Item No. Classification Decision Level Date
5.7 OPEN PLANNING COMMITTEE July 29 2008

From Title of Report
HEAD OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL DEVELOPMENT CONTROL

Proposal (08-AP-1256)
Demolition of existing buildings and erection of Part 5/Part 6/Part 7/Part 8 storey building comprising 4,067 sq.m of A1/B1 floorspace at basement and ground floor, and 142 residential units above (56 x 1 bed, 68 x 2 bed, 18 x 3 bed) and associated cycle storage, parking, refuse storage and landscaping.

Address
CENTURY HOUSE, 62 RILEY ROAD, LONDON, SE1 3PJ (82-84 TANNER STREET SE1)

Ward Grange

Application Start Date 16/05/2008 Application Expiry Date 15/08/2008

PURPOSE

1 To consider the above application, which is for Planning Committee consideration due to the scale of the development.

RECOMMENDATION

2 1) Subject to the applicant first entering into an appropriate legal agreement (at no cost to the Council) by no later than 14 August 2008, planning permission be granted subject to conditions and subject to referral to the Mayor.

2) In the event that the requirements of 1) are not met by 14 August 2008, the Head of Planning be authorised to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out under paragraph 66.

BACKGROUND

Site location and description

3 The application site is approximately 4,360 sq.m in size fronting Riley Road, Tanner Street and Maltby Street and currently occupied by two large warehouses and a row of office buildings. There are two single storey warehouses that have entrances onto both Riley Road and Maltby Street. On the southern part of the site is a large high-bay warehouse which is occupied by a company storing and distributing pipes (Wolseley Pipeline Supplier). To its north is a similar but smaller warehouse currently used as a
car park. There are two/three storey buildings fronting Tanner Street which are largely vacant. The existing buildings on the site are in a poor state of repair.

4 Immediately opposite the application site, to the west, is a seven storey residential block of flats ('Florin Court'). South of Florin Court is Purbrook Estate which consists of three storey blocks of flats. On the north side of Tanner Street (Nos. 51 and 53-55) is a recently constructed residential block also seven/eight storeys in height as well as two storey buildings part occupied by 'Tower Bridge Antiques'(Nos. 67-71). To the east of the site are industrial and office occupiers in the railway viaduct arches. Planning permission has been granted at No.41 Maltby Street for a seven storey flatted development, which is currently under construction. To the south are the 'Tower Workshops' industrial building and the Metropolitan Police Garage and offices, both about three storeys in height.

**Details of proposal**

4 It is proposed to redevelop the whole site with 4,067 sq.m of commercial space (Classes A1 and or B1) on the ground floor and basement and 142 residential units on the upper floors with car parking at basement level for 71 cars (12 existing spaces at ground level are to be retained). A caretakers’ flat will be provided on the ground floor of the development.

5 The demolition and redevelopment of the site will be phased with the northern half of the site (Phase 1) being demolished first with the existing Wolseley Pipeline Centre remaining *in situ* in the southern section of the site (Phase 2).

6 On the ground floor there will be three Class A1 retail and/or Class B1 office units, the largest (1412.8 sq.m) being at the northern half of the site (Phase 1) fronting Tanner Street. A caretakers’ flat will also be provided on this half of the site, adjacent to the vehicular access to the basement car park. The two smaller units will located in Riley Road (803.1 sq.m) and Maltby Street (513.8 sq.m) within Phase 2 of the development. Within the basement will be an additional commercial unit of 1290.7 sqm with a ground floor light-well separating the two smaller units which will help provide light to the basement and separation to the decked amenity areas above.

7 On the corners of the development there are balconies proposed and these are repeated in parts of the main street frontages. The courtyard elevations at the rear will also be balconied. On the street frontages the elevations are 'perforated' by setbacks in the main facades for shared balconies to living and bedroom accommodation with 'hard' elements acting as bookends which punctuate the facade. The lower floors will be set back 0.6m from the main facade with a continual balcony projecting out at these points where there is residential accommodation. 2,548.5 sq.m of amenity space will be provided by rear courtyard garden terraces, balconies and roof level terraces.

