PURPOSE

To report the application to the Walworth Community Council meeting due to the number of objections received.

RECOMMENDATION

1 To grant planning permission subject to conditions and a Section 106 Agreement to exempt future occupiers, residential and commercial, from obtaining parking permits.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Site location and description

2 The application site comprises the former front garden of the former Carter Place police station located off Walworth Road. The site is located at the corner of Walworth Road and Carter Place.

3 The subject site is presently vacant, but does contain two trees (a Lime and a Sycamore), both of which are subject to a tree protection order (TPO). There is a advertisement hoarding located on the flank wall of 294 Walworth Road.

4 The surrounding area is predominately in residential use aside from the shopping frontage along Walworth Road.

5 The site is located within a Public Transport Accessibility Zone, an Air Quality Management Area, the Elephant and Castle Town Centre and Opportunity Area, and within a Protected Shopping Frontage. The site is not located within a Conservation Area, but is located to the north of the Sutherland Square Conservation Area.
Details of proposal

Planning permission is sought for the construction of a four storey building, plus basement, comprising a mix of A1 / A3 use and residential units. The development of the site has been designed to retain the TPO trees.

The front building line of the development has been designed to retain the Lime tree and as such this has created a landscaped area adjoining Walworth Road, and there is a larger communal amenity space to the rear of the building, adjoining the Sycamore tree.

The proposed building at basement and ground floor will provide 330m² of A1 / A3 use floorspace, and will provide a total of 9 self contained residential units located at first, second and third floor levels, comprising 1 x studio, 6 x one bed and 2 x two bed units. The development will also provide waste and cycle storage at ground floor level, and balconies associated with two of the residential units.

The building will be of modern design and be constructed in a range of materials, but will predominantly be constructed in brick, with also materials including timber cladding and render being proposed.

The proposed development overall has been scaled down from the initial refusal (04-AP-0248) and the more recent refusal (09-AP-1559). The later application was almost identical to this current scheme, although the ground floor extended a further 6.7m toward the (western) boundary with the Old Police Station on Carter Place.

Planning history

Planning permission was granted in October 1995 for a change of use from a police station to a church and community centre with two associated residential unit. The subsequent use of the premises as a church generated problems with noise and disturbance to adjacent residential occupiers.

In January 2001, planning permission was granted subject to legal agreement for the change of use of the former police station from a church to form 24 flats, comprising 15 two-bedroom flats and 9 one-bedroom flats, some in the form of mezzanine studio flats. The proposal also included 18 car-parking spaces and about 240m² communal garden within the forecourt. Some of these spaces together with the proposed refuse storage was located within the railway arches which formed part of the application site. The legal agreement was not signed.

In October 2003 planning permission was granted in principle for the change of use of the former church and conversion into 24 self contained flats, 13 x one bedroom, 9 x two bedroom and 2 x studio flats with 10 parking spaces. The legal agreement has not been completed.

Planning permission (04-AP-0248) was refused in November 2004 for the erection of a four storey building comprising 2 retail units on the basement and ground floors, 9 flats on the upper three floors comprising 3 x one bed and 6 x two bed units, incorporating upper floor balconies, amenity area to the rear, cycle racks, disabled parking space and loading area with access off Carter Place. The application was refused for the following reasons:

1) It is considered that the proposed development, by reason of its detailed design including materials, appearance and external design, would adversely affect the appearance of the terrace of which it would form a part and this part of the Borough. The proposal is contrary to policy E.2.3 'Aesthetic Control' of the Southwark Unitary Development Plan (1995) and Policy 3.13 'Urban Design' of
2) The proposal in its current form does not incorporate the principles and objectives of 'Secured by Design', including a lack of natural surveillance and recessed door entrances to the rear which may result in the provision of an unsafe environment. Accordingly, the proposal is contrary to Policy E.1.1 'Safety and Security in the Environment' of the Southwark Unitary Development Plan (1995) 3.14 'Designing Out Crime' of the second draft deposit Southwark Plan 2004.

3) The proposal will result in the loss of two mature trees, both of whom are protected by a Tree Preservation Order, which make a significant contribution to the visual amenity of the area, the proposed replacement planting would fail to make such a significant contribution to the area. As a result the proposal is detrimental to the character and appearance of the area generally, contrary to Policy E.6.2 'Trees subject to Tree Preservation Orders and Trees in Conservation Areas' of the Southwark Unitary Development Plan (1995).

