

Item No.	Classification	Decision Level	Date
6.1	OPEN	Planning Committee	31 July 07
<b>From</b> DEVELOPMENT & BUILDING CONTROL MANAGER		<b>Title of Report</b> DEVELOPMENT CONTROL	
<b>Proposal</b> (07-AP-0650)  Erection of a building up to 9 storeys (29.5m) in height comprising 164 residential flats and 1,152m <sup>2</sup> of either B1 (offices) or D1 (non-residential institutions) floorspace, basement car parking, and associated works including hard and soft landscaping.		<b>Address</b>  LAND AT AMELIA STREET & ROBERT DASHWOOD WAY, LONDON, SE17 3PY  <b>Ward</b> Newington	

## PURPOSE

- 1 To consider the above application, which is for Planning Committee consideration due to its scale, and due to the number of objections received.

## RECOMMENDATION

- 2 Grant planning permission subject to conditions and an agreement with the applicant under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

## BACKGROUND

### Site Location and Description

- 3 This brownfield site is located on the northern side of Amelia Street, to the east of its intersection with the private road known as Robert Dashwood Way. The site is broadly rectangular in shape and around 0.4 hectares in area. It is currently vacant but was previously occupied by a print works, and prior to that operated as a British Rail coal depot.
- 4 The surrounding area is a mix of commercial, industrial and residential properties. Walworth Road is approximately 60m to the east of the site.
- 5 To the west of the site is Robert Dashwood Way, a private road which runs adjacent to the raised railway line. There are a number of businesses operating from the arches beneath the railway line. Further to the west of the site (i.e. the opposite side of the railway line) is a development under construction (known as South Central West). It is to provide a predominantly residential development in three new buildings rising from 2 storeys on Crampton Street to 9 storeys (up to 29.46m) alongside the railway line. Further beyond this site is the Pullens Estate Conservation Area.
- 6 To the north of the site is a residential development known as South Central East which is a mixed use development which varies in height between 6 storeys (21m) at its southern end to 10 storeys (33.2m) at its highest point. To the immediate east adjoining the rear of the site are a range of properties which front Walworth Road including the Grade II Listed John Smith House (up to 14.4m), a Metropolitan Police Laboratory facility and The Tankard public house. Adjoining the site east along

Amelia Street is a small hotel and public house.

- 7 To the south of the site on the southern side of Amelia Street is a police station. The police station building is set back from the Amelia Street frontage with a car parking area in the front.

### **Details of Proposal**

- 8 Full planning permission is sought for the erection of a building of up to 9 storeys (29.5m) in height, which steps down to seven storeys at both the northern and southern ends. The building will comprise 164 residential flats and 1,152m<sup>2</sup> of either B1 (offices) or D1 (non-residential institutions) floorspace. Car parking, storage, and plant would be provided in a single storey basement with a landscaped courtyard providing amenity space for residents to the east of the block. The residential component of the scheme will comprise 68 one bed, 76 two bed and 20 three bed units. In terms of affordable housing provision, the scheme provides 43 (108 habitable rooms or 24%) intermediate units, 24 social rented units (78 habitable rooms or 18%) and 97 private sale units (258 habitable rooms or 58%).
- 9 The proposal forms part of the London Wide Initiative (LWI), which is a collaboration between English Partnerships, the Department of Communities and Local Government, the Greater London Authority and the Housing Corporation, along with First Base, a development and management partner (formed out of Lend Lease and Stanhope). English Partnerships purchased 17 sites across London, including the Amelia Street site, with the aim of delivering mixed tenure housing, primarily affordable housing for key workers and first time buyers.

### **Planning History**

- 10 The proposals site comprises the southern portion of what was previously the print works site. There have been two planning applications since the site was vacated, 02-AP-1724, for the erection of a 6 storey self-storage facility, refused planning permission due to the impact on the adjacent listed building and unacceptable parking arrangements, and 02-AP-2211, for the erection of a 7 storey self storage facility plus a 13 storey building for residential and office use, which was withdrawn in January 2004.

## **FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION**

### **Main Issues**

- 11 The main issues in this case are:
- Principle of the Proposed Use;
  - Housing Density, Tenure and Mix;
  - Design and Layout;
  - Amenity Space Provision;
  - Traffic Issues;
  - Impact on the Amenities of Neighbouring Residents and Occupiers;
  - Impact on Character and Setting of a Listed Building or Conservation Area;
  - Flood Risk Assessment;
  - Planning Obligations.

### **Planning Policy**

- 12 At its meeting on June 27 2007 the Council resolved to formally adopt the Southwark Plan. Although the 1995 Unitary Development Plan will remain as the statutory development plan until the Southwark Plan is formally adopted, the Council should

give significant weight to the policies in the Southwark Plan in determining applications.

13 Emerging Southwark Unitary Development Plan 2007

The site is within the Central Activities Zone, and is within a Public Transport Accessibility Zone, a Transport Development Zone, and is within the Elephant and Castle Core Area and Opportunity Area as defined within the Elephant and Castle Development Framework SPG. The relevant policies of the Southwark Plan include:

- 2.2 Provision of new Community Facilities
- 2.5 Planning Obligations
- 3.1 Environmental Effects
- 3.2 Protection of Amenity
- 3.3 Sustainability Appraisal
- 3.4 Energy Efficiency
- 3.5 Renewable Energy
- 3.7 Waste Reduction
- 3.11 Efficient Use of Land
- 3.12 Quality in Design
- 3.13 Urban Design
- 3.14 Designing Out Crime
- 3.18 Setting of Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites
- 3.19 Archaeology
- 4.1 Density of Residential Development
- 4.2 Quality of Residential Development
- 4.3 Mix of Dwellings
- 4.4 Affordable Housing
- 4.5 Wheelchair Affordable Housing
- 4.6 Loss of Residential Floorspace
- 5.1 Locating Developments
- 5.2 Transport Impacts
- 5.3 Walking and Cycling
- 5.6 Car Parking
- 5.7 Parking Standards for disabled people and the mobility impaired

14 Southwark Unitary Development Plan 1995 [UDP]

The relevant policies of the UDP include:

- R2.2 Planning Agreements
- B.2.3 Class B1 Business Proposals
- B.3.1 Access for people with Disabilities
- E.1.1 Safety and Security
- E.2.1 Layout and Building Line
- E2.2 Heights of Buildings
- E.2.3 Aesthetic Control
- E.2.4 Access for Facilities for People with Disabilities
- E.2.5 External Space
- E.3.1 Protection of Amenity
- E.5.1 Sites of Archaeological Importance
- H.1.3 New Housing
- H.1.4 Affordable Housing
- H.1.5 Mix of New Housing
- H.1.7 Density of New Residential Development
- H.1.8 Standards for New Housing
- H.1.10 Provision of Housing to Mobility and Wheelchair Standards
- T.1.2 Location of Development in Relation to the Transport Network
- T.1.3 Design of Development and Conformity with Council Standards and Controls
- T.2.1 Measures for Pedestrians
- T.4.1 Measures for Cyclists