8 The residential accommodation will comprise 56 (38%) one bedroom, 88 (48%) two bedroom and 18 (12%) three bedroom flats. Originally the application proposed 84 one bedroom, 55 two bedroom and 14 bedroom flats (total 153 units). However the units were revised in order to increase the provision of larger family three bedroom units, particularly in the affordable social rented sector.
This application is an amendment to a consented scheme granted in 2005 (ref. 04-AP-0562) for 3,142 sq.m of commercial space and 131 flats on the upper floors. The principal differences between the consented scheme and that currently proposed is as follows:

- 925 sq.m increase in commercial floorspace
- 11 additional residential units
- additional first floor to provide residential accommodation within the consented double height commercial floorspace in the northern half of the development
- additional seventh floor situated along the Tanner Street element of the building which is set back from the building line
- relocation of the eight storey element to the Tanner Street elevation and a stepping down in height of the building along Maltby Street

It was originally intended at the time of the consented scheme that the existing occupier (Wolseley Pipeline Centre) would transfer from their existing position on the southern part of the site to the new commercial unit proposed on the northern half by phasing the demolition and development of the site. The Centre no longer wishes to relocate but rather remain in the same location and therefore there is now no longer the requirement for a double height space in the northern section of the development.

Planning history

Under application ref. 04-AP-0562 planning permission was granted in September 2005, subject to a legal agreement, for the demolition of the existing buildings and erection of a part six/part eight storey building comprising a mixed use development involving the creation of 3,142 sq.m of employment floorspace at ground floor level with 131 residential units on the upper floors. 71 car parking spaces were provided in the basement (2 reserved for car club use) together with 10 spaces for motor cycles and 120 bicycle storage spaces. The development is six storeys high in Riley Road, rising to eight storeys on the corner of Tanner Street and Maltby Street.

44 affordable housing units were to be provided within the development and contributions towards highways and environmental improvements and local educational facilities to the sum of £165,000 were secured via a section 106 agreement.

A further application was submitted in June 2007 seeking amendments to the consented scheme proposing to redevelop the site with 2,746 sq.m of commercial floorspace and caretakers flat on the ground floor and 153 residential units on the upper floors with car parking in the basement. This application was withdrawn on the 28th August 2007.

07-AP-2415 – an application was subsequently resubmitted for Demolition of existing buildings and erection of a part six/part eight storey mixed use development to provide 2,746 sq.m of employment space at ground floor and a total of 151 residential units over 1st to 7th floors and 71 car parking spaces and was refused on the following grounds:

1. The proposed development has a density well in excess of that expected
in the Urban Zone and this results in a building with a cramped layout, a high number of single aspect flats with poor outlook and amenity, inadequate accommodation for wheelchair users and insufficient family sized (i.e., two bedroom or larger) accommodation, as such the proposal fails to comply with Policies 3.11 (Efficient use of land), 4.2 (Quality of residential accommodation) and 4.3 (Mix of dwellings) of the Southwark Plan (2007).

2. The design of the building, with its visually cramped ground floor and overbearing overhang to the street, lack of architectural interest and poorly proportioned upper floors, is not of sufficiently high quality given the scale and prominence of the development and as such the proposal fails to comply with Policies 3.11 (Efficient use of land), 3.12 (Quality in design) and 3.13 (Urban design) of the Southwark Plan (2007).

The developer lodged an Appeal against the Council's decision to refuse the revised planning application. The Planning Inspectorate has agreed to the applicants request for a Public Inquiry, which is to take place on 16 September.

Planning history of adjoining sites

16 Under application ref. 03-AP-2150 planning permission was granted in January 2005, subject to a legal agreement, for the redevelopment of an industrial site to provide a seven storey block with basement car parking comprising showroom with offices and storage/distribution on part of the ground floor and offices on part first floor and 88 residential units on part ground, part first and upper floors at No.41 Maltby Street. Construction works have commenced on this site.

17 59-65 Tanner Street: 02-AP-1305 – planning permission granted for demolition of existing building and redevelopment to provide a new seven storey building for use as Class B1 offices on the ground and first floors, 3 live/work units on 2nd floors and 11 residential flats on 4th-6th floors (June 2003).

18 53-55 Tanner Street: 03-AP-0288 – planning permission granted for demolition of existing building and construction of a 7 storey building comprising Class B1 office on ground floor, 4 live/work units on 1st and 2nd floors and 10 residential units on 3rd to 6th floors (June 2003).

FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION

Main Issues

19 The main issues in this case are:

a] the principle of the development in terms of land use and conformity with strategic policies
b] whether the scheme overcomes the previous reasons for refusal
c] the retention of employment floorspace within the development
d] the scale and massing of the development in relation to the street scene
e] the impact on the amenities of adjoining properties
f) parking provision and the impact on the highway

g) planning obligations

h) the sustainability of the proposed development

i) the quality of the residential accommodation, including the dwelling mix and provision for disabled residents

Planning Policy

20 The application site falls within an Urban Zone and within the Borough, Bermondsey and Rivers Archaeological Priority Zone (APZ). Tanner Street is a cycle route. The following plan policies are considered the most relevant:

Southwark Plan 2007

21 1.4 Employment Sites outside the Preferred Office Locations and Preferred Industrial Locations

2.5 Planning Obligations

3.2 Protection of Amenity

3.3 Sustainability Assessment

3.4 Energy Efficiency

3.5 Renewable Energy

3.11 Efficient Use of Land

3.12 Quality in Design

3.13 Urban Design

3.14 Designing out Crime

3.19 Archaeology

4.1 Density of Residential Development

4.2 Quality of Residential Development

4.3 Mix of Dwellings

4.4 Affordable Housing

5.1 Locating Developments

5.2 Transport Impacts

5.3 Walking and Cycling

5.6 Car Parking

London Plan 2004

22 3A.1 Increasing the overall supply of housing

3A.2 Borough housing targets

3A.4 Housing choice

3A.7 Affordable housing targets

3C.22 Parking strategy

4A.7 Energy efficiency and renewable energy

4B.1 Design principles for a compact city

4B.3 Maximising the potential of sites

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

23 PPS1 Planning for Sustainable Communities

PPS3 Housing

PPG13 Transport

PPG16 Archaeology

PPS22 Renewable Energy

PPS25 Development and Flood Risk
Consultations

24 Site Notice: 03/06/2008
Press Notice: 05/06/2008

Internal Consultees

25 Access Officer
Archaeology Officer
Transport Group
Design and Conservation
Planning Policy
Noise and Air Quality Team

Statutory and non-statutory consultees

26 Environment Agency
Transport for London (TfL)
Thames Water
Metropolitan Police Service
London Fire and Emergency Planning

Neighbour consultees

27 45, 47, 49, Flats 1-10 51, 51A, 53, Flats 1-14 55, Flats 1-14 61, 67-73 Tanner Street
52-68, Flats 1-50 Florin Court 70, 82-84 Tanner Street
1-130 Purbrook Estate Tower Bridge Road
31, Tower Workshops 58 Riley Road
82, 166A, 166B Flats 1-15 166, Flats 1-16 Export House 168, 168B, Flats 1-3 Tannery
Lofts 172, Flats 1-4 174, 176, 178-178A Tower Bridge Road
1 Fellmongers Path Tower Bridge Road
17-31, Metropolitan Police Garage 20, 31, 33, 41 Maltby Street
783 Millstream Road
1-4, 2-16 Pope Street
Magdalen Tenants Association Hall, Purbrook Street

Consultation replies

Internal Consultees

28 Waste Management: raised a numbers of issues with the proposed refuse capacity and storage; applicant subsequently provided additional information to satisfy concerns raised.

Noise and Air Quality Team: no in-principle objection; requested conditions.

Archaeology: site is located with the Borough, Bermondsey and Rivers Archaeological Priority Zone; is also a tannery documented on historic Ordnance...
Survey maps. Recommended conditions.

Transport Group: scheme to be made exempt from parking permits; as site is not located within CAZ and has a PTAL rating 3, provision of some degree of parking acceptable; requested further technical detail on basement layouts.

Planning Policy: density is in excess of requirements set out in policy 4.1 – could be acceptable due to proximity to CAZ; is in accordance with Affordable Housing, dwelling mix, and wheelchair units; dual aspect component of draft Residential Design UDP cannot be enforced; renewable energy should be conditioned.

Statutory and non-statutory consultees

29 Metropolitan Police Service: raised initial concern in relation to reference to Secured By Design. A supplementary note was subsequently provided that set out how the development’s design complies with Secured By Design objectives.

Thames Water: no in-principle objection; requested conditions.

Environment Agency: no in-principle objection; requested conditions.

Transport for London: no in-principle objection provided residents made exempt from obtaining parking permits and that the applicant makes a £50,000 contribution to Strategic Transport upgrades.

London Fire and Emergency: no concerns with proposed development.