4) The habitable windows of the proposed development are within 21 metres of proposed habitable room windows within the former police station and will result in the loss of privacy for future residents of both proposals. The proposal is contrary to Policy E.3.1 'Protection of Amenity' and Supplementary Design Guidance No. 5 'Standards, Controls, and Guidelines for Residential Development' of the adopted Unitary Development Plan 1995 and Policy 3.2 'Protection of Amenity' of the second draft Southwark Plan (March 2004).

The above refused application was then subject to an appeal which was dismissed in September 2005. Within the decision, the Inspector considered that the TPO trees have great importance and should be retained, as their loss would result in a significant harm to the character and appearance of the locality. It was also considered that the development would result in unacceptably poor surveillance, and that the design of the building would contrast abruptly, constituting a discordant feature in the streetscene. However, the Inspector did not agree that the development would create opportunity for overlooking of the adjoining building.

In response to this Appeal Decision a further planning application (09-AP-1559) was submitted and subsequently refused in December 2009 for the construction of a four storied building, plus basement, comprising 374m² of A1 / A3 use at basement and ground floor, with 9 self contained residential units located at first, second and third floor levels (comprising 1 x studio, 6 x one bed and 2 x two bed units); with cycle and refuse storage at ground floor and hard and soft landscaping. The application was refused on the following grounds:

1) The bulk and massing of the rear component of the proposed building would result in a loss of outlook and be overbearing, affecting the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. The development is therefore contrary to policy 3.2 'Protection of Amenity', 3.12 'Quality in Design' and 3.13 'Urban Design' of The Southwark Plan [UDP] 2007.

2) The proposed development has failed to respond positively to its context, and by reason of detailed design would impact adversely on the appearance and character of the surrounding area, including the street scene on Walworth Road and Carter Place, and views from the Sutherland Square Conservation Area. The development is therefore contrary to policies 3.2 'Protection of amenity', 3.12 'Quality in design' 3.13 'Urban Design' and 3.18 'Setting of Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites' of The Southwark Plan [UDP] 2007.

3) The proposal fails to demonstrate the impacts of the development on the environment, and that a sufficient percentage of energy requirements could be
drawn from renewable energy sources. Due to lack of information on energy efficiency and a sustainability assessment (including water recycling, greywater reuse, sustainable drainage and renewable energy) the proposal is contrary to policies 4A.4 'Energy Assessment' and 4A.7 'Renewable Energy' of the London Plan (Consolidated with Alterations since 2004) and policies 3.3 'Sustainability Assessment', 3.4 'Energy Efficiency' and 3.5 'Renewable Energy' of The Southwark Plan [UDP] 2007.

The above refused application was also then subject to an appeal which was dismissed in August 2010. Within the decision, the Inspector considered that the outlook of the occupiers of the Old Police Station would be significantly compromised. However, with regard to the second reason for refusal the Inspector concluded that the development would not harm the character or appearance of the area, including to the streetscene and the Sutherland Square Conservation Area. As part of the Appeal process the applicant submitted a Renewable Energy Report which proposed solar thermal collectors and solar photovoltaic panels which would achieve a 20% reduction in predicted carbon dioxide emissions, however the Inspector felt that the arrangement and appearance of the panels was unclear, and therefore this matter had not been resolved yet.

Planning history of adjoining sites

Planning permission (92/0032B) was granted in August 1992 for the change of use of the first and second floor from B1 offices to 2 (two) one-bed flats.

Certificate of Lawful Development (05-AP-0068) was granted in March 2005 for the continued use of the first floor as a self contained flat at 294 Walworth Road.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Summary of main issues

The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:

a] the principle of the development in terms of land use and conformity with strategic policies.

b] whether the bulk scale and massing of the building is appropriate to its context and avoids impact on neighbouring occupiers.

c] the design and appearance of the building and how it fits within the character of the area, including the setting of the conservation area.

d] the impact of the development on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

e] the quality of residential accommodation for future occupiers.

f) the protection of the TPO trees.

