

<b>Item No.</b> 6.1	<b>Classification:</b> Open	<b>Date:</b> 8 September 2011	<b>Meeting Name:</b> Camberwell Community Council
<b>Report title:</b>	<b>Development Management planning application:</b> Application 11-AP-1676 for: Full Planning Permission  <b>Address:</b> SOUTHWARK TRAINING CENTRE, MAUDSLEY HOSPITAL CAMPUS, DENMARK HILL, LONDON, SE5 8AZ  <b>Proposal:</b> Redevelopment of the site to include the erection of a part three, part four storey learning centre (Use Class D1) with associated landscaping, cycling and parking facilities and removal of eight trees.		
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>	Brunswick Park		
<b>From:</b>	Head of Development Management		
<b>Application Start Date</b> 24 May 2011		<b>Application Expiry Date</b> 23 August 2011	

## RECOMMENDATION

- 1 Grant Planning Permission subject to Legal Agreement.

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

### Site location and description

- 2 The application site comprises a vacant two storey hexagonal building relating to Maudsley Hospital, fronting onto Grove Lane, and also accessed via walkways leading from Windsor Walk and Denmark Hill from Kings College hospital campus. The previous use of the building was as a training centre for staff and users of the hospital, and provided 1147sqm of floorspace within D1 Use Class (non-residential institution). It sits within a landscaped area with car park with 18 spaces, on its northern edge. The site has a generally unkempt appearance, due to a temporary fence facing onto Grove Lane, and unmanaged lawns and pathways.
- 3 Kings College and Maudsley Hospital campuses are to the south and west of the site, with Lyndhurst Primary School to the north. Two and three storey residential properties are on the east side of Grove Lane, 83 being a grade II listed building. The site is located within the Camberwell Grove Conservation Area.
- 4 The site is located within the Urban Density Zone and Air Quality Management Area, has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 4. The site is within a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ).

### Details of proposal

- 5 SLAM (South London and Maudsley NHS Trust Charitable Funds) wish to demolish the existing two storey Southwark Training Centre, and replace it with a new four storey building, of 1550sqm floorspace within the same use class, D1 (non residential

institutions) to include teaching spaces, shared spaces for meetings and interaction between members of staff, potential for community facilities, learning resources, and office and administration space. There would also be an ancillary cafe.

- 6 The building would be positioned 12m in from the Grove Lane Boundary of the site, 2m further back than the current building. There would be four level entry points, the main entrance would be through a foyer, set in to the south eastern corner of the new building. There would be a controlled access point from Grove Lane, closed between 7.30pm and 7am with video/voice control. There would be a level entry from the main Maudsley Campus and Windsor Walk, towards the rear (west) of the site, along a new tree lined avenue.
- 7 There would be parking spaces for 10 cars, of which 2 will be blue badge bays. There would be 16 cycle parking spaces.
- 8 The building would be constructed from brick, and the facades would have simple vertical and horizontal proportions. The building's floorplates would be split across a central void, internally, both to reflect the natural topography of the site, and to result in an open circulation space within the building. There would a roof terrace at upper first floor level facing west (into the campus). At upper second floor level (equivalent of fourth floor level) there would be a roof garden facing north.
- 9 The facility is proposed to operate within the following hours:  
Monday to Friday: 07:00 to 21:00  
Saturday: 08:00 to 21:00  
Sunday: 10:00 to 18:00.
- 10 The proposal includes the removal of eight trees, and planting of approximately 24 new trees, to the car park, new avenue to Windsor Walk and the Grove Lane frontage.
- 11 The application is accompanied by an application for Conservation Area consent.
- 12 Documents submitted in support of the application are as follows:
  - Sustainability Assessment
  - BREEAM Assessment
  - Ecological Assessment
  - Bat Survey
  - Statement of Consultation
  - Design and Access statement
  - Statement of Community Involvement
  - Historic Environment Assessment
  - Transport Assessment
  - Travel Plan
  - Tree Survey
  - Site Waste Management Plan
  - Planning Obligations Statement

- Method Statement (for the CAC application)
- Summary Report

### **Planning history**

- 13 10-EQ-0181: A pre-application proposal was submitted in respect of a masterplan for the redevelopment of the Maudsley Hospital campus. Advice was that whilst this document would have no formal weight in planning terms, it would be used to provide an overall strategy for the redevelopment of each parcel of land that comes forward for the site. The advice provided by officers highlighted that the piecemeal development of the Maudsley has led to poor permeability in and around the site. Opportunities for the site were therefore seen to be improving circulation and providing a hierarchy of clearly defined spaces, Windsor Walk being mentioned as one of the routes into the campus. A commitment to reinforcing boundaries fronting Grove Lane, Love Walk, Windsor Walk and De Crespigny Park was highlighted, as well as a desire that each individual parcel coming forward for redevelopment should be capable of being developed independently of the others. Four storeys was seen as an appropriate height for development provided that this is balanced by a proportionate public realm. The aim of the Masterplan would be to improve permeability across the campus, and visibility of mental health issues, it was therefore seen important to develop a palette of facade materials carefully chosen to reflect the character and appearance of the sub-area of the conservation area, the dominant material being brick.
- 14 10-AP-2907: Screening opinion issued on 29/10/10, which concluded that an Environmental Impact Assessment would not be required for the site.
- 15 11-AP-1677: Accompanying application for conservation area consent.