Neighbour consultees

30 Objections:

17 Florin Court: will affect sunlight.

45 Florin Court: disruption to sunlight.

31 Observations:

Southwark Cyclists: request 130% residential and 30% commercial cycle provision; a further 20 cycle spaces within 50 metres of the site.

32 Support:

8/55 Tanner Street: an improvement to area.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Principle of development

33 Planning permission has already been granted in September 2005 to redevelop the site with a part six/part eight storey building comprising commercial floorspace on the ground floor and residential units on the upper floors. Therefore the principle of the
The proposed development has already been established. No policy or other material considerations have significantly altered in the intervening period which could justify taking a different view at this time.

34 The site is located within what was previously a business/industrial area that has been redeveloped in recent years often for large blocks of flats. A residential block of between six and eight storeys in height will be in keeping with recent developments in the locality.

Employment Use

35 The existing buildings on the site provide approximately 4,208 sq.m of Class B1/B8 (office/light industrial/warehousing) floorspace. The proposed scheme retains 4,067 sq.m of employment (Class A1 retail and/or Class B1 office) use, which is 1066 sq.m more than the consented scheme (3,142 sq.m). The site is not within a designated Preferred Office or Industrial Location but has an established B Class Use, and is therefore considered an employment site which needs to be assessed against the criteria set out in Policy 1.4 concerning employment sites outside Preferred Office and Industrial Locations.

36 On such sites Policy 1.4 states that if the site (i) fronts onto or has direct access to a classified road, or (ii) is in a Public Transport Accessibility Zone, or (iii) is within the Central Activities Zone, or (iv) is within a Strategic Cultural Zone then development will be permitted provided the proposal does not result in a net loss of floorspace in Class B use. On employment sites outside Preferred Office or Industrial Locations and where this criteria is not applicable, then redevelopment from an employment use to a suitable mixed or residential scheme will be permitted.

37 The application site does not meet any of the listed criteria and as such there is no requirement to protect and retain employment use on this site, as policy states that in such instances redevelopment to residential use will be permitted. However the proposal will involve the retention of a significant amount of employment space which will maximise the use of the site and provide an efficient use of the land and create active frontage onto the street.

Environmental impact assessment

38 The proposed development is not of such a size or nature that would trigger the requirement for the submission of an Environmental Impact Assessment under the Regulations.

Impact of proposed development on amenity of adjoining occupiers and surrounding area

39 The impact of a part six/eight storey building on the amenities of adjoining occupiers was considered under the consented scheme. A Sunlight/Daylight Study was submitted as part of the original application.

40 What needs to be considered is whether the proposed amendments to the consented scheme, in particular the change in the massing of the development and the additional 9 units, will have any significant impacts on occupiers of adjoining buildings in terms of sunlight and daylight, outlook and privacy.
41 The additional residential units along the Riley Road frontage at first floor level will be contained within what was previously a double height space for the commercial unit on the northern section of the development (Phase 1). Given that these units will be provided within the envelope of the consented scheme and at first floor level this is unlikely to be detrimental to the block of flats immediately opposite (Florin Court). In addition the central section of the Riley Road frontage, where this part of the building will directly face Florin Court opposite, will be set back 4m at second/third floor and 5m at fourth floor level to provide a greater separation to Florin Court. This part of the building will also be lower in height, being five storeys.

42 The provision of an additional seventh storey along the Tanner Street frontage will be visible from existing blocks of flats on the opposite side of Tanner Street and Riley Road. Both these blocks are themselves seven/eight storeys in height. The additional seventh floor will be set back some 4.6m from both Tanner Street and Riley Road elevations to improve separation distances from neighbouring buildings. The set back of this floor is shown on the drawings to be within the light angles established within the consented scheme. Given these generous set-backs, it is considered that the higher elements of the scheme will not be noticeable from the lower levels of the adjoining developments.

43 The relocation of the eight storey block towards the north of the site will effectively move this element away from the development under construction at No.41 Maltby Street.

44 In terms of sunlight/daylight the proposed scheme falls within the envelope of the consented scheme apart from the additional seventh floor along Tanner Street and the relocated eight storey element. The additional floor, as mentioned earlier, is set back from the main elevations and falls within the light angles established for the consented scheme. The shift of the eight storey element away from No.41 Maltby Street represents an improved amount of available light between the two buildings.