Planning policy

Southwark Plan 2007 (July)

1.4 'Employment sites outside the preferred office locations and preferred industrial locations'
1.7 'Development within town and local centres'
3.1 'Environmental effects'
3.2 'Protection of amenity'
3.3 'Sustainability assessment'
3.4 'Energy efficiency'
3.5 'Renewable energy'
3.6 'Air quality'
3.7 'Waste reduction'
3.11 'Efficient use of Land'
3.12 'Quality in Design'
3.13 'Urban Design'
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'
5.2 'Transport Impacts'
5.3 'Walking and Cycling'
5.6 'Car Parking'


30 London Plan 2008 consolidated with alterations since 2004

4A.7 'Energy Assessment'
4A.9 'Renewable Energy'
4B.1 'Design principles for a compact city'

31 Core Strategy

The Council submitted the draft Core Strategy to the Secretary of State on 26 March 2010 and the Examination in Public hearings took place in July 2010. The Core Strategy policies should be considered as currently having no weight when determining planning applications as they are awaiting the Inspector's report and his finding of soundness. Applications should continue to be determined pending receipt of the Inspector's report primarily in accordance the saved policies in the Southwark Plan 2007 and the London Plan 2008.

The Inspector's report on the Core Strategy is expected in around December 2010. With a recommendation of soundness from the inspector there will be a very high degree of certainty that the Core Strategy will be adopted and that a number of existing Southwark Plan policies will be replaced. In view of this, on publication of the inspector's report, all core strategy policies should be given significant weight in determining planning applications. Less weight should be given to existing policies which are soon to be replaced. Formal adoption of the core strategy is expected in January 2011.

32 Planning Policy Statements [PPS]

PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development
PPS3: Housing
PPS5: Planning for the Historic Environment
PPS25: Development and Flood Risk

Planning Policy Guidance [PPG]

PPG 15 'Planning and the historic environment'
PPS 23 'Planning and Pollution Control'

Principle of development

33 A key land use issue with the determination of this application is that of building on gardens, referred to as "garden grabbing". Recent changes in government policy (PPS3 Housing) sets out that private gardens shall be removed from the brownfield definition. However, this is not at the same time conferring particular protection of this land, in the same way that Borough Open Land or Metropolitan Open Land are
protected for example. The development of such areas will not contribute to the 60% brownfield target set by the Government, but nevertheless would still contribute to housing overall, and given the limited number of back garden developments applied for in Southwark, would be unlikely to push up near the 40% limit for non brownfield, or greenfield, development. Therefore the fact that back gardens are no longer brownfield may not in itself be used as a reason for refusal. Rather regard still needs to be had to the site specific assessment of impacts in terms of matters such as character, design, amenity, transport.

The principle of development is acceptable, provided that the bulk, scale and massing responds positively to the context of the site, in addition to providing a high level of design, suitable standards of residential accommodation, minimising the impacts on neighbouring occupiers, and the suitable protection of the TPO trees.

The commercial use (A1/A3) is acceptable given that there is no loss of existing floorspace, and it is not considered that there would be an over-concentration of retail use within the vicinity. The residential use (C3) on the upper levels is encouraged as it will provide additional housing for the borough. The density of the development is also well within the density range expected within this area.

There is a significant level of objection raised by third parties regarding the loss of this green space. However, it is important to note that this land is not designated as Borough Open Land (BOL), and this is further discussed below.

Environmental impact assessment

A Screening Opinion was not requested prior to the submission of the application as the scheme is not Schedule 1 development. It does fall within Schedule 2, being an urban development project, and the development falls to be considered as to whether it is EIA development by reference to the Column 2 criteria because the site area exceeds 0.5ha. However it has been determined that the development is unlikely to have a significant effect upon the environment by virtue of its nature, size or location based upon a review of the Schedule 3 selection criteria for screening Schedule 2 Development. The site is a brownfield site in an inner London location, and is located outside of a sensitive area as per Regulation 2(1) and the development is unlikely to generate any significant environmental effects. Therefore an Environmental Impact Assessment is not required.

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

Amenity

Neighbouring Occupiers

New developments should be arranged to safeguard the amenity of adjoining occupiers, and should not subject neighbours to loss of daylight or sunlight access, overlooking, domination or a loss of privacy, amongst others.

Within the previous scheme it was considered that the proposed development would harm the amenities of adjoining occupiers, in particular those occupying the former Police Station on Carter Street, and neighbouring occupiers to the south and southeast of the site. This concern related essentially to the proximity of the proposed development to these neighbouring sites, in addition to the proposed massing and bulk of the building at this location, would result in a development which would be overbearing, leading to a loss of outlook.

