

Planning Sub-Committee A

Wednesday 14 November 2012

7.00 pm

Room G01a, 160 Tooley Street, London SE1 2QH

Supplemental Agenda

List of Contents

Item No.	Title	Page No.
7.	Development management items Addendum - Late observations, consultation responses, and further information.	1 - 4

Contact

Gerald Gohler, Constitutional Officer, on 020 7525 7420 or email:
gerald.gohler@southwark.gov.uk

Date: 14 November 2012

Agenda Item 7

Item No: 7.	Classification Open	Committee: Planning Sub-Committee A	Date: 14 November 2012
From: Head of Development Management		Title of Report: <u>Addendum</u> Late observations, consultation responses, and further information.	

PURPOSE

- 1 To advise Members of observations, consultation responses and further information received in respect of the following planning application on the main agenda. These were received after the preparation of the report and the matters raised may not therefore have been taken in to account in reaching the recommendation stated.

RECOMMENDATION

- 2 That Members note and consider the late observations, consultation responses and information received in respect this item in reaching their decision.

FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION

- 3 Late observations, consultation responses, information and revisions have been received in respect of the following planning applications on the main agenda:

3.1 **Item 1 – 44-50 and 52-58 Lancaster Street SE1 OSJ**

3.2 *Late observation*

A late observation has been received from a local resident stating

Objections for Planning Application 44-58 Lancaster Street (AP 1066) Meeting 14th November 2012

This objection primarily represents over 400 local resident online petition signatures, the Blackfriars Action for Responsible Development (BARD) and the newly established Blackfriars Preservation Society. It also supports objections from the Victorian Society, the Walworth Society and others.

We strongly object to the proposed demolition of these buildings. The buildings date from 1882 and are representative of the industrial heritage of the area between the Elephant and Castle and the river. We feel that there are strong grounds to refuse planning permission that are grounded locally and nationally in recently adopted National Planning Policy Framework.

There are a number of local and national presumptions in favour of protecting and retaining these buildings and we feel these are not being recognised by planners. The local Character Appraisal from 2007 recommends these buildings for local listing. It describes them as some of the best surviving sections of the historic core of Bankside and Borough and that they contribute to the character and appearance of the Lancaster Street precinct.

However, correspondence from the planners has suggested this guidance is out of date, yet the buildings have not changed and this guidance is clearly included in the documents for the proposed local SPD(1).

The planners have stated that they have omitted the Colorama buildings from the Character Appraisal, but this is not a draft document. We would like to state clearly that if this is being done, it is without consultation and it has not been undertaken as part of any transparent public process. The clear public demand is for these buildings to be retained as important local heritage assets.

Planners have also stated that the buildings do not fulfil the quality criteria of historic and architectural interest, however all Victorian facades have been retained including a 5m high industrial chimney and the famous engineer Robert Millar occupied these buildings between 1882 and 1910. He invented 'improvements in tramway cars' (3)

The Victorian Society states, 'We object to a damaging and backward proposals which would see the destruction of a part of Southwark's late-Victorian architectural heritage. The buildings in question form an interesting group and are some of the best remaining in immediate vicinity divorced of much of its worthy architecture.'

Recently adopted National Planning policy Framework Section 17 will be breached if these buildings are not retained. The proposed development fails to encourage the reuse of existing resources, including conversion of existing buildings. In addition it fails to 'conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance'.

Due to the threat of demolition, a listed building application has been submitted to list these buildings (Reference: 476326)

We request Councillors to refuse approving this application. More generally late Victorian buildings in this area are being picked off one by one, at an ever increasing speed. The acceleration of this loss is staggering and causing great harm to the character of the area. The tide needs to turn now. These buildings should be preserved for future generations to enjoy and imaginative reuse options should be explored and developed.

References:

- (1) Bankside, Borough and London Bridge SPD
- (2) The Character Appraisal 2007, South of Union Street and North of Borough Road
- (3) The London Gazette 1876
- (4) On-line petition print out.

3.3 *Correction to list of Consultees*

Lingfield House Lancaster Street was omitted from the consultation list in the report in error, all residents in Flats 1 to 88 Lingfield House were consulted.

Comments from Head of Development Management

3.4 Local Character Appraisal 2007

In terms of the local Character Appraisal from 2007 referred to by the objector above and in the representations made in the report, officers can confirm that this report is not planning guidance, it is not a Supplementary Planning Document, it was piece of evidence used to help inform the preparation of the draft Bankside, Borough and London Bridge SPD. As such it has very little planning weight. As a piece of evidence, like other evidence documents we produce such as employment land reviews, retail studies, viability appraisals etc it has not been specifically agreed by members. It informed the draft SPD which was agreed by members (although has little weight given that it has not been adopted and will be revised).

3.5 Assessment of Heritage Assets

The basis of whether a building can be considered a 'heritage asset' stems from its significance. Significance is defined by English Heritage in their Conservation Principles (2008). There are four values that provide significance for a heritage asset: evidential,

historical, aesthetic and communal values. Based upon the principles detailed in the 2008 volume English Heritage have also provided criteria for listing that are a useful guidance to the likely significance of a potential heritage asset of a particular type. The buildings in question are industrial or warehouse buildings that, according to material supplied by objectors, have had a variety of uses, rather than retaining the functions or features of a specific use. The applicants have provided an advice note from their heritage consultants that are based upon an external examination of the buildings and desk-based research. This document refers to the selection guidance for listing in paragraph 21 and demonstrates that the proposal site here does not meet those criteria.

Whilst the buildings have some significance in terms of evidential value - they are representative of the buildings and uses that formerly occupied the area and some aesthetic value, to the patterns of fenestration at the upper floors, cornices and roof forms; they are significantly altered and have been through numerous changes in use. This severely impacts upon the significance of the buildings in both aesthetic and evidential terms and their value as heritage assets. In comparison with other groups of industrial buildings in the immediate area of a similar age, most notably Valentine's Place and in the King's Bench conservation area, industrial buildings of this age are of far higher significance in terms of the evidential, historical and aesthetic values and survive in greater numbers, hence their designation as conservation areas.

Therefore whilst the buildings retain some significance, its value can be assessed to be low, so any consideration of them as a heritage asset must balance this low significance against the proposal in line with paragraph 135 of the NPPF.

In terms of the late representation, officers can reaffirm that the appraisal of the application properties as set out in the officer report still stands.

3.6 **Recommendation** – Remains to Grant Planning Permission subject to the Section 106 Agreement and the conditions as set out in the report.

4.0 **Item 2 44 Wanley Road SE5 8AT**

4.1 *Correction to Transport Section in report*

Paragraph 41, the application site is located within a low Ptal rate of 2 and not a high Ptal rate. There are two wheelchair flats within the proposal and not three as stated.

Paragraph 42, there are no minimum parking standards, the standards quoted are expectation standards for parking.

4.2 **Recommendation** - remains to grant planning permission subject to the Section 106 Agreement and the conditions set out in the recommendation.

REASON FOR LATENESS

5. The comments reported above have all been received since the agenda was printed. They all relate to an item on the agenda and Members should be aware of the objections and comments made.

REASON FOR URGENCY

6. Applications are required by statute to be considered as speedily as possible. The application has been publicised as being on the agenda for consideration at this meeting of the Sub-Committee and applicants and objectors have been invited to attend the meeting to make their views known. Deferral would delay the processing of the applications/enforcements and would inconvenience all those who attend the meeting.

Lead Officer: Gary Rice - Head of Development Management

Background Papers: Individual case files.

Located at: 160 Tooley Street London SE1.