### T.6.3 Parking Space in New Developments

15 London Plan 2004

The relevant policies of the London Plan include:

- 2A.2 Opportunity Areas
- 2A.4 Areas for Regeneration
- 3A.1 Increasing the overall supply of housing
- 3A.2 Borough housing targets
- 3A.4 Housing choice
- 3A.7 Affordable housing targets
- 3A.8 Negotiating affordable housing
- 3C.22 Parking Strategy
- 4A.7 Energy Efficiency and renewable energy
- 4A.8 Energy Assessment
- 4A.9 Providing for renewable energy
- 4B.1 Design principles for a compact city
- 4B.4 Enhancing the quality of the public realm
- 4B.6 Sustainable design and construction
- 4B.11 Heritage Conservation
- 5B.1 The strategic priorities for Central London
- 5B.2 Development in the Central Activities Zone
- 5B.4 Opportunity Areas in Central London
- 6A.5 Planning Obligations

16 Planning Policy Guidance [PPG] and Planning Policy Statements [PPS]

The relevant Planning Policy Guidance and Statements include:

- Planning Policy Statement 1: Planning for Sustainable Communities
- Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing
- Planning Policy Guidance 13: Transport
- Planning Policy Statement 22: Renewable Energy
- Planning Policy Statement 25: Development and Flood Risk
- Mayor's Sustainable Design and Construction SPG May 2006
- Circular 6/98 Affordable Housing 1998
- Circular 05/2005 Planning Obligations 2005

### **Consultations**

17 Site Notice: 27/03/2007

Press Notice: 29/03/2007

18 Internal Consultees

Access Officer, Design and Conservation Officer, Noise and Air Quality Team, Traffic Group, Waste Management and Transport, Archaeology Officer, Elephant and Castle Special Projects Team

19 Statutory and Non-statutory Consultees

Environment Agency, Thames Water, Metropolitan Police, Government Office for London

20 Neighbour consultees

Over 1000 consultation letters were sent in relation to the application, including the following properties:

2-16, 29/ 31/ 178-181 Amelia Street

Iliffe Yard, 1-96 Iliffe St

Peacock Yard, 1-48 Peacock St

Railway Arches/ 7 Robert Dashwood Way

114/ 116-118/ 120-149/ 151/ 153-155/ 157-163/ 169/ 171-173/ 175-179 /181-189/

190-200/ evens 202-218/ 220-222 Walworth Rd

Eagle Yard Arch 147 Walworth Road  
John Smith House 144-152 Walworth Road  
1, 2, odds 3-11/ 12-28/ 17-21/ 25/ 30/ 33/ 182-185 Manor Place  
Newington Estate/ evens 64-74 Canterbury Place  
502-507, 700-708 Julian Markham House 114 Walworth Rd  
Walworth One Stop Shop Wansey St  
1-3, 9 and 11 Steedman St  
Evens 44-188 / odds 81-85/ 111-123/ 186 Crampton St  
10/14/15 19-24 Newington Industrial Estate Crampton St  
Tenants Hall Crampton St  
Walworth Clinic Larcom St  
Cleansing Depot / 1 Occupation Rd  
Cuming Museum and Newington Library Walworth Rd  
1C/ 1B/ 2A/ 3 Browning St  
10-12 Colworth Grove  
1/ 3/ 5 Ethel St  
2-12/ 2A/ 2B/ 4A/4B /6A/ 8A/8B/ 9/10A/10B/ 12A/12B/ 14 Larcom St  
Evens 38-78, odds 29-77 Marlborough Close  
Odds 1-9, 18 evens 52-230 Amelia St  
Lynford French House Thrush St/ Penton Place  
Evens 40-50, 58-72 Penton Place  
25-56 Pullens Buildings Penton Place  
1-15 Thrush St  
George Elliot House, Thrush St

## **Consultation Replies**

### Internal Consultees

- 21 Access Officer: A detailed and comprehensive Access Statement has been provided. The proposals are to the highest standards of access provisions and meet the Councils requirements in all respects.
- 22 Noise and Air Quality Team:
- Noise- Conditions are recommended for internal ambient noise levels and vibration within residential units, in order to ensure that the design recommendations to mitigate Railway Noise Cat C addressed in the consultants Acoustic & Vibration report are implemented. The report also refers to the need for ventilation other than by openable windows – this conflicts with independent Air Quality Assessment Report and therefore needs to be conditioned.
  - Contaminated Land- The site investigation report and results of intrusive sampling show a degree of contaminants to be present at the site. No remediation is proposed as the hard standing and the building itself will block any pathway for the contaminants to reach occupant / receptors and areas of soft landscaping proposed are unlikely to provide a pathway for the migration of contaminants. A condition is recommended to manage this element.
  - Air Quality- the Air Quality Assessment concludes that the development is likely to have a negligible impact upon local air quality arising from vehicle movement emissions and the proposed centralised heating system. There are other sustainable energy features, which will also be beneficial in air quality terms. It is recommended that the applicant submit details of the calculations of discharge flue height prior to the commencement of works on this part of the development. The report refers to natural ventilation of residential units which will not satisfy noise mitigation measures to support a Cat C approval. Therefore a scheme for ventilating habitable rooms and the basement car park and protecting future occupiers of the development from the poor air quality in the locality and showing intake location and filtration processes should be submitted, to be dealt with by

conditions.