The Planning Inspector considered that the residential occupiers within the adjoining building at 294 Walworth Road would not be unacceptably affected by the development.
With regard to the Old Police Station this has windows to residential accommodation facing the subject site on four levels. The windows at lower ground floor level face toward a retaining wall and the Inspector found that the development would not have any material impact on these occupiers.

At upper ground floor level the present outlook from these windows is towards the boundary hoardings of the application site, and should the development be constructed these windows would look directly onto the rear of the proposed building.

The Planning Inspector concluded that the single storey rear elevation of the ground floor commercial unit would be in close proximity to these upper ground floor windows. For this reason it would found that the development would be unduly overbearing and the outlook of the occupiers would be significantly compromised.

The application has since been amended to reduce the proposed footprint of the ground floor extension to the rear by 6.7m, providing a setback of at least 11.5m from the upper ground floor windows to the Old Police Station.

It is considered that this significant increase in setback from the Old Police Station would sufficiently overcome the previous concern regarding impact on amenity of these associated adjoining occupiers.

The building has been designed to avoid overlooking and a loss of privacy to neighbouring occupiers, through a combination of sufficient setbacks (more than 21m), and avoiding large windows and balcony areas directly facing neighbouring buildings.

The retention of the existing TPO trees has, in the opinion of the Council, overcome the previous concerns regarding their loss. The amenity of the site in this regard is therefore satisfactory.

Should consent be granted, a condition of consent would be imposed requiring the applicant to provide details of landscaping to be approved prior to occupation of the units, and implemented in the first planting season subsequent.

For the aforementioned reasons, it is considered that the proposed development would ensure that the development would protect the amenities of adjoining occupiers and would therefore be in accordance with policies 3.2 'Protection of Amenity', 3.12 'Quality in Design' and 3.13 'Urban Design' of The Southwark Plan [UDP] 2007 and the Residential Design Standards [SPD] 2008, and should be granted on this basis.

Future Occupiers

The Residential Design Standards [SPD] 2008 have been set to provide guidance on what constitutes a good quality of residential accommodation, which is required pursuant to Policy 4.2 'Quality of residential accommodation' of the Southwark Plan, for example unit and room size standards to ensure that an adequate amount of space is provided within each proposed unit, layout and stacking of units, and sunlight and daylight standards. Whilst these standards are minimum, and exceeding these standards is preferable, there is some flexibility, especially for conversions where it is recognised that in some cases the configuration of an existing building may preclude full compliance with the standards.

The proposed development will provide 9 self-contained flats which have been assessed against these minimum individual room and overall floor area requirements as outlined within section 2.3 of the aforementioned SPD, and the individual rooms and overall the units generally meet or exceed these standards.
It is considered that the stacking is good, there is sufficient storage space, and there is a good level of natural daylighting, that the proposed flats would provide a good standard of residential accommodation for future occupiers.

In terms of the proposed outdoor amenity space, the development would provide only two residential units private amenity space, both measuring approximately 4.5m² in area. However, the development would provide informal communal amenity space to the rear of the site facing Carter Place, and around the protected tree. This communal amenity space would total approximately 150m² in area, which will be completely landscaped as part of the development.

The Residential Design Standards [SPD] requires 50m² of communal amenity space, in addition to 10m² private amenity space for each unit (added to the communal space where appropriate). Therefore, in this instance, the SPD would seek to provide a total of 140m² of amenity space, and the development provides more than this. It is considered that the size of this space would meet the needs of the future occupiers especially given the units are one and two bedrooms and are not family sized.

Furthermore, future occupiers would have sufficient access to outdoor amenity space within close proximity to the subject site (Burgess Park is located a short distance away).

Overall it is considered that the future occupiers would have a good standard of accommodation and would therefore meet the requirements of policy 4.2 'Quality of residential accommodation' of The Southwark Plan [UDP] 2007.

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

It is not anticipated that any adjoining occupier would generate any material harm to the amenities of the future occupiers of the site. Subject to the imposition of a condition requiring that the proposed residential units are designed to achieve a suitable internal ambient noise level.

Traffic issues

The development is located in a high Public Transport Accessibility Level, a CPZ and within the Central Activity Zone (CAZ), therefore a car free development would be expected and the occupiers of the development would be made exempt from applying for parking permits.