45 It is recognised that the proposed development is within fairly close proximity to neighbouring buildings and that the main elevations will be built up to the site boundaries along each of the frontages. That said the height of the building is comparable with adjacent buildings and the set backs at upper floor levels will improve the relationship with neighbouring blocks. The blocks opposite the application site have also being built up to the boundary of the site. Balconies/terraces are a common feature of other residential buildings in the locality where there is already some degree of mutual overlooking given the urban context of the area.

Impact of adjoining and nearby uses on occupiers and users of proposed development

46 The application site is close to an existing railway line on a brick viaduct (about 9m high) east of London Bridge Station. An acoustic report on sound insulation was submitted with the application. The study concluded that the main noise levels affecting the site are from trains passing on the viaduct. The PPG24 Noise Exposure Category of the site was found to be Noise Exposure Category B (NEC B) for both day and night. For this category PPG24 states "Noise should be taken into account when determining planning applications and where appropriate conditions imposed to
ensure an adequate level of protection against noise”. The proposal, with appropriate sound insulation measures in place is therefore acceptable for residential purposes. The Council's Noise Team have also stated that the development would comply with the British Standard BS 8233: 1999, subject to conditions imposed requiring details of noise attenuation measures to achieve this standard.

Traffic issues

47 The proposed development will include a basement car park for 71 car parking spaces and 12 bays for disabled drivers. In addition the development will provide 20 motor cycle parking spaces and capacity for 173 cycles. Access to the car park will be via a ramp from Riley Road.

48 The Transport Assessment submitted with the application states that the site has a moderate accessibility to public transport with a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 3. TfL requested that this rating be reviewed with a supplementary Transport Assessment which confirms that the site has a PTAL Level of 3. The Council also raised concerns about the amount of on-site car parking given the sites close proximity to the Central Activities Zone (CAZ) and relatively good access to public transport nodes including London Bridge station, however the parking provision proposed is within policy guidelines for the area and this was not a previous reason for refusal.

49 The applicant has previously agreed to fund the change to the existing traffic order locally to prevent future occupiers from obtaining on street resident parking permits and a contribution towards improvements to an alternative modes of transport such as walking, cycling and public transport.

Design issues

50 A key consideration is whether the current proposal meets or exceeds the design quality of the approved scheme, whether the revisions overcome the reason for refusal in relation to design of the 2007 scheme, and whether the proposal does in itself meet the policy requirements in terms of quality of design.

51 The previous ground for refusal stated:

“The design of the building, with its visually cramped ground floor and overbearing overhang to the street, lack of architectural interest and poorly proportioned upper floors, is not of sufficiently high quality given the scale and prominence of the development and as such the proposal fails to comply with Policies 3.11 (Efficient use of land), 3.12 (Quality in design) and 3.13 (Urban design) of the Southwark Plan (2007).”

52 Following discussions with officers after the previous decision, the applicant has amended the revised scheme in order that it better reflects the proportions and details of the 2005 consent. The additional floor situated along the Tanner Street element has been set well back from the building line and within light angles of the proposed structure that also masks long views of the 8 storey element.

53 The height is considered to be generally acceptable, and the degree of set back of the
higher elements effectively reduces the visual impact of the building. In most views, it will appear consistent with the height of the other newer buildings in this area. The relocation of the taller element will improve the relationship of the building, not just within the streetscene but also in terms of its impact on the outlook from existing flats.

The building has a very long frontage, effectively across three streets. Although some attempt has been made to break up the massing through the introduction of different materials, and use of set-back and balconies, the building does appear, in some perspectives, as a rather monotonous structure, lacking the finer grain apparent on the older developments in the area.

In terms of materials, the building uses stock brick, render and metal panels, with stock brick used for the main facades on the 2nd to 5th floors, and metal for the upper, recessed levels. The ground floor provides an active frontage with substantial areas of glazing.

Design officers have expressed some concerns about the rather generic nature of the design and lack of aspiration in its architecture. However, the scheme is considered to be of a similar quality to that previously approved (and still capable of implementation). It has also overcome previous concerns about the ground floor treatment. The development would bring about the redevelopment of a currently underused site to provide new housing, and the existing buildings themselves do not contribute to a high quality streetscene. On balance, the design is not considered to be sufficiently poor to warrant refusal of planning permission.

It is considered that, on balance, given the improvements to the scheme in other areas that result in a development that is substantially improved from the extant permission, the design is comparable to the consented scheme and there are not sufficient grounds to refuse the current application in this regard alone.