- 23 Traffic Group: Vehicle, Pedestrian and Disabled Access and sightlines/visibility splays are acceptable. The proposed parking provision for cars (including disabled provision), cycles and motorcycles is acceptable. All occupiers will be exempt from applying for parking permits within the CPZ. Refuse Storage and Access- Late changes to the layout meant changes in refuse access were made with provision for a loading bay on the public highway agreed at a cost to the developer. The application does not include a Travel Plan (a UDP requirement) to show how sustainable travel is going to be promoted as an alternative to private vehicles and as such the application is incomplete. In principal however this group has no objections to the proposal but a travel plan needs to be submitted.
- 24 Waste Management and Transport: Residential Waste: There is adequate overall storage capacity, with each basement store serving one third on the residential units, or 10 x 1100 eurobins (6 x residual waste, 2 x paper/card, 1 x glass, and 1 x cans/plastics). The proposal in 6.16 that the waste contractor be responsible for bringing the bins up to the ground floor is unacceptable and should be a facilities management function. The waste buffer area should will be able to accommodate 18 x 1100 eurobin (the total amount of bins designated for residual waste) and the distance from this area to the actual point of delivery to the refuse vehicle will not exceed 10m. B1/D1 Waste: It is almost impossible to estimate the amount /type of waste to be generated as we don't know what activities will take place (until units are tenanted). If the activities include a clinic/health centre there is likely to be a need for separate storage / collection of clinical waste. Irrespective, as the collection of non-residential waste is a paid for service, there should be separate and secure storage for each commercial unit. This would not necessarily be an issue if all commercial waste was collected as part of one agreement entered into by a facilities management company- a condition can be included to address this. The Council would prefer not to carry out daily collections; however, as the service is paid for, the unit occupiers can have their waste collected by private companies.
- 25 Archaeology: The site in question stands adjacent to the Walworth Village Archaeological Priority Zone and near to the Kennington Road and Elephant and Castle Archaeological Priority Zone. This is an area where little archaeological work has been undertaken, however the proximity of the development site to these two priority areas does indicate that there is a potential for archaeology to be present relating to the development and growth of Walworth Village. Towards these ends it is recommended that any site investigation works to be undertaken on site are monitored by a suitably qualified and experienced archaeologist or archaeological organisation and that an archaeological evaluation is undertaken of the site and following the results of this further mitigation works may be required. These recommendations are both reasonable and necessary to provide properly for the likely archaeological implications in line with emerging Southwark Unitary Development Plan policies 3.15 and 3.19 and the recommendations of PPG16. Two appropriately worded conditions would be sufficient to secure the level of investigation and mitigation of impact that the proposal warrants.
- 26 Elephant and Castle Special Projects Team: Generally very supportive of the proposal which would be consistent with the quality and mix of the new development which has taken place on the west side of Walworth Road [Steedman Street and Crampton Street]. The scheme incorporates employment space on the ground floor and residential on the upper floors and this is consistent with the SPG approach which identified the area on either side of Robert Dashwood Way as a mixed residential/ employment area. The social housing element of the scheme will be made available in the first instance to Heygate residents and this will provide these residents with additional housing choices which will contribute to wider regeneration objectives and

help bring forward the redevelopment of the core area.

- 27 The only reservation is that access to the courtyard area is to be restricted to occupiers of the development. The site adjoins the Met Police Lab on the corner of Amelia St/ Walworth which is a site that will come into development in the near future. There is therefore the potential over time to establish an additional public route through to Walworth Road improving the areas connectivity and permeability. Over time, the courtyard has the potential to become more of a public space with its own particular characteristics and ambience. It would be unfortunate if this possibility was frustrated in the early phases of the overall redevelopment by the creation of a private area which would inhibit this option from occurring in the future as the area changes. It is recognised that there is a need to consider security in the short term. Finally, while it is recognised that the immediate impacts of the scheme may need to be mitigated through a s106 agreement, this needs to be balanced against the requirement for the development to contribute to the wider objectives of creating new public space and an improved public realm on Walworth Road by the Elephant and Castle SPG.

#### Statutory and Non-statutory Consultees

- 28 Environment Agency: The Environment Agency has no objections to the proposed development as submitted and supports the sustainability measures incorporated within the development, in particular the brown roof, methods of sustainable drainage and greywater recycling. The submitted flood risk assessment (FRA) by URS dated March 2007 is acceptable. It demonstrates that the site does not lie in an area at residual risk of flooding from a breach in the Thames tidal defences. A number of conditions are recommended.
- 29 Thames Water: No objections raised and informatives recommended.
- 30 Metropolitan Police: No issues.
- 31 Government Office for London: No response received.

#### Neighbour Consultees

- 32 59 representations were received. Some 40 of the objections were received in the form of a standard letter which was prepared on behalf of the Pullens Estate by the Pullens Tenants and Residents Association and distributed amongst local residents, who then individually signed and submitted the letter. A summary of the main points of objection contained within this letter are:
- No in principle objection to housing development taking place on the site
  - Concerned about design quality and loss of local amenity, increase in traffic, need for parking, and local pressure on health and childcare services
  - Scale and rate of local development faster than other regeneration projects and concern that this will mean the proper standard of design quality and provision of services will not be met
  - Lack of design quality- design not sympathetic or responsive to historical context, particularly Pullens Estate, Tankard Pub, and railway line, which are predominantly London Stock brick- not metal cladding as proposed- which is relentless in its use and set back windows give no sense of where flats begin and end, no sense of occupation and no human scale on the façade. Stairwells have no openings. Site will remain cut off from public access and will be a gated enclosure- thus not repairing the urban fabric. Forces maximum number of units on site irrespective of quality. Single aspect lower value housing faces railway, landscaped courtyard created for private housing- scheme is out of scale and inappropriate in this tight urban context. Half basement means noise and smell

will spill out corner refuse point will cause problems to low cost housing, bin lorries will restrict traffic flows.

- Raised Floor Level- Building raised a half level- concrete plinth open to graffiti and need for access ramps alienating it from the street.
  - Not an exemplary design in terms of provision and delivery of mixed use. Were advised that affordable housing would be spread across the development but this is not the case and applicants concerns over letting of B1/D1 space could mean boarded up vacant units. These units should not be granted change of use to make more residential or live work units- rather s106 could go towards ensuring these ground floor units are accommodated by local amenities- doctors/ dentists
  - Inappropriate material selection- concerns about choice and colour of materials, not contextually or sustainably informed and light/ even coloured metal panels show staining/ dirt/ pollution.
- 33
- Not Secure by Design- Raised building is divorced from context at pavement level. External northern boundary creates an unsafe back alley for pedestrians. Gates on southern boundary create blank, unwelcoming elevation.
  - Not exemplary in terms of legislation or standards- flats not accessible, 10% renewable but London Plan stipulates 20%, 46% affordable, but all located in the unattractive parts of the site, aspires to BREEAM very good, but commitment to sustainability are token gestures- flats single aspect, no cross ventilation, recessed balconies restrict natural light. Dispute creation of green lung and biodiversity- just a geometrically derived plan.
  - Loss of Local Amenity in terms of traffic and parking- concerns over increase in noise/ activity of new traffic, where is the alternative parking for the police cars currently using the site, little or no provision for guest parking- Robert Dashwood Way may become congested.
  - Loss of potential public space linking to Walworth Road- Public pedestrian route welcomed, but proposed pathway is bounded by high buildings, not overlooked, insecure. Courtyard could be a high quality public space and route for all users.
  - Loss of local amenity in terms of added capacity to services- 164 flats means pressure on existing utilities/ local services which are already stretched, compounded by other recent developments, particularly healthcare. Additional provision should be arranged via s106.
  - Proximity to Pullens Estate Conservation Area- development conflicts with guidance for developments near conservation area in terms of materials, massing and rhythm.
  - Community Consultation Process- exhibition closed prior to the advertised time. Letter relating to s106 sent to applicants has not been considered.
  - Continual Construction Disturbance- due to extent and length of disturbance, no more weekend work should be allowed; proposal will add to existing noise and disturbance, increased road traffic, safety on Amelia Street, many problems from Crampton Street construction. Should be strict hours of working, noise levels, and access to site.
- 34
- Councillor Caroline Pidgeon, Councillor for Newington Ward and Executive Member for Children's Services and Education also provided the following submission in relation to the proposed development-
- Aware of letter provided by Pullens TRA, and not opposed to a housing development on the site;
  - Materials an issue- a condition should be included to ensure materials are suitable and in keeping with the area;
  - Location of refuse and impact on local area to be considered;
  - Location of affordable housing element- which may be in least desirable part of site;
  - Consider issue of accessible flats and renewable energy;



- Car parking is in line with UDP, but a condition should be included to restrict residents and visitors from obtaining parking permit in CPZ;
- Conditions on hours of working for the development and protection of trees to be included;
- Need to understand the developer's plans for B1/D1 units, to show they will be let and not turned into flats through retrospective planning permission.