This site falls within a controlled parking zone. Therefore, in order to prevent possible overspill parking from the development, the applicant should be informed that a planning condition will be imposed preventing occupiers of this development being eligible for on-street parking permits. In order that the TMO can be changed, a sum of £2,750 must be secured from the applicant for the costs associated with amending the TMO by way of S106 legal agreement. As such the applicant has entered into a S.106 legal agreement on this basis, which has been agreed by both parties.

The application plans have indicated that there are two separate cycle storage spaces, the larger one being located adjoining the rear of the building which provides 10 stacked cycle spaces, and the smaller one is located along the southern boundary, which provides 2 cycle spaces.

The Southwark plan states that cycle storage must be provided at 1:1. Policy 5.3 of the Southwark Plan states that cycle storage must be convenient, secure and weatherproof. For reasons of convenience, cycle storage must be of dimensions as stated in Manual for Streets, sections 8.2.21-8.2.24. Detailed and accurate plans are required to demonstrate the provision of cycle storage.
Overall, should consent be granted a condition could be imposed requiring that further
details should be provided and approved prior to the occupation of the units.

The applicant will also need to provide the Council with a Service Management Plan,
which should incorporate the total number and type of vehicles expected at the site for
all elements; where the deliveries / servicing is to take place from (i.e. on-street or
within the development); If on-street, what is the existing restrictions and / or
proposed.

The applicant should be aware of any loading waiting and restrictions that operate in
the area and that any contraventions will be enforced accordingly. The parking of any
motorised vehicle on the public footway / footpath is also illegal and enforceable
(unless otherwise indicated).

Also mentioned above, Transport for London (TfL) supports the scheme provided
there is a Delivery and Servicing Plan for both the residential and commercial
elements is provided, in addition to a Construction Management Plan and
Construction Logistics Plan, which are conditional should consent be given.

It is considered that the further information such as a Service Management Plan and
Construction Management Plan could be provided, and secured by way of condition
should consent be granted.

In terms of access, the development has been assessed by the Access Officer, who
confirms that all dwellings conform to Lifetime Homes Standard, and Part M (Access
to and within Buildings) of the Building Regulations.

**Design issues**

The application site occupies a prominent corner to Walworth Road and Carter Place,
which was once the front garden to the former police station, but is currently
underdeveloped. The proposed building would form the end to a terrace of six 4
storey buildings on Walworth Road. The terrace is mainly characterised by simple
relationships between primary and secondary design elements. Overall the traditional
windows to brick ratios on neighbouring facades and vertical emphasis combine to
present a clean uncomplicated group appearance. The exception being the 1950’s
infill immediately adjacent to the site. This section of Walworth Road is characterised
by corner pivotal buildings which bring emphasis to street junctions.

The subject site is not a designated open space, however as the front garden to the
former Police Station it does afford visual amenity within this urban area. Two mature
trees on the site are protected, and make a significant contribution to the visual
amenity of the area. The former police station has been converted into residential
accommodation, as discussed above.

In 2005 an Appeal was dismissed for the erection of a new building comprising of two
A1 units and 9 self contained residential units. The Inspector cited the loss of the TPO
trees and the proposed materials and design features, as being unacceptable. The
plan form of this current scheme has been dictated by the requirement to retain the
two mature TPO trees on the site, and the distance of the new development from the
adjoining properties.

The previous application (09-AP-1559) as mentioned was refused, amongst other
reasons, as it was considered that the development failed to respond positively to its
context, and by reason of detailed design would impact adversely on the appearance
and character of the surrounding area, including the street scene on Walworth Road
and Carter Place, and views from the Sutherland Square Conservation Area.

However, within the Planning Inspectors report, it was considered that the previous
development would respect the character and appearance of the area. The four storey
Walworth Road bulk was considered acceptable and the fenestration would reflect the patterns of windows in the upper floor of the terrace. The Carter Place elevation would be more varied in bulk and design, and this was considered to reflect the varied scale of buildings on Carter Place.

The Inspector considered that the building made an appropriate architectural statement that reflects the scale of the buildings on either side, and that the form, design and materials would create a lively appearance that would still be in harmony with the streetscene.

It is further concluded that the character and appearance of the area would not be harmed.

In terms of this current application the proposed building is identical to the one the Planning Inspector assessed, aside from the reduction in the ground floor footprint to the rear, and the solar panels on the roof.

Given that the Planning Inspectorate has accepted the bulk, design and massing of this building there is no objection raised to the development in these terms. It is therefore considered that the development meets the relevant policies of The Southwark Plan [UDP] 2007 and The London Plan, and should be granted on this basis.