### **Planning history of adjoining sites**

- 16 United reform church proposal, 11-AP-1561 (Full planning) and 11-AP-1562 (Conservation area consent).  
Planning permission was granted with a Grampian condition to exempt future occupants from obtaining car parking permits, on 21st July 2011. The development was for demolition of existing church building and perimeter hardstanding and steel fence and erection of 8 x 3 bedroom apartments in four-storey block along Grove Lane, with 3 storey 4-bed house on corner (Use Class C3) and erection of 2-storey church and community hall building on Love Walk (Use Class D1).

## **KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

### **Summary of main issues**

- 17 The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:
- a) Principle of development in terms of land use.
  - b) Acceptability of the scheme in terms of its design, impact on the streetscene and in the context of the hospital campus, on the character and appearance of the conservation area, and on the setting of the nearby listed buildings.
  - c) Impact of the new development on the amenity of nearby residents and occupiers.
  - d) Transport issues.
  - e) Tree and biodiversity issues.

- f) Sustainability issues.
- g) Planning Obligations.

## **Planning policy**

### Core Strategy 2011

- 18 Strategic Policy 1 – Sustainable development
- Strategic Policy 2 – Sustainable transport
- Strategic Policy 4 – Places to learn and enjoy
- Strategic Policy 11 – Open spaces and wildlife
- Strategic Policy 12 – Design and conservation
- Strategic Policy 13 – High environmental standards

### Southwark Plan 2007 (July) - saved policies

- 19 2.1 Enhancement of community facilities
- 2.2 Provision of new community facilities
- 2.4 Educational Deficiency - provision of new educational establishments
- 2.5 Planning Obligations
- 3.3 Sustainability Assessment
- 3.12 Quality in Design
- 3.15 Conservation of the Historic Environment
- 3.16 Conservation Areas
- 3.17 Listed Buildings
- 3.18 Setting of Listed Buildings, conservation areas and World Heritage Sites.
- 3.3 Sustainability Assessment
- 3.11 Efficient Use of Land
- 3.13 Urban Design
- 5.2 Transport Impacts
- 5.3 Walking and Cycling
- 5.6 Car Parking

### London Plan 2011

- 20 Policy 1.1 Delivering the strategic vision and objectives for London
- Policy 3.9 Mixed and balanced communities
- Policy 3.18 Education facilities
- Policy 5.1 Climate change mitigation
- Policy 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
- Policy 5.3 Sustainable design and construction
- Policy 5.7 Renewable energy
- Policy 6.3 Assessing effects of development on transport capacity
- Policy 6.9 Cycling
- Policy 6.10 Walking
- Policy 6.13 Parking
- Policy 7.2 An inclusive environment
- Policy 7.3 Designing out crime
- Policy 7.4 Local character
- Policy 7.5 Public realm
- Policy 7.6 Architecture
- Policy 7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology

Policy 7.19 Biodiversity and access to nature  
Policy 7.21 Trees and woodlands  
Policy 8.2 Planning obligations

Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) and Planning Policy Statements (PPS)

- 21 PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development.  
PPS5: Planning for the Historic Environment.  
PPG 9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation.  
Ministerial Statement: Planning for Growth, March 2011

**Principle of development**

- 22 The principle is acceptable in land use terms as the use will not be taken out of the existing D1 (non-residential institution) use. The proposed facility will open out the use of the building to other community groups, and other external organisations. Facilities within the building include exhibition/lecture/meeting space, Wi-Fi access, cafe, seminar/meeting spaces and external landscape.
- 23 This complies with policy 2.2 which states that:  
*"planning permission will be granted for new community facilities, provided:*  
*i) provision is made to enable the facility to be used by all members of the community; and*  
*ii) the facility is not detrimental to the present and future occupiers of the surrounding area, in accordance with policies 3.2 (protection of Amenity) and 5.2 (Transport Impacts); and*  
*iii) where developments would generate over 20 vehicular trips at any one time, a Transport Assessment will be required in accordance with policies 3.3 (Sustainability Assessment) and 5.2."*
- 24 The proposal also complies with policy 2.4, which states that:  
*"planning permission will be granted for new educational establishments, especially in areas of demonstrated educational deficiency, provided:*  
*i) opportunities are taken wherever possible to ensure that provision is made to enable the facility to be used by all members of the community."*

**Environmental impact assessment**

- 25 None required due to the nature and size of the scheme which does not fall within Schedule 1 and is below the relevant thresholds for Schedule 2 development, being less than 0.5ha in area and as it is not within a sensitive area and would not generate significant environmental impacts in this urbanised location.

