

Planning Committee

Tuesday 7 March 2017

5.30 pm

Ground Floor Meeting Room G02A - 160 Tooley Street, London SE1
2QH

Supplemental Agenda No.1

List of Contents

Item No.	Title	Page No.
8.	Development Management Addendum report: Late observations, consultation responses, and further information.	1 - 4

Item No: 8.	Classification: Open	Date: 7 March 2017	Meeting Name: Planning Committee
Report title:		Addendum Late observations, consultation responses, and further information.	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		Cathedrals	
From:		Director of Planning	

PURPOSE

1. To advise members of observations, consultation responses and further information received in respect of the following planning applications 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 of each 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:

Item 8.1 – Application 16/AP/3974 for: Full Planning Permission – 10 – 18 Union Street, London SE1 1SZ

Errors and additional comments for the report

Paragraph 4

- 3.1. Crossbones Graveyard is located to the west of the site and not the east as referred to in the officer report.
- 3.2. The scheme would result in a widening of a narrow footway on Union Street, providing a public realm enhancement. This matter is not referenced in the officer report.
- 3.3. Additional S106 costs – The site is located within the Central London Crossrail s106 contribution area which requires an additional S106 payment when schemes involve a net increase in office floorspace of more than 500m². Because there would be a net increase of net office accommodation of 2251m² of office space, the contribution would be £315,140 at £140 m². The actual figure would be lower because the Mayoral CIL contribution of £118,005 would be subtracted from the Crossrail s106 contribution.

Additional neighbour responses and comments on the published case officer report and recommendation

- 3.4. The additional responses have been received which raise the following issues:

- Loss of the historic building and impacts on historic views.
- Insufficient evidence or justification to warrant demolition.
- A more suitable use should be found if offices are no longer practical.
- Heritage Statement does not justify the demolition.

3.5. These issues have been addressed in the officer report.

3.6. One response has been received which comments on the officer's report raising the following points:

Paragraph 39 Daylight & Sunlight Report

There are 5 office rooms facing the site not 12 as suggested and the proposed development will significantly impact on the daylight received by these existing offices.

Response:

The report should read 12 windows as opposed to rooms. The assessment of the impact of the reduction in daylight for these windows is contained in the officer report.

Paragraph 48 Sense of Enclosure:

The assessment for sense of enclosure has not considered the impact on the rear of No.6 Union Street which has residential use on the upper floor including projecting bay windows which directly overlook the application site.

Response:

The proposed building would be pulled away from the rear of the property at no.6 Union Street where the existing flank wall faces directly onto the existing projecting bays. The proposal would help reduce the sense of enclosure relationship with this property which would also help improve the overall outlook from these units. Overall, the proposal would have a positive impact in terms of reducing enclosure on these properties.

Paragraph 64-79 Design Issues and Impact on Character and Setting of a Listed Building and/or Conservation Area

3.7. A Heritage assessment has been prepared by The Heritage Advisory on behalf of the neighbouring site occupiers, Deighton Pierce Glynn, to assess the current proposals for 10-18 Union Street. This report questions the accuracy of the conclusions of the applicants Heritage Statement and also questions the conclusions of the officers in relation to heritage and design.

Response:

The heritage matters are assessed within the main case officer report. While the loss of the warehouse building would result in some harm, it would be less than substantial and outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme, including additional employment.

Amendment to conditions

3.8. An amendment to condition 22 is proposed as the incorrect roof terrace was referenced. The roof terrace at fourth floor would sit below the flank wall of the adjoining building and as such no further screening would be required. The roof terrace at fifth floor would sit opposite the existing roof terrace within the adjoining property and as such it is this roof terrace that should be restricted.

Amend condition 22 to

- 3.9. The boundary screening for the northern elevation of the proposed office roof terrace located at *fifth* floor level shall contain obscure glazed screening to a height of 1.8m above the finished floor level and shall not be replaced or repaired otherwise than with obscure glazing.

Amendment to condition 2 to

- 3.10. Removal of Plan - proposed - D 1203 REV P2 - PROPOSED SECTIONAL ELEVATION NORTHERN WITH EXISTING, as this is superseded by Rev 3 which is already included.
- 3.11. Addition of D1200 REV P2 - PROPOSED UNION STREET ELEVATION WITH EXISTING BUILDING RED LINE OVERLAY, as this was omitted in error.

Additional conditionsFlood Risk

- 3.12. An additional condition is proposed in relation to flood risk following further consultation with the council's flood and drainage team:

No below ground works shall commence until suitable investigations are undertaken to determine the ground and groundwater conditions (including levels) at the site and an updated basement impact assessment is submitted to (2 copies) and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This should include groundwater mitigation measures as required, with the measures constructed to the approved details.

Reason

To minimise the potential for the site to contribute to changes in groundwater conditions and any subsequent flooding in accordance with section 5.3.3 of the Southwark Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2008) and section 5.7 of the Dulwich SPD (2013).

Ventilation

- 3.13. Three flue pipes are shown at fourth floor level which would serve the basement plant area. They would be close to residents in Maidstone Mews. It is important that any emission from these flues are mitigated so as not to lead to a reduction in air quality for these residents and a condition is recommended to this end:

Notwithstanding Drawing no.D1104 Rev P4, details of the ventilation to the basement plant, including the heights of the flues and details of any mitigation in order to ensure that the development that would lead to a reduction in air quality for local residents.

Reason:

To safeguard the amenities of neighbouring residential properties in accordance with The National Planning Policy Framework 2012, Strategic Policy 13 High environmental standards of The Core Strategy 2011 and Saved Policy 3.2 Protection of Amenity and 3.6 Air Quality of The Southwark Plan 2007

Item 8.3 – Application 16/AP/4569 for: Full Planning Permission – 133 Park Street, London SE1 9EA and 105 Sumner Street, London SE1 9HZ

Corrections

- 3.14. Paragraph 1. (b) should read - *in the event that the requirements of (a) are not met by 31 August 2017, the Director of Planning be authorised to refuse planning permission, if appropriate, for the reasons set out under paragraph 84.*

Updates

- 3.15. Transport for London have advised that the S106 obligation for the cycle hire docking station has been revised from £200,000 to £125,000.

REASON FOR URGENCY

4. 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 planning 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 and would inconvenience all those who attend the meeting

REASON FOR LATENESS

5. The new information, comments reported and corrections to the main report and recommendation have been noted and/or received since the committee agenda was printed. They all relate to an item on the agenda and members should be aware of the objections and comments made.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Individual files	Chief Executive's Department 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH	Planning enquiries telephone: 020 7525 5403