Impact on character and setting of a listed building and/or conservation area

It was previously considered under the application 09-AP-1559 that although the application site was located just outside the boundary of the Sutherland Square Conservation Area, the mass and bulk of the proposed building to the rear would have an adverse impact on its setting and views out of the conservation area.

The Planning Inspector on the other hand concluded that the scheme was of a satisfactory design, and that public views of the development from the Conservation Area would be almost entirely absent, and as such there is no impact on the Sutherland Square Conservation Area.

Similarly, given the suitable design and bulk of the building it is considered that the development would preserve the setting of the listed shopfront located at 305 Walworth Road (opposite).

Impact on trees

There are two protected trees at the site (subject to a TPO), Tree T1 is a Sycamore approximately 15m in height, and the second, Tree T2 is a Lime approximately 5m in height.

The proposed development has been designed around the root protection area (in accordance with BS 5837) of the Sycamore, with some crown pruning with some balancing of the crown being acceptable. The proposed development has also been designed around the Lime tree, with the front building line being pulled back from Walworth Road and allowing for a small amenity space to be provided.

The Arboricultural Team have assessed the proposed development, and associated statement from the Arboricultural and Woodland Consultants, and is satisfied that the health and vitality of the two TPO trees can be protected with the imposition of conditions, should consent be granted.

Environmental Protection

The Environmental Protection Team, as mentioned, have no great concerns with either the Environmental Noise Survey or Air Quality Assessment, although they
commented that the developer has not fully considered using the layout of the units to mitigate against the challenging environmental conditions at the site. Of particular concern is that bedrooms are located along Walworth Road and could be subject to high noise levels. The Environmental Protection Team therefore recommend that the internal arrangement should be revisited to address this issue, although this is not considered a reason for refusal.

Furthermore, the habitable rooms along this facade may need to be mechanically ventilated. Details of this ventilation and ambient noise levels could be conditioned if consent is granted.

**Archaeology**

The site in question is located on the Walworth Road, one of the major, historic routeways through Southwark. Its location is immediately adjacent to the Archaeological Priority Zone of Walworth Village. The site in question appears to have remained as open ground as far back as the map evidence held by the Council indicated, therefore there is the potential for archaeological remains from the early post-medieval period and medieval periods to be present on site. The nature of archaeological remains from this period, due to the rural nature of the site, have the potential to be shallow and lacking in deep stratigraphy.

The proposal includes a basement and therefore the loss of all archaeological significance from the site is likely should such potential be present and no protection measures are incorporated. To comply with policy HE6 of PPS5 and policy 3.19 ‘Archaeology’ of the Southwark Plan the applicant is required to supply adequate information to enable the archaeological significance of the site to be assessed.

In this case this would be an archaeological evaluation. The site is currently clear open land so there are no obvious constraints to such work being undertaken. The Archaeological Officer requested that this evaluation be done prior to determination, however given the limited timeframes in which determination is required this was not possible in this instance.

However, to ensure an adequate archaeological evaluation is undertaken prior to the development, conditions will be imposed requiring this is undertaken and submitted to the Council for approval prior to any works commencing at the site.

The Archaeological Officer can, on request, provide an archaeological brief detailing the methodology of the archaeological programme and can also provide information concerning archaeological organisations who work frequently within the Borough and who may be able to carry out the works.

**Waste**

The plans indicate two separate waste storage spaces, one being located near the residential entrance, and another smaller one located near the secondary access from Carter Place. There are no further details of the use (whether it is for residential or commercial use) size of the bins, if there is recycling available, or collection details.

However, it appears that the larger of the two spaces relates to the residential component of the mixed-use scheme, and therefore the smaller would relate to the commercial element. At the time of writing further information was being sought from the application in this regard.

Each waste store appears large enough to accommodate separate refuse and recycling for the residential and commercial elements respectively. Therefore it is considered that should consent be granted, it would be suitable for a condition to be imposed requiring further detail to be provided and approved prior to occupation of the units.
**Sustainability**

93 The previous application was not accompanied by a Sustainability Statement, although some measures were outlined within the design and access regarding some basic energy efficiency measures.

94 Within the Appeal, the applicant submitted a Renewable Energy Report which proposed solar thermal collectors and solar photovoltaic panels which would achieve a 20% reduction in predicted carbon dioxide emissions.