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

Impact of proposed building on residential properties opposite the site.

- 26 The front facade facing Grove Lane would be located 25m away from the front facades of those nearest residential properties opposite the site on Grove Lane. This would allow the scheme to comply with the minimum standard as set out in residential design guidelines, of a distance of 12m between front facing windows (although this applies to residential development it may be used as a guideline to demonstrate that the scheme would not result in undue overlooking.) This distance is considered sufficient such that the scheme would not result in undue overlooking. The proposed

building is positioned so that it is within the centre of its site, set more towards the rear of the site than the existing building. Furthermore the floorplan is such that the central windows in the front elevation relate to the stairwell, views across the road from the facility would therefore be limited to the far sides of the building, and would be further blocked by the proposed trees.

- 27 The north facing roof terrace proposed at upper second floor level would look over the playground to Lyndhurst primary school, albeit screened behind pillars. Due to the distance of the terrace from the boundary, (17m), it is not considered that detrimental overlooking would occur to the playground.

#### Daylight and Sunlight

- 28 A BRE test was applied in respect of a 25° line being taken from the ground floor windows of properties on the eastern side of Grove Lane, on a section drawing, and the line was not intercepted by the development. Due to the set back of the proposed building into the site, no significant loss of daylight or sunlight would be inflicted on these properties.

#### Access

- 29 The access to the site would be improved by the proposal, and would include a route through the campus to Windsor Walk. This is in accordance with aspirations for the site as set out in the response to the Masterplan proposal, and would encourage a greater transparency and permeability within the site.

#### Hours of operation

- 30 The hours of operation are proposed to be Monday to Friday: 07:00 to 21:00, Saturday: 08:00 to 21:00, and Sunday: 10:00 to 18:00. It is not envisaged that this would result in undue disturbance as a result in activity taking place on site. The transport statement asserts that the main users of the facility would be SLAM staff, already located on site who can therefore walk to the facility. The Travel Plan data concludes that the facility would generate 178 arrivals and 178 departures per day (an increase of 128 compared with the existing facility). 78% of these would be travelling to the facility by non-car modes. Any activity experienced at 21:00 when people are leaving would therefore be predominantly non-car modes.

- 31 Conditions.  
It is considered that conditions requiring details on the following shall be imposed:
- mechanical ventilation.
  - flue design.
  - restriction on noise levels when measured from the nearest noise sensitive premises.
  - restriction within use class to preclude nurseries and churches from the D1 use, as these typically result in high traffic levels.

- 32 The proposal complies with SP13 High Environmental Standards, and saved policy 3.2 Protection of Amenity.

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

- 33 None envisaged as the neighbouring sites are already predominantly in community or institutional use, and through conditions, any impacts on nearest residents should be adequately mitigated such that complaints do not arise.

## Traffic issues

34 The Travel Plan and Transport Statement present data on the modal split for the existing and proposed facility. As stated in the amenity section, most of the users of the facility are anticipated to be those staff already at the Maudsley or Kings College Hospitals, and proposed limitations on eligibility for the controlled parking zone coupled with good public transport options in the locality should serve to ensure that car trips to the site will be minimised.

### 35 **Policy 5.3 (Cycle Storage)**

Table 15.4, the Southwark Plan has no standards for D1 uses. In these instances the level of cycle usage is expected to be taken as a base line figure and then increased to encourage cycling. The proposed development has suggested that there will be 16 covered Sheffield stands for visitors/ students and three separate internal secure cycle parking spaces for staff. The travel plan also suggest that the level of cycle usage will be monitored and should there be a high level of cycling recorded a suitable level of cycle parking shall be installed.

### Car Parking

### 36 **Policy 5.6 (Car Parking)**

Southwark Council has no parking standards for D1 uses and standards are applied flexibly, on an individual basis. Parking provision must be justified within the submitted Transport Assessment. The existing building has 18 car parking spaces. The proposed development has proposed a reduction to ten car parking spaces (two of which are disabled spaces). The council welcomes the reduction in off street car parking in association with the proposed development. The submitted transport statement suggests that a reduction in off street parking facilities will generate a significant modal shift towards sustainable modes of travel.

37 The proposal site is situated in a CPZ. Therefore, in order to prevent possible overspill parking from the development, the applicant has agreed to an exclusion of any occupiers of this development being eligible for on-street parking permits. In order that the Traffic Management Order can be changed, a sum of £2,750 must be secured from the applicant for the costs associated with amending the Traffic Management Order, either through a S106 agreement, unilateral undertaking or Grampian condition.

