

The Brixton Society

Understanding the Past, Looking to the Future

Reg'd. Charity No.1058103, Registered with the London Forum of Amenity Societies

Website: www.brixtonsociety.org.uk

Lambeth Planning,
(Development Management)
PO Box 734,
Winchester,
SO23 5DG

Please reply to:
Alan Piper, RIBA,



APiperBrix@aol.com

18 August 2019

For attention of:
Jeni Cowan,
JCowan1@lambeth.gov.uk

Your ref:
19/02326/FUL &
19/02327/LB

Brockwell Park: Garden Temple, SE24 9BN – Proposed Changes:

Dear Miss Cowan,

Thank you for your recent letter about the above applications. This is a prominent site within Brockwell Park, and the Society's main concerns are as follows:

Change of Use:

We have no objection to the proposed change of use, but I am surprised that you did not even mention this in your consultation letter. We realise that finding an active and compatible use is often key to the survival of historic buildings like this.

Location:

I do not understand why a spurious postcode has been used. If the location was in or accessible from Dulwich Road, the postcode would be SE24 0PA. In the more likely case that access was from Brockwell Park Gardens, as for the nearby Brockwell Hall, then the postcode would be SE24 9BN.

Exterior Details:

The main architectural interest of this building lies in its external features and its setting within the park landscape. A classical temple feature of this kind is characteristic of park landscapes of the 18th and early 19th centuries. However the applicants have failed to provide any illustration of their proposed movable shutters (or "removal shuttes" as they describe them) which would have a major impact on the external appearance.

In the absence of any such visual information, we must **object**, in order to uphold Lambeth Local Plan policies Q7(iv), Q8, Q11(a), Q20 and Q21.

Alternative Layouts:

Internally, the building has been much altered in the course of the past 200 years, and the detailed interior treatment is less critical. Nevertheless, the applicants are being far too casual in putting forward 3 alternative layouts without indicating which they would select, or what their selection criteria would be.

In the case of Option 1 in particular, no section or ceiling plan is provided to indicate if there will be a downstand lintel, or if any such support will be concealed above ceiling level. Our preference would be for the former, both to avoid interfering with the roof construction, and to indicate the original partition line. Again, in the absence of clarity from the applicants, we must **object** on the previous grounds.

I hope that the applicants can be encouraged to put forward proposals that are detailed enough – and free of typos – to make a convincing application for Listed Building Consent.

Yours sincerely,



Hon. Secretary