95 The Planning Inspector felt the technology would be at odds with the brown roof then proposed, and there were no plans provided to show their arrangement and potential visual impact.

96 The application plans have been amended since the previous application (09-AP-1559) to include the solar panels on the main roof space above the third floor level, and a smaller area above the second floor level to the rear.

97 As shown on the elevational plans the proposed solar panels would project slightly above the roofline of the building, however in reality the vast majority of views toward the building will be from ground level and it would be unlikely that any view of these panels would harm the appearance of the building or its wider setting.

98 The proposed panels would obviously provide wider benefits which would overcome any concern raised relating to visual appearance.


**Flood Risk**

100 As mentioned above, the Environment Agency supports the application provided the measures detailed within the submitted Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) are adhered to, and secured by way of condition, should consent be granted.

**Planning obligations (S.106 undertaking or agreement)**

101 As discussed above, the applicant has entered into a S.106 legal agreement exempting future occupiers from obtaining car parking permits.

**Sustainable development implications**

102 As discussed above.

**Other matters**

103 Residents have raised the issue of covenants, in particular that the land was historically gifted to the community, however, these are not material planning matters.

104 The subject site is not proposed as being Borough Open Land (BOL) within the proposed Core Strategy, and for that matter the site is not currently as BOL land. However it is important to note that a late submission was received, from a then Ward Councillor, within the recent Examination in Public proposing to the Planning Inspector that the land should be designated as such. Although the Council has not formally pursued such a designation itself.

105 The Inspector decision on the soundness and detail of the Core Strategy is still
awaited and may be issued in December 2010. Until this time the Core Strategy policies should be considered as currently having no weight when determining planning applications. Applications should continue to be determined pending receipt of the Inspector's report primarily in accordance with the saved policies in the Southwark Plan 2007 and the London Plan 2008.

Conclusion on planning issues

106 Overall, the Planning Inspectors decision regarding the similar development previously refused scheme (09-AP-1559) is a significant material consideration that needs to be taken into account, and for reasons further explored above, it is considered that the current amended application has sufficiently overcome the previous outstanding concerns and is now in compliance with the relevant policies of The Southwark Plan [UDP] 2007 and The London Plan, and should be granted on this basis, subject to conditions.

Community impact statement

107 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.

Consultations

108 Details of consultation and any re-consultation undertaken in respect of this application are set out in Appendix 1.

Consultation replies

109 Details of consultation responses received are set out in Appendix 2.

110 Summary of consultation responses

- The development will remove one of the only green spaces along Walworth Road and this should be retained, as it provides much needed amenity space and the green space is believed to have been covenanted to the public. This public space and its historic character will be lost forever. The Council should compulsory purchase the property to retain public access to the amenity space, contributing to the public realm. The greenspace contributes to a sense of local identity.

- A detailed archaeological study is required to ensure there is no loss of remains.

- The design does not relate to the immediate context and is lacking in all aspects, there is no architectural relations with adjoining buildings, and the scale and massing show no respect to neighbouring properties. The scheme is overdevelopment.

- Loss of view of a historic building (Old Police Station).

- Further information is required regarding servicing and construction management

- The development is an overdevelopment with too many residential units within this space.

- There will be no car parking provided and there will be further pressure placed on the already strained residents car parking within the area.
• There are too many fast food takeaways within the area, in particular A3 class shops, with many struggling to pay rent.

• There will be noise and refuse pollution from the development.

• The development would remove the protected trees from the site.

Human rights implications

111 This planning application engages certain human rights under the Human Rights Act 2008 (the HRA). The HRA prohibits unlawful interference by public bodies with conventions rights. The term ‘engage’ simply means that human rights may be affected or relevant.

112 This application has the legitimate aim of providing a mixed use development at the site including housing. The rights potentially engaged by this application, including the right to a fair trial and the right to respect for private and family life are not considered to be unlawfully interfered with by this proposal.
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APPENDIX 1

Consultation undertaken

Site notice date:
20 October 2010

Press notice date:
21 October 2010

Case officer site visit date:
20 October 2010

Neighbour consultation letters sent:
21 October 2010

Internal services consulted:
Archaeological Officer
Arboricultural Officer
Access Officer
Design and Conservation Officer
Environmental Protection
Metropolitan Police
Transportation Team
Waste Management

Statutory and non-statutory organisations consulted:
Environment Agency
Transport for London