38 The exemption of the development from the CPZ will mitigate against over spill parking by the development in CPZ operational times while the use of the car park during non CPZ operation times will mitigate against the developments impact on on-street parking stress out side of CPZ operation hours, and towards the peak times of residential parking demand.

39 The Sustainable Transport SPD Section 8.3 states:

40 “People living or working in a new development will be unable to park on the street in a Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs). This will be controlled through a s106 planning agreement which prevents people living or working in the development from applying for an on-street parking permit.”

### Disabled parking

41 Policy 5.7 (Parking for Disabled and the Mobility Impaired)

the proposed development has provided two disabled parking spaces. This level of disabled parking provision is in line with Policy 5.7 of the Southwark Plan.

42 The bays adhere to the dimensions as stated by the DfT in *Parking for Disabled People*.

### Service Access

- 43 The applicants have interrogated trip generation data bases to ascertain the level of service vehicle movement by the proposed development. Trip generation data bases suggest that there will be 1-2 delivery vehicles servicing the development each day. This level of service vehicle movement will not impact negatively on the performance or safety of the surrounding highway network or differ from existing vehicle movements currently experienced.
- 44 At present the site is serviced from an off street location. The transport statement suggests that the proposed site will also be serviced from an off street location within a close proximity to the development
- 45 The exiting one way service route will continue to be used in association with the above application.
- 46 Swept path analysis has show that an emergency vehicle and 7.5t service vehicle can enter and exit the development in a forward gear.

### Trip Generation

- 47 Trip generation information has been submitted in the transport statement.
- 48 An expected 128 further trips per day will be associated with the proposed development. Trip generation data suggest that of these 128 further trips 40% of these trips will be by existing Maudsley/Kings staff. The trip generation data bases have suggested that 21 cars will be generated by these 128 trips, however with a robust travel plan in place, CPZ exemption and limited off street parking, this level of private vehicle trip generation will be significantly lower once the development is operational.
- 49 The above mentioned factors (CPZ exemption, no off street parking and a robust travel plan) are suitable mitigation measures to encourage modal shift towards sustainable modes of transport.
- 50 In response to the objection regarding impacts of construction service vehicles on the surrounding street, it has been suggested that in order to make turns into Grove Lane and the application site, temporary removal of approximately four residents parking bays would be required. The applicant would need to apply to the Highways department for any such alterations, via a s278 agreement. A clause to ensure the applicant enters into such an agreement shall be written into the s106.
- 51 A Construction Management Plan shall be requested as a condition so that the type of vehicles and their routes to the site are able to be assessed.

It is considered that the development is in accordance with saved policy 5.2 Transport Impacts, and SP2 Sustainable Transport.

### **Design issues and Impact on character and setting of a listed building and conservation area**

- 52 The context, while entirely within the Camberwell Grove Conservation Area, is very varied in terms of character and urban grain. The site faces onto Grove Lane, the western side of which is notable for its larger scale buildings that often sit in some isolation and set-back from the street frontage; the eastern side in comparison is generally one of consistent Georgian and Victorian terraces fronting onto the streetscape. Maudsley Campus itself is a self-contained block within the conservation

area and is a collection of hospital/academic buildings of varying architectural quality; the Camberwell Grove Conservation Area Appraisal notes that the existing building is not a 'key unlisted' building that makes a positive contribution to the area.

- 53 The Maudsley Campus is currently developing a new masterplan, which the re-development of this site should carefully consider. This includes for 'boulevards' running east-west across the campus, and these would be to the north and south of the site with openings onto Grove Lane. That to the north remains as the eastern vehicular entrance to the campus, and that to the south is to be demarcated by an avenue of trees; both routes also facilitate pedestrian access points.
- 54 Saved Policy 3.13 Urban design requires that the height, scale and massing of buildings should be appropriate to the local context and should not dominate its surroundings inappropriately. The urban structure, space and movement of a proposal should have regard to the existing urban grain, development patterns and density in the layout of development sites. Proposals should also be designed with regard to their local context, making a positive contribution to the character of the area's townscape and providing active frontages.
- 55 The proposal takes advantage of the site sloping down from south to north, by having a split-level approach with three-storey on the upper and four-storey on the lower section; this height is considered to be responsive to the general context, slightly lower than adjacent buildings on the campus and matching the eaves-level on the Windsor Walk block. The height is only marginally taller than the terraced housing opposite. In terms of massing the proposal forms a simple rectangular block, with articulation expressed by the emphasised structural framing (of the split-level) and the regular fenestration grid. Set within open space, the building has a certain villa-like quality, in a vaguely neo-classical style, and in materials which we consider to be an appropriate response to the area's character and urban grain.
- 56 The site layout should organise the optimum building location, public spaces, microclimate, and outlook, site access and servicing, permeability, safety and ease of movement including vehicular, pedestrians and cyclists. The site layout is as simple and rational as the building design, with car and cycle parking on the existing northern access route, and three building access points at the building's southern end. Of particular importance will be the quality of the boundary treatment, which will be conditioned for detailed approval.
- 57 Where appropriate, developments should include landscape design that enhances the area and biodiversity, for example through the use of green roofs. Much of the site layout is informed/determined by the existing mature trees on the site, with more tree-planting to augment these, all of which should provide considerable environmental enhancement to the context. An area of the flat-roof is also proposed to be planted with green-roofing. To the front of the application site, a wedge of public realm is created by widening the pavement; details of this and other landscaping materials/details should be conditioned.
- 58 Saved Policy 3.12 Quality in design requires that developments should achieve a high quality of both architectural and urban design, enhancing the quality of the built environment in order to create attractive, high amenity environments people will choose to live in, work in and visit. New buildings and alterations to existing buildings should embody a creative and high quality appropriate design solution, specific to their site's shape, size, location and development opportunities and where applicable, preserving or enhancing the historic environment.
- 59 The form of the building has proposed a very simple form and elevational treatment, which expresses the concrete frame in strong horizontal bands at split floor-levels and