35 Further independent objections were also received as follows:

- 3a Iliffe Yard- look at population density as 2 large schemes have added some 260 flats in ¼ mile. Note the size of this development.
- Address not supplied- the streets around Walworth Rd, Crompton St, Amelia St Robert Dashwood Way are all overcrowded and dull, little light available, parking problems. Developments built recently cut down the light and will cause more noise, pollution, parking problems.
- 12 Robert Dashwood Way- strongly disapproves due to continued development of all space into residential to the exclusion of commercial and business- need a balance to provide local employment. Local infrastructure lacks amenities such as shops, increase in travel to get to shops and local infrastructure and essential services cannot sustain large increase in use, no provision in the plans for open spaces leading to children playing on streets. Sunlight will be lost from Arches along Robert Dashwood Way/ may be ancient rights to light. The development will create tensions between residents and businesses- noise, intrusion, loss of privacy. Robert Dashwood Way is a private road and gets freely used by visitors/ contractors, causing problems for businesses due to parking and extra vehicles causing delays.
- 164 Crompton Street- several large developments in progress and impact should be assessed being allowing more development. Changing character of area, pressure on local transport and healthcare facilities. Crompton St has had 18 months of noisy building work- need a break from constant building and disruption.
- 60 Amelia Street- constant disturbance outside agreed working times on Crompton Street, Heygate being squeezed into smaller space- no longer for families and Council owned will start over 200K, developers should increase the dwindling community space in the Walworth Area

- 36
- 136 Amelia Street- rise in population density, Crompton St and South Central developments- parking impossible, Amelia St overcrowded, new flats will choke the area, and traffic will increase beyond already unacceptable level.
  - Resident of Pullens Buildings- refers to Walworth Areas Priorities in s106 draft Planning Obligations document. Conflicts with Priority 1 for increase in quality and quantity of open space- proposed space is private and could be public space linking to Walworth Road rather than canyon like back alley proposed. Ground floor B1 use is a suitable backdrop for public square and B1 may be easier to let. Pressure on parking space will increase unless police car park is relocated. Impact of more pedestrians, delivery vehicles, taxis will compound existing problems. S106 funds are sought to mitigate extreme and unique pressures in line with Conservation Status Guidance and Pullens Conservation Area Appraisal- in the form of a new public realm project. Amelia Street is a main route for local residents. Increase in traffic and congestion, high gates impede visibility, fumes and noise from half basement, how will users safely cross the junction of the development and Amelia Street safely? Need assessment and strategy of long term impact on businesses in Robert Dashwood Way. Loss of local employment anticipated. Some of the proposed B1 units should be for community facilities- doctors, dentists, crèche. Development will increase pressure on education, health community and cultural facilities. Concern over s106 process- should involve community with money for local projects.
  - 32 Peacock Street- object as no plans to support all the new people moving here

with new doctors dentists- existing are all full- also worry about on street parking, already oversubscribed.

- 37
- 8 Berryfield Road- object to creation of gated community, not clear in consultation- deliberately misled by developer on this as not evident in material provided. The gated community will not benefit the local community, rather the people in the proposed development would only increase demand on local services and increased parking pressure. Gated community will feel threatening to pedestrians outside the gates, no reference to a gate to the landscaped courtyard- posters advised of improving the local environment. The space would be a pleasant open space for local residents if not gated- local residents are excluded from the green space. Shortage of green space and parks in the area. Business units not retail shops but private gated offices- won't revitalise local area. Advised by First Base that gates needed in order to sell the units- but if the development is for key workers surely they aren't demanding gated homes. The development will not benefit the local community- feel consultation was misleading.
  - Address not supplied- no address supplied- objects due to lack of quality design, inadequate community consultation- premature, unadvertised closure of public exhibition, unwillingness to accommodate constructive suggestions, loss of pressure on local amenities.
  - 31 Pullens Buildings- poor design and materials, proximity to Conservation Area, lacks good pedestrian areas/ walkways, not mixed, needs to be scaled down.
  - 9 Steedman Street- building too high, number of dwellings too high.
  - 108 Amelia Street- health services- waiting lists for doctors surgeries in the area are all closed, this is prior to the 197 Oakmayne flats and the 164 First Base flats, representing 361-800 new residents, not including 100+ flats in South Central East. Local dentists likely to be under same pressure. Overall intense pressure on health services. Parking- new residents will not purchase parking spaces, but will choose to park on the street, as well as visitor parking. Police have not made provision for additional parking needed (50-60 cars park on the site), solution to parking needed, Design- not in keeping with Pullens historic neighbourhood, not architecturally interesting, question the regeneration solution of putting up 3-4 large blocks of flats in 1 city block, the regeneration is supposed to be mixed use /mixed types of housing sizes, not replicating Heygate and Aylesbury, s106 monies should go directly into the area for necessary projects.
  - Eurotraveller Hotel- object as 9 storey building adds great degree of uniformity and adds to overall bulk and mass. Sense of openness will be lost on the site and would have an excessively dominating effect on 18 Amelia Street. Balconies will overlook our site. Ramp would cause noise impact to bedrooms in hotel.
  - Anonymous objection- detrimental impact on quality of Pullens neighbourhood, loss of daylight, pressure on parking, and substantial investment in local public realm should be considered as compensation.
  - 86 Penton Place- consultation event closed an hour earlier than advertised by developer, there are fundamental conflicts between the scheme and the UDP and Elephant and Castle Enterprise Quarter SPD- who has decided to relax policy guidance?; the developers are intentionally misleading local residents in particular about the public and private amenity spaces- Southwark planning should not have allowed this; asks that the project be put on hold and consultation process begins again without misleading information.
- 38 Letter of support were also received as follows:
- 146 Amelia Street- Good for regeneration of the area; would like more services for residents in the area such as restaurants, bars, shops, gym.
  - 48 Marlborough Close- supports application- 'we all need to live somewhere'.