**Layout and Quality of Accommodation**

To an extent, the Council is bound by the layouts approved within the extant permission, although developments should always be considered in light of current policy. The refused scheme, whilst an amendment to an approved development, proposed a mix and layout of units that was considered not to comply with policy giving rise to reason for refusal at paragraph ##.

The current scheme has addressed this reason for refusal with regard to also bring the previously approved scheme more in line with the Council’s current and more onerous layout and dwelling mix policies.

A part of the previous reason for refusal included the design resulting in a building with a cramped layout and inadequate accommodation for wheelchair users. In response to this, the development has been designed to meet or exceed the Council’s standards for minimum floorspace requirements, thereby providing sufficient space for future occupiers and good quality living standards.

An additional part of the previous reason for refusal related to the high number of single aspect flats with poor outlook and amenity. This related particularly to the 9no
affordable units adjacent to the railway. The current scheme has been redesigned so that the majority of units adjacent to the railway are now dual aspect or with at least aspect in two directions on the same face.

For clarity, the table below demonstrates the differences between the schemes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Consented scheme 2005</th>
<th>Refused scheme 2007</th>
<th>Revised scheme 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dwelling mix</strong></td>
<td>8.4% 3 bed</td>
<td>10.6% 3 bed</td>
<td>12% 3 bed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43% 2 bed</td>
<td>36.4% 2 bed</td>
<td>48% 2 bed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58.8% 1 bed</td>
<td>53% 1 bed</td>
<td>38% 1 bed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51.4% 2+ bed units</td>
<td>47% 2+ bed units</td>
<td>60% 2+ bed units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dual aspect flats</strong></td>
<td>37 (28%)</td>
<td>37 (25%)</td>
<td>55 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amenity space</strong></td>
<td>2,173 sqm</td>
<td>2,709 sqm</td>
<td>2,548.5 sqm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Density**

The application site is in close proximity to the Central Activities Zone that provides a density guide of between 650 and 1100 habitable rooms per hectare. Whilst the number of flats from the refused scheme have been reduced, given there is a much greater provision of commercial floorspace and a greater proportion of family sized flats that incorporate more habitable rooms being provided, the density is now 1,225 habitable rooms per hectare.

It is considered that the addition of 9 flats to the extant scheme is not sufficient enough of an increase to challenge the scheme on density grounds, which is not a reason for refusal in itself. In addition, given the proposed scheme is providing a greater proportion of employment space as well as more 2 bedroom and above units, it is considered that the density proposed for the scheme is acceptable in this instance.

Any refusal would need to demonstrate not only that the density was above the guideline set out in the London Plan/Southwark Plan, but that this density produced a scheme which was in itself not satisfactory in terms of its form, impact, or the quality of the accommodation it provides.

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

Planning obligations are intended to offset the negative impacts of a development. In this case the affordable housing would be secured by a legal agreement and the applicant has submitted a proposed Heads of Terms based around the Planning Obligations SPD as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>130,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYMENT IN THE DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>33,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYMENT DURING CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>94,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC OPEN SPACE, CHILDRENS’ PLAY EQUIPMENT, AND SPORTS DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>179,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORT STRATEGIC</td>
<td>89,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORT SITE SPECIFIC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC REALM</td>
<td>143,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHAEOLOGY</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH</td>
<td>137,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY FACILITIES</td>
<td>29,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMIN CHARGE (2%)</td>
<td>16,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>861,079</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

67 An additional £2,750 is required to contribute towards amending the Traffic Management Order exempting residents from obtaining parking permits.

68 In addition to the Council’s contributions in line with the Planning Obligations SPD, TfL have requested an additional £50,000 to contribute towards public transport improvements in the area.

69 In accordance with the recommendation, should the planning obligations agreement not be signed within the specified time, the following reasons for refusal apply:

In the absence of a legal agreement being completed by 15 August 2008, the applicant has failed to adequately mitigate against the impacts of the development and, in accordance with Article 22 of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) (England) (Amendment) Order 2003, it is recommended that the application be refused for the following reasons:

1. The development fails to adequately mitigate against the adverse impacts of the development in accordance with London Plan policies 6A.4 Priorities in Planning Contributions and 6A.5 Planning Contributions and Southwark Plan policies 2.5 Planning Obligations, SP10 Development Impacts and Supplementary Planning Document ‘Section 106 Planning Obligations’ 2007.