a secondary system of vertical ribs to set the regular pattern of window-openings/solid-panels. Key to the success of this proposal will be the quality of detailing and materials, particularly the brickwork infill panels; a mock-up panel of concrete framing and brickwork will be required on-site for conditioned approval.

- 60 The boundary treatment to Grove Lane will also be a crucial element for this proposal, as its positioning set-back from the street-edge reduces the building's direct impact on the street-scape; sample panels will also be required on site for the brickwork boundary walling, as well as details of this and the gates.

- 61 Saved Policy 3.15 Conservation of the historic environment requires development to preserve or enhance the special interest or historic character or appearance of buildings or areas of historical or architectural significance. Planning proposals that have an adverse effect on the historic environment will not be permitted. The character and appearance of conservation areas should be recognised and respected in any new development within these areas.

- 62 Saved Policy 3.16 Conservation areas requires that development should preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area. New development, including alterations and extensions, must:
- i. Respect the context of the conservation area, having regard to the content of Conservation Area Appraisals and other adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance / Documents; and
  - ii. Use high quality materials that complement and enhance the conservation area; and
  - iii. Do not involve the loss of existing traditional features of interest which make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the Conservation Area; and
  - iv. Do not introduce design details or features that are out of character with the area, such as the use of windows and doors made of aluminium, uPVC or other non-traditional materials.

- 63 The demolition of the existing building is not viewed as problematic in any way, as this is not of an architectural quality that makes a positive contribution to the conservation area. The replacement building is considered to be of a high architectural quality, unobtrusive and simple in style, and of a contemporary design that we consider to be an enhancement to the general townscape.

- 64 Due to the development being of an appropriate design, it is not considered that it would harm the setting of the nearby Listed Building at Cliftoville (83 Grove Lane), and the development complies with the provisions of saved policy 3.18, which states that planning permission would not be granted for developments that do not preserve or enhance the immediate or wider setting of a listed building.

- 65 Strategic Policy 12 – Design and conservation of Core Strategy 2011, requires that development will achieve the highest possible standards of design for buildings and public spaces to help create attractive and distinctive places which are safe, easy to get around and a pleasure to be in. We will do this by:
1. Expecting development to conserve or enhance the significance of Southwark's heritage assets, their settings and wider historic environment, including conservation areas, archaeological priority zones and sites, listed and locally listed buildings, registered parks and gardens, world heritage sites and scheduled monuments.

- 66 Policy HE7.2 of PPS5 requires that in considering the impact of a proposal on any heritage asset, local planning authorities should take into account the particular nature of the significance of the heritage asset and the value that it holds for this and future generations. This understanding should be used by the local planning authority to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect

of the proposals.

On this site, it is considered that the consistency and quality of the Grove Lane frontage/streetscape is the particular nature of the conservation area's significance, and this includes the mature trees on/around the site. While the quality of the proposed building is the largest issue, this does sit within the campus, and the boundary treatment and landscaping/trees will be vital to reduce any conflict with the heritage asset's significance.

Conditions to require samples of the materials to be used in the permission shall be imposed.