## Principle of Development

- 39 The application site is located within the Central Activities Zone, London South Central, the Elephant and Castle Opportunity Area and Transport Development Area and it is located within the boundary of Proposals Site 39P in the emerging Southwark Unitary Development Plan. The London Plan and Council strategy is for a high density, high quality, mixed use town centre at the Elephant and Castle that will address demonstrable local, sub- regional and London wide needs for new homes, an enhanced public transport interchange, employment and retail floor space and other social benefits.
- 40 The London Plan establishes the need for regional growth in new homes and employment. The overall spatial strategy for development in London identifies further development in the Central Activities Zone (Policy 5B.2), London South Central (encompassing Southwark) and associated Opportunity Areas (Policy 2A.2) as a means by which this new requirement for homes and employment can be accommodated. The Key Diagram and Proposals Map in the emerging Southwark Unitary Development Plan identifies the Elephant and Castle as an Opportunity Area within the Central Activities Zone and as an area of mixed use with a strong retail character.
- 41 The London Plan sets general policy directions to be followed in the Elephant and Castle Opportunity Area and states that *'the planning framework for the area around the Elephant and Castle should draw on its good public transport accessibility, closeness to the Central Activities Zone and relatively affordable land. This could be a suitable location to meet some of London's longer-term needs for extra office space and is generally suitable for tall buildings. Large – scale car based retail development should not be encouraged. The framework should seek a significant increase in housing and integrated with a more efficient transport interchange'*.
- 42 Section 8.2 and policy 6.1 of the emerging Southwark Unitary Development Plan provides a Borough context and objectives for the Elephant and Castle Opportunity Area. A development framework for the Elephant and Castle was adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance in February 2004 following extensive consultation, and contains a detailed set of plans and proposals for the area providing further guidance to the London Plan and adopted and emerging Southwark Unitary Development Plans. The vision for the Elephant and Castle is set out as *'a vibrant, thriving and successful mixed use metropolitan town centre, accessible from a highly integrated public transport system establishing a place where people will want to live, to work and to visit for shopping and leisure.'*
- 43 A comprehensive approach is needed to achieve the identified housing, employment, open space and retail floorspace objectives. To accommodate the range of uses the core site (39P on the emerging Southwark Unitary Development Plan proposals map) has been allocated as a redevelopment area with the capacity to accommodate not fewer than 4,200 new homes, up to 75,000sqm of retail, leisure and complimentary town centre uses, a minimum of 50, 000sqm of B1 space, and a range of D use class facilities. As transport is the key to unlocking the Elephant and Castle's regeneration potential, the Elephant and Castle Opportunity Area has been designated as a Transport Development Area in the emerging Southwark Unitary Development Plan policy 5.5.
- 44 The application proposes 1,152m<sup>2</sup> of either B1 (offices) or D1 (non-residential institutions) floorspace. A number of objectors raised concerns in relation to the ability to let the proposed B1 business space and the option of securing the space for community use via condition or section 106. The current application, which allows for a D1 use (including, for example, clinics, health centres, day nurseries and crèches) is

considered to address the concerns about the future viability of the proposed business units, and will allow for certain community uses on the site. It is not considered necessary to secure such uses through condition or section 106. Further, should the spaces remain vacant, a future change in use to residential is unlikely to be supported by the Council, and the establishment of mixed business uses along Robert Dashwood Way is an objective of the Elephant and Castle SPG.

- 45 The proposals are consistent with the requirements of the London Plan and the emerging Southwark Plans as set out above. It will provide 164 new homes in a high density, quality mixed-use scheme making a significant contribution to the provision of housing, whilst maintaining business and employment opportunities on the site, and will make an important contribution to the regeneration of the Elephant and Castle Opportunity Area in accordance with the policy objectives.

### **Housing Density, Tenure and Mix**

- 46 PPS1, PPG3 and draft PPS3 all emphasise the benefits of creating mixed communities. PPG3 indicates that in order to achieve this, LPAs should provide 'wider housing opportunity and choice and a better mix in the size, type and location of housing'. London Plan policy 3A.7 (Affordable Housing Targets) states that boroughs should take account of the London wide objective of 70% social housing and 30% intermediate provision, and the promotion of mixed and balanced communities. Policy 4.4 of the emerging Southwark Unitary Development Plan outlines the requirements for affordable housing provision, requiring the provision of 40% affordable housing on a 70:30 split between social rented and intermediate housing in this location.
- 47 The site is located within the 'Central Activities Zone' under the emerging Southwark Unitary Development Plan which attracts a density range of 650-1100 habitable rooms per hectare.
- 48 The proposal consists of 20 x 3-bed flats (12%), 76 x 2-bed flats (46%) and 68 x 1-bed flats (41%) in accordance with the requirements of Policy 4.3 of the emerging Southwark Unitary Development Plan. The density calculation requires that a percentage of the non-residential area be included in the calculation which in this instance is 1152sqm ( $1152\text{sqm}/27.5=41.9$ ). The number of habitable rooms within the scheme is 444 which, with a site area of 0.4ha results in a density calculation of 1215 habitable rooms per hectare. On this basis it is clear that the scheme presents a relatively high density proposal which is marginally above the 1100 habitable room guidance figure. Policy 3.11 of the emerging Southwark UDP seeks to maximise the efficient use of land where a positive impact on local character and good design are achieved. The overall height is 9 storeys (29.5m) combined with a high quality design and there are no identified adverse impacts resulting from the higher density level.
- 49 In respect to the provision of residential units, the flat sizes range in size from 45sqm for one bedroom units, 63 to 66sqm for 2 bed units and 83-88sqm for three bedroom units. These bedroom sizes are in compliance with policy requirements. Further, all units incorporate design features to meet Lifetime Homes standards and in accordance with Policy 4.3 of the emerging Southwark Unitary Development Plan. 10% of the units will be wheelchair accessible, spread across all unit sizes and tenures.
- 50 The proposal provides a total of 97 private units, 43 shared ownership London Wide Initiative units (25 x 1 bed, 14 x 2 bed, 4 x 3 bed) and 24 social rented units (18 x 2 bed, 6 x 3 bed) resulting in an overall provision of 42% of the total habitable rooms being affordable, which exceeds the requirements of the emerging Unitary Development Plan policy 4.4 which requires a 35% provision on the site. Further,

policy 4.4 seeks a 50:50 split between social and intermediate affordable housing within the Elephant and Castle Opportunity Area. The scheme does not meet this apportionment of affordable tenure, with 64% of the affordable units being shared ownership, targeting key workers (the fundamental aim of the London Wide Initiative project). The London Wide Initiative units differ from conventional shared ownership units because on the part of the property not owned by the buyer, no rent is payable. In addition, the unit remains in this form of tenure in perpetuity. On this basis, it is considered that the affordable housing provision on the site is acceptable in overall policy terms and will provide an affordable means for first time buyers and key workers to purchase properties.

- 51 Accordingly, the proposed housing density, mix and tenure are considered acceptable.

### **Design and Layout**

- 52 Policy 3.12 of the emerging Southwark Unitary Development Plan seeks to ensure that a high standard of architecture and design are achieved in order to create high amenity environments. Policy 3.13 requires that the principles of good urban design are considered, in terms of context, height, scale, massing, layout, streetscape, landscaping and inclusive design. Policy 4.2 requires that residential development achieve good quality living conditions within the development. The proposal has benefited from pre-application discussions with officers and a presentation to the Southwark Design Review Panel. The view of the panel was generally supportive of the proposal.

