to residential standards. The Council have confirmed this opinion in the Statement of Common Ground and I have been given no significant information that would lead me to a contrary view.
28. The provision of Affordable Housing would be less than that normally required by the Council. However the Council have accepted the lower figure following the submission of a Viability Assessment, and I have been provided with no significant evidence that would lead me to a different view to that of the Council. I also note that the provision of wheelchair accessible units would be 1% below that required by the London Plan. Such a small differential is not however in my view sufficient to lead me to a different overall conclusion.
29. I have also been made aware of the concerns of the residents of the recently refurbished Theatre Place that lies to the east of the proposed development and the south of the Deptford Reach building. I was able to visit this

development during my site visit and view the relationship between it and the proposed development. As with the Deptford Reach development there would be the communal garden area of the latter between the two buildings. Furthermore, the west elevation of Theatre Place is a blank end elevation. I conclude therefore that the proposed development would not have a significant detrimental effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of Theatre Place.

Conditions

30. The conditions set out in the accompanying schedule are based on those suggested by the Council and discussed at the Inquiry. Where necessary I have amended the wording of these in the interests of precision and clarity in order to comply with advice in planning guidance.
31. In the interest of the final appearance of the development I have imposed conditions relating to the submission of samples of external materials to be used, the implementation of a landscaping scheme and one to prevent exterior pipework other than rainwater pipes. For the same reason I have imposed a condition requiring further details of the proposed shop frontages.
32. So that the proposed development will comply with local and national policy relating to sustainability I have imposed conditions requiring that it reaches a Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 in respect of the residential units and a BREEAM rating of excellent for the commercial units. Also in the interest of sustainability I have also imposed a condition requiring details of the proposed photovoltaic roof level array to be submitted, approved and implemented.
33. There was some debate at the Inquiry regarding the suitability and necessity of a condition requiring that the proposed development have included within it the necessary conduits and pipework such that it could be connected to a district wide heating system in the future. I consider that such a condition would be in line with current policy on sustainability and also that the revised condition proposed by the Council is precise in its nature. I have therefore imposed this condition.
34. In the interest of the amenity of local residents and the future residents of the development I have imposed conditions to prevent noise intrusion into and out of the development and also within the development. Also in the interest of the amenity of local residents I have imposed a condition requiring a construction method statement, one that requires further details of the on-site storage, disposal and collection of refuse and recycling facilities and one that limits the hours and type of use of the commercial units.
35. To ensure the bio-diversity credentials of the development I have imposed a condition requiring the submission of a strategy for ecological enhancement and to prevent future flooding I have imposed a condition requiring details of a sustainable drainage scheme to be submitted, approved and implemented.
36. In line with the agreement reached between the two main parties in respect of the second reason for refusal, I have imposed a condition that ensures that servicing of the building will be carried out from New Cross Road rather than Watson's Street. To protect the safety of future residents I have also imposed a condition requiring that contamination remedial works are carried out in line with the Remediation Strategy Report already prepared by the appellants. This differs somewhat from the condition requested by the Council which required

that a further desk top study be carried out. To my mind, given the existence of the existing one, a further one is not required.

37. I have not imposed a condition requiring a programme of archaeological work as requested by the Council as the appellant submitted an archaeological desk based assessment at the application stage. This assessment concluded that *no further archaeological mitigation measures are recommended in this particular instance*. Nor have I imposed the element of the construction method statement condition that required *full details of the number and time of construction vehicle trips to the site*. Whilst I understand what the Council are trying to achieve, it seems to me to be unduly onerous on the part of the appellant, if not impossible.
38. Finally, otherwise than as set out in this decision and conditions, it is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I have therefore imposed a condition to this effect.

Overall conclusion

39. I have found that the proposed development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area or on the adjacent heritage assets or their setting. Having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