### **Impact on trees**

- 67 The applicant has submitted an Arboricultural Report which explains which trees are proposed for removal from the site and protection measures for any trees retained or affected by damage that could result during construction.
- 68 Protection measures are well designed and include the installation of no-dig surfaces for plant access and hand digging elsewhere for utilities. These will allow construction to proceed with minimal risk of damage during development. The tree protection method statement follows site management processes described in BS 5837 Trees in relation to construction.
- 69 The proposal will result in the loss of eight medium to large sized trees to facilitate development. These are considered to be of poor to medium amenity value and hence suitable for removal should acceptable mitigation be provided via replacement of canopy cover.
- 70 The trees which are of greatest significance and provide the most contribution to amenity are Sycamores (T21 to T25) to the front of Grove Lane and the large Limes (T16 & T17) to the rear. The Sycamores are growing in a characteristic multistemmed arrangement forming a coherent group which is redolent of their natural self-seeded origin. They perform a highly valuable function as a screen to the adjacent school and housing opposite whilst also providing a suitable setting for the conservation area which is characterised by avenues and mature garden trees.
- 71 The Lime trees form a pair either side of the access road. These are large and stately specimens which form a gateway into the centre of the hospital complex and help to demarcate the separate service areas.
- 72 Trees proposed for removal include trees T18, T19, T26 to T28 inclusive, T37 and T38.
- 73 Tree T18 is a twin stemmed semi-mature Willow located in close proximity to the existing block. It has a strongly included branch union at the base, which together with its leaning growth habit, represents a defect due to the likelihood of stem failure and collapse. Similarly, Sycamore T19 is notable for closely spaced stems and pockets of decay throughout the crown where this has been severely and poorly reduced. However, this is a large tree with a significantly sized canopy which contributes both to the group of better quality Sycamores and to the setting of the conservation area. The proposed replacement with large specimen trees at this location is therefore appropriate.
- 74 Trees T26 to T28 form a small group of semi-mature Limes and Cherry. The Cherry is of poor quality and form due to removal of a central structural limb. The remaining Lime trees are small sized and suitable for replacement with similar sized specimens.

- 75 The remaining Sycamore trees T37 and T38 are of poor quality and located to the rear of the site providing less contribution to screening or amenity. Although these may potentially be retained their location is not suitable in relation to the proposed new avenue planting shown within the landscape plan.
- 76 Apart from two large specimens planted as replacements for T19, this shows five new trees adjacent to the Sycamore group, a new semi-mature tree in replacement of the Lime group, a replacement for the Willow to the rear, six new trees within the car park area and ten new trees to form an avenue.
- 77 The avenue planting is a continuation of this new landscape feature joining the centre of the hospital and serves to provide a new green link and access across the campus, including a pocket square. Overall, the landscape is of design merit and successfully mitigates the proposed tree removal via the use of appropriately spaced formal and more naturalistic tree planting. A significant number of additional trees are to be planted which together with the associated soft and hard landscaping and boundary treatments will enhance the setting of the conservation area.
- 78 Conditions on tree protection measures shall be imposed, as well as on replacement species to be agreed.

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

- 79 Circular 5/05 Planning Obligations states that planning obligations must be
- relevant to planning,
  - Necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms,
  - directly related to the proposed development,
  - fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development,
  - reasonable in all other aspects.
- 80 The applicant is a charitable organisation attached to the Maudsley hospital, and results in an uplift of approximately 400sqm D1 floorspace. Technically, the standard toolkit Heads of Terms may not be calculated for this size or use, however due to the fact that a new building of approximately 1500sqm floorspace is being provided, some payments are to be secured as set out here.
- 81 Employment during construction  
The construction for the new Learning Centre will be tendered. The Trust requires that the appointed contractor use at least two apprentices either in trade or management roles. This is to be written into the s106 as a standard clause, which requires the developer to provide details to the Council regarding apprenticeships.

#### Transport

- 82 The Council is implementing works around Denmark Hill station, which will complement the upgrade works that Network Rail are currently undertaking to Denmark Hill. A sum of £22,000 will therefore be put towards the pedestrian improvements in the vicinity, namely, a crossing on Champion Park which has recently been upgraded, with an overspend of £30,000. For the purposes of the Council's standard s.106 toolkit, the sum of £22,000 was calculated based on floorspace of an equivalent B1 development.

#### Public Realm

- 83 No improvements to the public realm are considered necessary as a result of the application proposals. The footpath along Grove Lane is to be widened as a result of the hard landscaping in this location, as well as improved circulation routes through the hospital delivered through this scheme and the wider masterplan area.

- 84 A contribution of £2,750 will also be made to change the Traffic Management Order to exempt future occupants from obtaining car parking permits in the Controlled Parking Zone.

#### Community Facilities

- 85 The facility is proposed to replace an existing facility. Part of the proposal is to extend the opportunities for the building to be used by the local community.
- 86 These obligations are considered to be in accordance with policy and National Legislation, and are proportionate to the development in order to mitigate the impacts arising.

#### **Sustainable development implications**

- 87 The development incorporates areas of green roofing and PV panels to the roof. The PV panels would part power a Close Loop ground source heat pump. These measures would enable the development to achieve a 20% reduction in carbon emissions, in accordance with London Plan Policy 5.7, Renewable energy .

#### 88 BREEAM

Although the development is only required to achieve 'Very Good', by the Core Strategy policy SP13 High Environmental Standards, the pre-assessment reports that it would in fact achieve 'Excellent' rating.