Neighbours and local groups consulted:

Neighbour Consultee List for Application Reg. No. 10-AP-2796

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TP No</th>
<th>App. Type</th>
<th>Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TP/1065-292</td>
<td>Full Planning Permission</td>
<td>292 WALWORTH ROAD, LONDON, SE17 2TE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Printed</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21/10/2010</td>
<td>4 SUTHERLAND WALK LONDON SE17 3EF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/10/2010</td>
<td>36 SUTHERLAND WALK LONDON SE17 3EF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/10/2010</td>
<td>5 SUTHERLAND WALK LONDON SE17 3EF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/10/2010</td>
<td>7 SUTHERLAND WALK LONDON SE17 3EF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/10/2010</td>
<td>6 SUTHERLAND WALK LONDON SE17 3EF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/10/2010</td>
<td>35 SUTHERLAND WALK LONDON SE17 3EF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/10/2010</td>
<td>30 SUTHERLAND WALK LONDON SE17 3EF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/10/2010</td>
<td>2 SUTHERLAND WALK LONDON SE17 3EF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/10/2010</td>
<td>31 SUTHERLAND WALK LONDON SE17 3EF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/10/2010</td>
<td>34 SUTHERLAND WALK LONDON SE17 3EF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/10/2010</td>
<td>32 SUTHERLAND WALK LONDON SE17 3EF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/10/2010</td>
<td>16 ABBEY COURT MACLEOD STREET LONDON SE17 3HA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/10/2010</td>
<td>15 ABBEY COURT MACLEOD STREET LONDON SE17 3HA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/10/2010</td>
<td>17 ABBEY COURT MACLEOD STREET LONDON SE17 3HA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2

Consultation responses received

Internal services

Archaeological Officer - requested that an archaeological evaluation is undertaken prior to determination, however this is unable to be undertaken given the restricted timeframe for meeting statutory targets and having the application heard at Community Council. For this reason conditions are recommended to be imposed requiring that such evaluation is undertaken with details submitted to the LPA for approval prior to any works commencing on site.

Arboricultural Officer - does not object to the development provided suitable conditions are imposed to facilitate protection of the TMO trees.

Access Officer - the dwelling conforms to lifetime homes standard and Part M of the Building Regulations, so there is no objection in this regard.

Design and Conservation Officer - had previous concerns with the development although the Planning Inspector's decision is a material consideration which has accepted the bulk, scale and design of the building. See above for further considerations.

Environmental Protection - have no great concerns with either the Environmental Noise Survey or Air Quality Assessment, but have requested a condition is imposed requiring a suitable internal ambient noise level within the residential units.

Metropolitan Police - no issues.

Transportation Team - in principle supports the scheme, although condition further details regarding cycle and waste storage to be provided, in addition to a service management plan. Refer to considerations above for further information.

Waste Management - no response received.

Statutory and non-statutory organisations

Environment Agency - supports the application provided the measures detailed within the submitted Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) are adhered to, and secured by way of condition.

Transport for London - supports the scheme provided there is a Delivery and Servicing Plan for both the residential and commercial elements is provided, in addition to a Construction Management Plan and Construction Logistics Plan.

Neighbours and local groups

A total of 22 letters of objection have been received from the follow:

- No address given x 4
- 29, 30, 31, 36, 48 and 60 Sutherland Square
- 34 Sutherland Walk
- 302 Walworth Road
The reasons for objection are summarised as follows:

- The development will remove one of the only green spaces along Walworth Road and this should be retained, as it provides much needed amenity space and the green space is believed to have been covenanted to the public. This public space and its historic character will be lost forever. The Council should compulsory purchase the property to retain public access to the amenity space, contributing to the public realm. The greenspace contributes to a sense of local identity.

- A detailed archaeological study is required to ensure there is no loss of remains.

- The design does not relate to the immediate context and is lacking in all aspects, there is no architectural relations with adjoining buildings, and the scale and massing show no respect to neighbouring properties. The scheme is overdevelopment.

- Loss of view of a historic building (Old Police Station).

- Further information is required regarding servicing and construction management

- The development is an overdevelopment with too many residential units within this space.

- There will be no car parking provided and there will be further pressure placed on the already strained residents car parking within the area.

- There are too many fast food takeaways within the area, in particular A3 class shops, with many struggling to pay rent.

- There will be noise and refuse pollution from the development.

- The development would remove the protected trees from the site.