John Wilde

Inspector

Schedule of conditions

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2499.1 Topographical survey, 12021-D01 Location Plan, 12021-D02 Existing elevations AA BB, 12021-D03 Existing elevations CC DD, 12021-D04 Proposed plan ground level, 12021-D05 Proposed plan level 1, 12021-D06 Proposed plan level 2, 12021-D07 Proposed plan level 3, 12021-D08 Proposed plan level 4, 12021-D09 Proposed plan level 5, 12021-D10 Proposed plan roof level, 12021-D11 Proposed long elevations AA BB, 12021-D12 Proposed long elevations CC DD, 12021-D13 Proposed elevations AA BB, 12021-D14 Proposed elevations CC DD EE, 12021-D15 Unit type wheelchair A, 12021-D16 Unit type Wheelchair B, 12021-D17 Unit type wheelchair C, 12021-D18 Unit type wheelchair D, 12021-D19 Unit types E F G H I, 12021-D20 Unit types J K L M N, 12021-D21 Unit types O P Q R, 12021-D22 Unit types S T U V, 12021-D23 Proposed plan boundary treatment, 12021-D24 Proposed plan refuse plan, 13715 L93.01 Hardworks plan, 13715 L94.01 Softworks and planting plan, L411-100A Servicing details.
- 3) No development shall take place until a detailed schedule and samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building (including windows, doors and roof coverings) hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 4) No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The Statement shall provide for:
 - i) Details of practical measures to be employed to mitigate noise and vibration arising out of the construction process.
 - ii) Details of construction traffic movements including cumulative impacts designed to rationalise travel and traffic routes to and from the site and including measures to deal with pedestrian safety
 - iii) Security management (to minimise risks to unauthorised personnel
 - iv) Measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction
 - v) The location and operation of plant and wheel washing facilities
 - vi) Details of the training of site operatives to follow the Construction Management Plan requirements and any environmental Management Plan requirements
- 5) No development apart from the demolition of existing buildings and structures shall commence until contamination remedial works have been carried out in line with the Remediation Strategy Report prepared by Ground and Environmental Services Ltd dated April 2013.

If during any works on the site, contamination is encountered which has not previously been identified ("the new contamination") the Council shall be notified immediately and a further Remediation Strategy Report shall

be compiled and its recommendations shall be undertaken prior to any further construction works being carried out on that part of the site or adjacent affected areas.

The development shall not be occupied until a closure report has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council.

This shall include verification of all measures, or treatments as required above and relevant correspondence (including other regulating authorities and stakeholders involved with the remediation works) to verify compliance requirements, necessary for the remediation of the site have been implemented in full.

The closure report shall include verification details of both the remediation and post-remediation sampling/works, carried out (including waste materials removed from the site); and before placement of any soil/materials is undertaken on site, all imported or reused soil material must conform to current soil quality requirements as agreed by the authority. Inherent to the above, is the provision of any required documentation, certification and monitoring, to facilitate condition requirements.

- 6) (a) The rating level of the noise emitted from fixed plant on the site shall be 5dB below the existing background level at any time. The noise levels shall be determined at the façade of any noise sensitive property. The measurements and assessments shall be made according to BS4142:1997.

(b) Development shall not commence until details of a scheme complying with paragraph (a) of this condition have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

The development shall not be occupied until the scheme approved pursuant to paragraph (b) of this condition has been implemented in its entirety. Thereafter the scheme shall be maintained in perpetuity.

- 7) (a) The commercial element hereby approved shall achieve a minimum BREEAM Rating of 'Excellent'.

No development shall commence until a Design Stage Certificate (prepared by a Building Research Establishment qualified Assessor) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority to demonstrate compliance with part (a).

Within 3 months of occupation of the commercial element, evidence shall be submitted in the form of a Post Construction Certificate (prepared by a Building Research Establishment qualified Assessor) to demonstrate full compliance with part (a) for that specific building.

- 8) (a) The residential units hereby approved shall achieve a minimum Code for Sustainable Homes Rating Level 4:

No development shall commence until a Design Stage Certificate for each residential unit (prepared by a Code for Sustainable Homes qualified Assessor) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority to demonstrate compliance with part (a).

Within 3 months of occupation of any of the residential units, evidence shall be submitted in the form of a Post Construction Certificate (prepared