#### **Other matters**

#### Ecology Issues

- 89 The bat surveys are consistent with best practice.  
The bat surveys show bats are commuting across the site from Windsor walk and there are no bats recorded roosting in the existing building.  
There is however evidence of a historical roost in the Training Centre. This appears to have been lost when insulation works were done about 5 years ago.
- 90 The new planting will benefit wildlife and probably help foraging bats.
- 91 Two conditions are recommended.
- 92 1, That 8 bat bricks or bat chimneys are built into the new building this is to replace the lost roost. The condition is supported by planning policy 3.28.  
The developer should work with the bat conservation trust or the London bat group to establish the best locations for the new bat features.
- 93 2, The lighting is designed to retain the dark corridor from Windsor Walk to Grove Lane. This is to avoid disturbance to the bat commuting route.  
Lighting of the new bat features must be avoided.

#### **Conclusion on planning issues**

- 94 The development would deliver a high quality replacement facility on site, which would provide additional facilities to a wider group in the community. The development would also be in accordance with the Masterplan vision for the site and include routes through the hospital campus. No adverse amenity or transport impacts are envisaged, and sustainability measures demonstrate that the development could achieve a 20% reduction in carbon emissions.

## **Community impact statement**

95 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.

b) The issues relevant to particular communities/groups likely to be affected by the proposal have been identified.

c) The likely adverse or less good implications for any particular communities/groups have been also been discussed above.

## **Consultations**

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

## **Consultation replies**

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

## **Summary of consultation responses**

98 Concerns regarding design of the building, construction servicing, loss of trees, loss of privacy and loss of daylight and sunlight. Consultation responses are reported in full below.

## **Human rights implications**

99 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.

100 This application has the legitimate aim of providing a training centre facility in D1 use. 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.

## **SUPPLEMENTARY ADVICE FROM OTHER OFFICERS**

101 N/A.

## BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Site history file: TP/2511-C  Application file: 11-AP-1676  Southwark Local Development Framework and Development Plan Documents	Regeneration and Neighbourhoods Department 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2TZ	Planning enquiries telephone: 020 7525 5403 Planning enquiries email: <a href="mailto:planning.enquiries@southwark.gov.uk">planning.enquiries@southwark.gov.uk</a> Case officer telephone: 020 7525 5405 Council website: <a href="http://www.southwark.gov.uk">www.southwark.gov.uk</a>

## APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	Consultation undertaken
Appendix 2	Consultation responses received

## AUDIT TRAIL

<b>Lead Officer</b>	Gary Rice, Head of Development Management	
<b>Report Author</b>	Susannah Pettit, Planning Officer	
<b>Version</b>	Final	
<b>Dated</b>	16 August 2011	
<b>Key Decision</b>	No	
<b>CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER</b>		
<b>Officer Title</b>	<b>Comments Sought</b>	<b>Comments included</b>
Strategic Director of Communities, Law & Governance	No	No
Strategic Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods	Yes	Yes
Strategic Director of Environment and Housing	No	No
<b>Date final report sent to the Community Council Team</b>	26 August 2011	

## APPENDIX 1

### Consultation undertaken

- 101 **Site notice date:** 17/06/2011
- 102 **Press notice date:** 16/06/11
- 103 **Case officer site visit date:** 25/06/11 (unaccompanied)
- 104 **Neighbour consultation letters sent:** 16/06/11

#### Internal services consulted:

- 105 Design and Conservation Team  
Urban Forester  
Environmental Protection Team  
Transport Planning  
Ecology Officer  
Waste Management

#### Statutory and non-statutory organisations consulted:

- 106 None

#### Neighbours and local groups consulted:

- 107 83C GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SN  
FLAT 1 71 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SP  
FLAT 8 93 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SN  
FLAT 5 93 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SN  
FLAT 6 93 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SN  
FLAT 7 93 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SN  
FLAT 2 71 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SP  
FLAT 3 83A GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SN  
FLAT 4 83A GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SN  
FLAT 5 83A GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SN  
FLAT 2 83A GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SN  
77A GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SP  
FLAT 1 83A GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SN  
FLAT 4 93 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SN  
FLAT 2 HULL COURT GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SL  
FLAT 3 HULL COURT GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SL  
FLAT 4 HULL COURT GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SL  
FLAT 16 HULL COURT GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SL  
FLAT 13 HULL COURT GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SL  
FLAT 14 HULL COURT GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SL  
FLAT 15 HULL COURT GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SL  
FLAT 5 HULL COURT GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SL  
FLAT 1 93 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SN  
FLAT 2 93 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SN  
FLAT 3 93 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SN  
FLAT 9 HULL COURT GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SL  
FLAT 6 HULL COURT GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SL  
FLAT 7 HULL COURT GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SL  
FLAT 8 HULL COURT GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SL  
GROUND FLOOR FLAT 34 DE CRESPIGNY PARK LONDON SE5 8AB  
GROUND FLOOR FLAT 71A GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SP  
GROUND FLOOR FLAT 91 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SN  
BASEMENT FLAT 34 DE CRESPIGNY PARK LONDON SE5 8AB  
FIRST FLOOR AND SECOND FLOOR FLAT 71A GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SP  
FIRST FLOOR FLAT 34 DE CRESPIGNY PARK LONDON SE5 8AB  
FIRST FLOOR FLAT 91 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SN  
SECOND FLOOR FLAT 34 DE CRESPIGNY PARK LONDON SE5 8AB  
SECOND FLOOR FLAT 91 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SN