- 53 Context: The immediate site context is dominated by the railway viaduct to the west and new and existing residential development to the north and beyond the railway line to the west. To the east the Grade II Listed John Smith House and local views require consideration. In the context of the Elephant and Castle SPG, the site offers the opportunity re-establish development on an unused brownfield site, repairing the urban fabric, and enhancing Robert Dashwood Way. Ultimately the creation of links through the railway viaducts to create an additional linkage from Crampton Street to Walworth Road will increase permeability in line with masterplan objectives.

- 54 The relationship to Robert Dashwood Way was a consideration raised by both the panel and officers and the ground floor treatment is considered appropriate and will likely make a positive contribution to the permeability of the area. The proposal is considered acceptable in its urban design response that provides for active frontages along the ground floor in both Amelia Street and Robert Dashwood Way.

- 55 Height, Scale and Massing: The building is designed as a single block, curved to follow the railway line. The building's simple urban form works well and at 9 storeys (stepping down to seven storeys at both the northern and southern ends) fits comfortably within the local context and establishes a transitional grain between the taller and larger scale development at the Elephant and Castle and the established, more traditional grain of the existing urban fabric. The design effectively uses the stair and lift cores to articulate the buildings exterior creating an appropriate visual break and scale to the block and the slight set back and lighter cladding treatment of the upper two storeys aids in reducing the overall impact of the proposed height. Internally, high quality living environments have been created that will have the benefit of good light, circulation and privacy. Common circulation space is generous. Residential room sizes comply with Council requirements, and all units will be built to Lifetime Homes standards.

- 56 Appearance and Materials: Specific recommendations were made by the Design Review Panel in terms of materiality, sustainability and amenity space, which must

respond to the local context. The proposal was revised to address these early criticisms and the current proposal is considered acceptable with regard to its detailed design. The external cladding of the proposed scheme is a key consideration in terms of the detailed design. As the major architectural feature, the cladding creates a finely grained appearance and visual interest. The use of a prefabricated aluminium rainscreen will enable the building to maintain a high quality finish and appearance over a long period. This material is considered sufficiently robust and appropriate given the context of the proposed scheme. Suitable conditions will be attached to any planning permission to ensure that the aesthetic appearance of the building is adequately controlled.

- 57 Overall, the height, scale, massing and general design of the proposed development is considered to be acceptable in this location and will relate satisfactorily to its existing context. The proposal is considered to represent a high standard of design that would provide good quality residential accommodation that respects its context, and is consistent with the requirements of Policies 3.10, 3.13 and 4.2 of the emerging Southwark Unitary Development Plan.

### **Amenity Space Provision**

- 58 Supplementary Planning Guidance for residential development advises that amenity space should be provided at around 50 square metres per block plus 10 square metres per unit. The total amenity space deemed reasonable on this basis is 1690sqm. Each flat from 1<sup>st</sup> to 6<sup>th</sup> level is provided with a private balcony (over 4sqm per balcony minimum), with private terraces and balconies provided at 7<sup>th</sup> floor level, with four 3 bed flats located on the northern and southern facades with direct access to large (over 70sqm) private terraces. At 8<sup>th</sup> floor some units are not provided with balconies. The overall amenity provision is further enhanced by the provision of a private landscaped courtyard to the rear of the site of over 1500sqm.
- 59 The landscaped courtyard is currently proposed as private amenity space for the sole use of occupiers of the development on the basis of safety and security. A number of objections have been received in relation to the restriction of public access to this space. A longer term aim of the masterplan is to create an east-west link from Robert Dashwood Way to Walworth Road along the northern boundary of the application site, and the courtyard space includes access to this link. Further, the masterplan envisages the creation of a new public space (Faraday Square) to the north of the Walworth Town Hall on the east side of Walworth Road, with the landscape treatment of the space to be carried out into and across the Walworth Road to extend the space and create a relationship with the buildings located on the west side of Walworth Road, linking directly to the proposed pedestrian link from Robert Dashwood Way. In light of the objections received, the developer has agreed to consider full or partial public access to the courtyard in the longer term, though in the short term a secure and private amenity space for occupiers of the development is considered the priority. This will be facilitated through the provisions of the section 106 agreement. With these factors in mind, the current proposals for a private courtyard area are considered acceptable.
- 60 Improvements to the pavement area fronting the employment units along Robert Dashwood Way are proposed in the form of lighting and creation of landscaped beds enclosed by steel edging, separated by either grass turf or granite set paving. Enhancement works to Amelia Street will be addressed via a provision within the section 106 in which moneys are to be allocated towards the procurement of a public realm design competition (including a capital sum for implementation of works) for the enhancement of Amelia Street. Overall, the amenity space provisions within the scheme are considered acceptable and in accordance with the urban design and designing out crime objectives of policies 3.13, 3.14 and 4.2 of the emerging

### **Impact on the Amenities of Neighbouring Residents and Occupiers**

- 61 Daylight/ Sunlight: A Daylight and Sunlight Impact Assessment was submitted with the application. It assessed the impact of the proposed development on the daylight and sunlight of adjoining residential occupiers against the guidance provided in the BRE Report 209 "Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice" (1991).
- 62 In terms of the impact on daylighting within adjoining development, the South Central East building located to the north of the site will have 2 rooms on its southern façade falling marginally below BRE guidance levels, though the property retains good levels of daylight overall. The South Central West scheme opposite the site though across the railway viaduct, a number of work units (considered less sensitive in daylight terms) will see a reduction in daylight levels to below BRE guidelines- however all residential components of these live-work units are unaffected by the proposal. In terms of the impact on sunlight within the South Central East building, there will be a marginal decrease in sunlight levels in windows facing 90 degrees of south in the summer, with a minor reduction below BRE guideline amounts in winter. There is no impact on sunlight levels within South Central West. Whilst certain deficiencies and impacts are evident, it is considered that in light of the overall high density urban context in the immediate vicinity of the site, the impact is satisfactory.
- 63 The scheme has some potential to impact on the outlook of adjacent residents of the South Central East building to the north, and the recently developed South Central West building which is separated from the site by the railway viaduct. However, given the high density urban context in this particular location, the proposal is not considered to impact on the outlook of these residents to an unacceptable level.
- 64 Noise: A primary concern with the proposed scheme is its proximity to a railway viaduct and the subsequent impact on the residential amenity of future occupiers (particularly in single aspect units facing the viaduct) due to noise. The site is rated Category C in terms of its sensitivity to noise in terms of PPG24, where development is generally precluded unless noise can be mitigated through the use of appropriate materials and insulation. An acoustic survey was submitted with the application, which advises that all units will achieve acceptable internal noise levels. No objection has been raised by the Councils Noise and Air Quality Team in relation to the scheme, subject to the imposition of suitable conditions on any planning permission.
- 65 A number of objections have been raised in relation to the impact of the development on noise within the local area, primarily on the basis of increased traffic volumes and construction noise. In terms of traffic noise, the proposed development is considered to generate only low levels of vehicular traffic (refer also to traffic section of report below) and as such a minimal impact is expected. Construction noise and general disturbance are not considered matters for consideration in the assessment of a planning application however restrictions do apply to construction times and the Councils Noise and Air Quality Team are able to address any complaints made during the construction phase of the development. Further concerns were raised about the impact of noise on future occupiers from existing businesses located within the railway arches along Robert Dashwood Way, and the continued viability of these businesses should complaints arise, however it is considered unlikely that the proposal will compromise their ongoing viability for employment use as appropriate mitigation measures have been incorporated into the design of the units- particularly to address the issue of railway noise.
- 66 Overall the proposed development is considered to adequately protect the amenity of

adjoining occupiers consistent with the outcomes sought by Policy 3.2 of the emerging Southwark unitary Development Plan.