2. The development fails to contribute towards increasing the availability of school places or improving accessibility to high quality education in schools and other channels in accordance with London Plan policies 3A.15 Protection and enhancement of social infrastructure, 3A.21 Education Facilities and Southwark Plan policies 2.1 Enhancement of Community Facilities, 2.3 Enhancement of Educational Establishments and 2.4 Educational Deficiency, SP 9 Meeting Community Needs;

3. The development fails to contribute towards increasing accessibility to
employment through training and other schemes in accordance with London Plan policy 3B.12 Improving the Skills and Employment Opportunities for Londoner’s and Southwark Plan policy 1.1 Access to Employment Opportunities, SP5 Regeneration and Employment Opportunities;

4. The development fails to contribute towards increasing the quality and quantity of open spaces and associated facilities in accordance with London Plan policies 3D.7 Realising the Value of Open Space, 3D.10 Open Space Provision in UDP’s, 3D.11 Open Space Strategies and Southwark Plan policies 3.1 Environmental Effects, 3.2 Protection of Amenity, 3.11 Efficient Use of Land, 3.13 Urban Design, SP15 Open Space and Biodiversity;

5. The development fails to contribute towards increasing the capacity of public transport provision and improving accessibility to the development in accordance with London Plan policies 3C.1 Integrating Transport and Development, 3C.3 Sustainable Transport in London, 3C.16 Tackling Congestion and Reducing Traffic, 3C.17 Allocation of Street Space, 3C.20 Improving Walking Conditions, 3C.21 Improving Conditions for Cycling and Southwark Plan policies 5.1 Locating Developments, 5.2 Transport Impacts, 5.3 Walking and Cycling, 5.4 Public Transport Improvements, 5.5 Transport Development Areas, 5.6 Car Parking, SP6 Accessible Services, SP18 Sustainable Transport


7. The development fails to contribute towards increasing the quantity of health facilities in accordance with London Plan policy 3A.15 Protection and Enhancement of Social Infrastructure and Community Facilities and Southwark Plan policies 2.1 Enhancement of Community Facilities and 2.2 Provision of new Community Facilities;

8. The development fails to contribute towards the provision of affordable housing in accordance with London Plan policies 3A.2 Borough Housing Targets, 3A.7 Affordable Housing Targets, 3A.8 Negotiating Affordable Housing and Southwark Plan policy 4.4 Affordable Housing and SP17 Housing.

CONCLUSION

The proposed scheme is considered to have overcome the previous reasons for refusal and to provide a development with a satisfactory scale, design, and standard of accommodation. The reasons, and how they have been addressed, can be summarised as follows:
1. The revised scheme provides a more generous layout as well as an increased number of dual aspect flats. There is also a considerable increase in family sized units as well as wheelchair accessible units with the development now exceeding policy in all of these areas.

2. The redistribution of bulk within the development has resulted in a more balanced and appropriate scale. In addition, the ground floor has been more successfully resolved.

In light of the revised development overcoming the previous reasons for refusal, the quality architecture and level of accommodation as well as the scheme’s general compliance with policy, it is considered that there remains no grounds for refusal and, as such, it is recommended that the application be approved.

COMMUNITY IMPACT STATEMENT

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.

a) The impact on local people is set out above.

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT IMPLICATIONS

Policy 3.4 requires all new development to maximise energy efficiency. The EcoHomes Assessment indicates that the residential element of the scheme can expect to achieve a very good rating. The BREEAM assessment suggests that the commercial element will achieve a good rating with the potential to achieve a very good. Due to the speculative nature of the commercial element the consultant states that it is difficult to specify efficiency measures for the shell commercial units and therefore accord a very good rating at this stage. A condition can be attached to ensure that prior to occupation of the building a report should be submitted stating that a very good rating can be achieved.

In terms of the efficient use of water, the EcoHomes assessment states that the scheme should achieve 3 out of the 5 credits through the use of dual flush toilets, aerated taps etc. The BREEAM assessment suggests how the commercial elements can make water savings, however indicates that it is difficult to provide details at this stage given that only shell units are proposed.

It should be noted that the consented scheme did not provide any renewable energy whereas the proposed scheme proposes to provide 20% renewable energy provision via three options being a mixture of Ground Source Heat Pump, Photovoltaic panels, Combined Heat and Power and/or biomass.
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