- by a Code for Sustainable Homes qualified Assessor) to demonstrate full compliance with part (a) for that specific unit.
- 9) No development shall commence until drawings and sections showing a scheme for the provision of on-site conduits and/or piping for future connection to a district energy network have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 10) No development shall commence on site until a scheme for surface water management, including specifications of the surface treatments and sustainable urban drainage solutions, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme and thereafter the approved scheme is to be retained in accordance with the details approved therein.
- 11) No development shall commence on site until plans and sectional details at a scale of 1:10 or 1:20 showing the proposed shop fronts have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Such information should demonstrate the location of fascia signs, any shutters/grill boxes, the window systems and the entrances. The development shall be constructed in full accordance with the approved details.
- 12) (a) The building shall be designed so as to provide sound insulation against external noise and vibration, to achieve levels not exceeding 30dB LAeq (night) and 45dB L_{Amax} (measured with F time weighting) for bedrooms, 35dB LAeq (day) for other habitable rooms, with windows shut and other means of ventilation provided. External amenity areas shall be designed to achieve levels not exceeding 55 dB LAeq (day) and the evaluation of human exposure to vibration within the building shall not exceed the Vibration dose values criteria low probability of adverse comment' as defined BS6472.
- (b) Development shall not commence until details of a sound insulation scheme complying with paragraph (a) of this condition have been submitted to an approved in writing by the local planning authority.
- The development shall not be occupied until the sound insulation scheme approved pursuant to paragraph (b) has been implemented in its entirety. Thereafter, the sound insulation scheme shall be maintained in perpetuity in accordance with the approved details.
- 13) (a) No development shall commence until full written details, including relevant drawings and specifications of the proposed works of sound insulation against airborne noise to meet D'nT,w + C_{tr} dB of not less than 55 for walls and/or ceilings where residential parties non domestic use have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.
- (b) The development shall only be occupied once the soundproofing works as agreed under part (a) have been implemented in accordance with the approved details. The soundproofing shall be retained permanently in accordance with the approved details.
- 14) Details for the on-site storage, disposal and collection of refuse and recycling facilities shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the

local planning authority prior to commencement of each phase of development hereby approved.

- 15) No development shall commence until full details of the proposed photovoltaic (PV) array at roof level have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local authority and these details shall demonstrate how the array shall contribute to the required 25% carbon saving required and proposed within the submitted Sustainability and Energy Strategy. Details shall also include additional SAP and SBEM modelling and EPC production for the residential units as referred to in the submitted Sustainability and Energy Strategy. The PV array shall be installed as approved and retained thereafter.
- 16) The ground floor commercial space shall only be used for purposes within Use Classes A1/A2/B1 and for no other purpose (including any other purpose in the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) and this unit shall not be open to the public other than between the hours of 0700 and 2300 hrs on weekdays and Saturdays and 0900 and 2200 hrs on Sundays and bank holidays.
- 17) Notwithstanding the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order), no plumbing or pipes, other than rainwater pipes, shall be fixed on the external faces/front elevation of the building.
- 18) All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the landscaping scheme hereby approved shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of the buildings, or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner. Any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.
- 19) Development shall not be occupied until a site wide strategy for ecological enhancement and mitigation has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Details within the strategy shall include a habitat management plan and details of the number and location of the bird/bat boxes and monitoring arrangements.
- 20) Servicing or deliveries to or from the ground floor commercial unit(s) hereby approved shall occur from the existing service bay on New Cross Road and shall not take place from Watson's Street at any time.

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Miss Saira Kabir Sheikh of Counsel

She called Mr Phillip Ashford
 Mr Peter Munnelly

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr Stephen Morgan of Counsel

He called Mr Anthony Walker
 Mr Simon Chadwick

DOCUMENTS

- 1 Appearances on behalf of the appellant.
- 2 Opening statement on behalf of the appellant.
- 3 Opening statement on behalf of the Council.
- 4 Extract from the Deptford Urban Design and development framework.
- 5 Copy of Bedford Borough Council v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and Nuon UK Ltd.
- 6 Letter to residents dated 7 October 2013 giving notice of the appeal.
- 7 Copy of advert for the Inquiry placed in local newspaper and dated 22 January 2014.
- 8 Further notification letter dated 20 January sent to objectors/other interested parties.
- 9 Signed and dated copy of Unilateral Undertaking.
- 10 Document setting out justification for the various required contributions.
- 11 Technical note outlining the cost of public realm works.
- 12 Closing submissions on behalf of the Council.
- 13 Closing submissions on behalf of the appellant.

PLANS

- A Copies of plans D11 and D110 with attached computer generated images.
- B Deptford High Street Conservation Area.
- C Drawings 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 201 relating to development at Deptford Reach.

If you require an alternative accessible version of this document (for instance in audio, Braille or large print) please contact our Customer

Services Department:

Telephone: 0870 333 1181

Fax: 01793 414926

Textphone: 0800 015 0516

E-mail: customers@english-heritage.org.uk