### **Impact on Character and Setting of a Listed Building or Conservation Area**

- 67 Policy 3.18 of the emerging Southwark UDP required that permission will not be granted for developments that would not preserve or enhance the setting or views into or out of listed buildings and Conservation Areas. The Pullens Estate Conservation Area, a small late 19<sup>th</sup> century development of tenements and workshops, has its boundary approximately 60m from the site to the west, though it is separated both visually and spatially by the railway viaduct and the new South Central West development which extends up to 29.46m.
- 68 The nearest listed building is the Grade II Listed John Smith House, formed of 7 terraced houses built in the 1790s, which front the Walworth Road to the east of the site. In 1978 a major programme of works converted some of the terraced houses to offices, which included a massive rear extension whose plant room is visible above the original houses' attics. This extension is directly adjacent to the application site and as such the proposal is not considered to have an impact on the immediate setting of the original listed building. Whilst the upper floors of the proposed development will be visible above John Smith House from certain parts of Walworth Road, it is considered that as the general scale and form of the proposal are similar to other new developments nearby, and the upper 2 floors have been slightly set back and incorporate a lighter cladding treatment, the impact on the views in the background of the listed building will not be substantially altered from that already in existence and would not be overly obtrusive. In conclusion, it is not considered that there will be a detrimental impact on the setting of the listed building or on the Conservation Area, primarily as a result of the setting of the site and its immediate context, for which it is appropriately designed.

### **Traffic Issues**

- 69 The proposal is situated in close proximity to Elephant and Castle with its overland and underground rail lines and the area is well served by local buses. Accordingly, the site has a very high public transport accessibility rating (PTAL) of 6.
- 70 Access: The application proposes a sub basement car park with access from Amelia Street in the same location as the existing site access. Access to the rear courtyard, which is raised above the basement level, incorporates a 1 in 18 pedestrian access ramp from the Amelia Street (allowing for wheelchair accessibility), adjacent to the basement access ramp. Further access points to the courtyard area are provided from the northern boundary of the site linking to the proposed future public route linking to Walworth Road. There will be level access into the B1/D1 employment space fronting on to Amelia Street, and level access to the circulation cores fronting Robert Dashwood Way. The sightlines for pedestrians and motorists to/from the entrance are considered acceptable, and will help to ensure safety for pedestrians and motorists. Visibility splays (i.e. areas where no structure can be sited which might obstruct visibility) will ensure that the visibility within the 'access' area of the site are maintained.
- 71 Car Parking: In line with the emerging Southwark UDP and other local and national policies, the Council is seeking to encourage reduced car dependence and ownership levels in urban areas and thus encourage the use of more sustainable transport modes. Appendix 15 of the emerging UDP states that for sites within the 'Central Activities Zone', where there is high accessibility to public transport, a maximum of 0.4 parking spaces per residential unit should be provided (i.e. 66 spaces maximum). 36 car parking spaces, including 10 disabled person spaces and 12 motorcycle spaces



are proposed. The remaining 26 spaces are to be prioritised for families. A maximum of 1 parking space per 1500sqm gfa should be provided for a B1 use, with no site specific standard provided for D1 use. No parking has been provided for the commercial use. Given the very high accessibility level, parking levels are considered acceptable. Further to this, existing traffic orders would be amended to prevent future occupiers of the development from obtaining parking permits. This would prevent overspill car parking in the surrounding street by occupiers of the development. Further, the low volume of additional traffic from the development is not expected to have a negative impact on the existing road network.

- 72 Cycle Parking: The emerging Southwark UDP requires cycle parking at a rate of 1 cycle space per 250sqm B1 floorspace (i.e. 5 spaces), a minimum of 1 space per unit plus 1 visitor space per 10 units (i.e. 180 spaces). The scheme proposes 185 cycle spaces, 90 within the basement and 95 in a secure store in the courtyard. Some visitor cycle stands are also to be provided outside the entrance to courtyard area adjacent to Amelia Street. The scheme provides cycle parking in accordance with the emerging Southwark UDP.
- 73 Refuse Storage: Adequate refuse storage space has been incorporated into the development at basement and ground floor levels. A 12m loading bay for heavy goods vehicles and refuse collection is located on Amelia Street close to the corner of Robert Dashwood Way, to assist with servicing and on site loading. The residential refuse area located on the ground floor has a dedicated goods lift that will bring the waste from the basement to the ground floor, so that bins can be presented (within 10m) to Southwark's waste contractors for disposal. The waste management strategy is based on a private facilities management team being on-site who will take care of all the internal movement of residential waste to and from the basement to the 'residential refuse' area located on the ground floor prior to its collection. Whilst the future occupiers of the commercial units is currently unknown, the applicant has confirmed that all commercial tenants would be expected to provide immediate storage and management of waste within their own space (i.e. cleaners store areas, local bins) and the commercial waste store for collection of the refuse located on the ground floor can be arranged to suit various commercial activities, including clinical use should a D1 occupier take the space.
- 74 A number of objectors have identified that the site is used as a car park (primarily by the Metropolitan Police Service). The applicant has confirmed that the site is no longer used for the parking of police vehicles, a use which ceased several months ago, and the site is currently vacant. However, the transport statement as submitted with the application confirms that when the site was being used as a car park, it had up to 70 vehicles parked in it each day, the equivalent of at least 140 vehicle movements per day. On this basis, the proposed use, having only 36 parking spaces, would represent a significant reduction in traffic movements to and from the site from that which previously occurred.
- 75 Overall, the proposal is considered consistent with policies 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.6 and 5.7 of the emerging Southwark Unitary Development Plan. It would help promote non-car modes of transport, provide an acceptable level of car parking and bicycle storage, and a suitable refuse and servicing arrangement.

### **Flood Risk Assessment**

- 76 The site is located within Flood Zone 3a, however the site is protected by the Thames Barrier and related defences. A flood risk assessment has been submitted with the application and confirms that the site has the potential to be inundated in the event that the flood defences fail.

- 77 The proposed scheme meets the Planning Policy Statement 25 sequential test. Within the London Plan, Southwark has a target of providing 16,300 new dwellings in the period 2007/8-2016/17 at rate of 1,630 dwellings per year. A total of 12,523 are expected to be provided on sites designated within the emerging Southwark UDP. The majority of these sites are located in Flood Zone 3a with a small minority in Flood Zone 2. On the sites in Flood Zones 1 and 2 which are currently available for development, there is capacity to provide approximately 1852 dwellings, but all of these sites either benefit from planning permission for redevelopment, or are currently subject to pre-application discussions. Southwark will only be able to meet its housing target if sites in Flood Zone 3a are also developed. Whilst the proposal site is not designated within the Plan, the development of brownfield sites such as this will be necessary if Southwark is to achieve its housing targets. The proposal site is located on previously developed land and there are strong sustainability reasons why the site should be redeveloped. It has good access to public transport and is capable of providing housing on a site which currently has none.
- 78 It is for the applicant to demonstrate that the development can be made safe through the submission of a Flood Risk Assessment. The Environment Agency has confirmed that they have no objection to the proposal based on the Flood Risk Assessment submitted by the applicant. The proposal is therefore considered consistent with Planning Policy Statement 25.

#### **Planning obligations [S.106 undertaking or agreement]**

- 79 Planning obligations are intended to offset the negative impacts of a development. In this case, the overall scale of development means that it is likely to have only a localised impact therefore any obligations that may be secured should be used to offset impacts on the local area. The applicant has submitted a proposed Heads of Terms based around the emerging Planning Obligations SPD. A full financial viability appraisal was submitted to assess the capability of the scheme to comply with s106 planning obligation requirements. The following sets out the offer:
- 80
- Affordable Housing - The proposal provides a total of 43 shared ownership (London Wide Initiative) units and 24 social rented units resulting in an overall provision of 42% of the total habitable rooms being affordable. Full details provided at paragraph 49;
  - Education Contribution- The social rented element of the scheme has been fully Grant Funded (meaning no education contribution is payable on the social housing element), resulting in a contribution of £76,922;
  - Employment Training and Support in Completed Development Contribution- £8,430 based on a 50/50 split between B1 and D1 uses and a total GIA of 1,124sqm;
  - Workplace Co-ordinator and Training During Construction Contribution- A Workplace Co-ordinator will be provided by the developer at an estimated value of £30,000;
  - Open Space and Sports Development Contribution- £163,088;
  - Children's Play Contribution- £2,665;
  - Archaeology Contribution- Not in an Archaeological Priority Area;
  - Strategic Transport Contribution- £72,746;
  - Site Specific Transport and Public Realm Contribution: £275,840 comprising:
    - £125,000- (This contribution has been offered in response to consultation feedback and hopes to address some concerns about the scheme, in particular from the Pullens Tenants and Residents Association.) The £125,000 will fund a public realm design competition, to generate ideas and solutions to improve the public realm in the immediate locality of the site and to start to implement the resulting proposals. The competition would be managed by the Architecture Foundation with a judging panel drawn from their organisation, local residents,

the LB Southwark Local Area Committee and the developer First Base. The competition brief would request that designers find creative solutions to the public realm issues in the locality relating to hard and soft landscaping, street furniture, lighting, cycle routes and cycle parking, accessibility, pedestrian routes, refuse management, safety and vehicle management. The £125,000 comprises £5,000 for Architectural Foundation costs for running the competition; £10,000 for prize money/ fee allocation stage 1 of competition (ideas); £10,000 for prize money/ fee allocation stage 2 of competition (design development); £100,000 towards the capital sum to commence implementation of the proposals.

- £2750- amendment to traffic order to restrict parking permits
- £5500- Provision of loading bay in Amelia Street (marking, signing, traffic order)
- Remaining funds to be allocated to other works in the locality where not covered by works likely to result from the design competition
- Health Contribution- £147,764;
- Community Facilities: £23,334. A clause shall also be included requiring that the applicant investigate the provision of partial or full public access to the courtyard in the future with a trigger point and provisions for this review to be included.
- Administration fee of 2% of total (£770,779)- £15,416

- 81 There will be a total cash contribution is £786,195 or £4,794 per unit. When combined with the equivalent in kind contribution of £30,000 the total contribution is £816,195 or £4977 per unit. Overall, the proposal is consistent with Policy 2.5 (Planning Agreements) of the emerging Southwark Unitary Development Plan and the draft Supplementary Planning Document on Planning Obligations 2007.

### **Conclusion**

- 82 The application will see the redevelopment of a currently unused brownfield site to provide both employment opportunities and much needed private and affordable housing. The principle of the use is accepted. The height and general bulk of the building is considered acceptable within the context of the existing environment and the Elephant and Castle Opportunity Area. The traffic impact, car and cycle parking provisions are also acceptable. Planning obligations will be secured to offset the impact of the development in accordance with the Supplementary Planning Document on Planning Obligations. The scheme is in accordance with local and national policies and is recommended for approval.

### **COMMUNITY IMPACT STATEMENT**

- 83 In line with the Council's Community Impact Statement the impact of this application has been assessed as part of the application process with regard to local people in respect of their age, disability, faith/ religion, gender, race and ethnicity and sexual orientation. Consultation with the community has been undertaken as part of the application process. The impact on local people is set out above.

### **SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IMPLICATIONS**

- 84 Sustainability and Energy Statements were submitted with the application in accordance with Southwark Plan policy. Policy 3.4 of the Southwark Plan requires development to be designed to maximise energy efficiency, while Policy 3.5 requires development to incorporate renewable energy technology. The London Wide Initiative aims to provide high quality, well designed, sustainable housing, with all developments achieving a BREEAM EcoHomes rating of 'very good', though early indications are that the proposed scheme will achieve a rating of 'excellent'.
- 85 The energy statement advises that on-site renewable energy technology can be

incorporated into the development to produce a minimum of 10% of the development's total energy demand. In terms of energy efficiency, the building would be constructed to ensure that it is highly energy efficient. Some of the main technologies to be incorporated in to the scheme to reduce energy use and include renewable energy are:

- Connection to the proposed Multi-Utility Services Company [MUSCo] which is intended to deliver a programme of decentralised heat, power, and cooling to address the Elephant and Castle SPG targets for zero carbon growth. Specifically the scheme will incorporate a heating system provided by MUSCo, and will link to the grey water network;
- Façade Engineering and thermal mass construction;
- Green Roof;
- Low energy lighting/ lighting control;
- Use of an Energy Management System;
- Roof mounted photovoltaic cells for renewable energy;
- BREEAM EcoHomes assessment of 'excellent'.

LEAD OFFICER	David Stewart	Interim Head of Development and Building Control
REPORT AUTHOR	Kristina Butler	Development Control [tel. 020 7525 5400]
CASE FILE	TP/1166-C	
Papers held at:	Regeneration Department, Council Offices, Chiltern, Portland Street SE17 2ES [tel. 020 7525 5403]	