OFFICES ADJACENT DENMARK HILL RAILWAY STATION WINDSOR WALK LONDON SE5 8BB  
93 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SN  
FLAT 1 73A GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SP  
FLAT 2 69A GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SP  
FLAT 2 73A GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SP  
FLAT 1 69A GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SP  
FLAT 6 83A GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SN  
FLAT 7 83A GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SN  
FLAT 8 83A GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SN  
RESEARCH CENTRE 1-3 WINDSOR WALK LONDON SE5 8BB  
5 WINDSOR WALK LONDON SE5 8BB  
LYNDHURST GROVE PRIMARY SCHOOL GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SN  
75A GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SP  
4 WINDSOR WALK LONDON SE5 8BB  
16 WINDSOR WALK LONDON SE5 8BB  
THE PHEONIX WINDSOR WALK LONDON SE5 8BB  
FLAT 2 30-32 DE CRESPIGNY PARK LONDON SE5 8AB  
30-32 DE CRESPIGNY PARK LONDON SE5 8AB  
FLAT 10 30-32 DE CRESPIGNY PARK LONDON SE5 8AB  
FLAT 1 30-32 DE CRESPIGNY PARK LONDON SE5 8AB  
FLAT 1 HULL COURT GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SL  
FLAT 11 30-32 DE CRESPIGNY PARK LONDON SE5 8AB  
FLAT 6 30-32 DE CRESPIGNY PARK LONDON SE5 8AB  
FLAT 7 30-32 DE CRESPIGNY PARK LONDON SE5 8AB  
FLAT 8 30-32 DE CRESPIGNY PARK LONDON SE5 8AB  
FLAT 5 30-32 DE CRESPIGNY PARK LONDON SE5 8AB  
FLAT 12 30-32 DE CRESPIGNY PARK LONDON SE5 8AB  
FLAT 3 30-32 DE CRESPIGNY PARK LONDON SE5 8AB  
FLAT 4 30-32 DE CRESPIGNY PARK LONDON SE5 8AB  
FLAT A 5 GROVE LANE TERRACE GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SW  
FLAT B 5 GROVE LANE TERRACE GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SW  
6 GROVE LANE TERRACE GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SW  
4 GROVE LANE TERRACE GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SW  
1 GROVE LANE TERRACE GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SW  
2 GROVE LANE TERRACE GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SW  
3 GROVE LANE TERRACE GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SW  
7 GROVE LANE TERRACE GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SW  
FLAT 14 93 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SN  
FLAT 15 93 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SN  
FLAT 9 93 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SN  
FLAT 13 93 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SN  
FLAT 10 93 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SN  
FLAT 11 93 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SN  
FLAT 12 93 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SN  
FLAT 2 94 CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RF  
FLAT 3 94 CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RF  
FLAT 4 94 CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RF  
FLAT 1 94 CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RF  
81 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SP  
83 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SP  
FLAT 5 94 CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RF  
FLAT 10 HULL COURT GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SL  
FLAT 11 HULL COURT GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SL  
FLAT 12 HULL COURT GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SL  
96A CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RF  
FLAT 6 94 CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RF  
FLAT 7 94 CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RF  
FLAT 8 94 CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RF  
79 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SP  
96 CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RF  
98 CAMBERWELL GROVE LONDON SE5 8RF  
80 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SN  
16 DE CRESPIGNY PARK LONDON SE5 8AF  
FLAT 9 30-32 DE CRESPIGNY PARK LONDON SE5 8AB  
UNIT 2B 93 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SN  
85 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SN  
73 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SP  
75 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SP  
77 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SP  
69 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SP  
87 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SN  
89 GROVE LANE LONDON SE5 8SN  
204 Camberwell Grove London SE5 8RJ

**Re-consultation:**

108 N/A

## APPENDIX 2

### Consultation responses received

#### Internal services

- 109 Design and Conservation Team: Comments incorporated into report.  
Urban Forester: Comments incorporated into report.  
Environmental Protection Team: Request conditions on flue design, no amplified music, and that details of mechanical ventilation are submitted to and approved.  
Transport Planning : comments incorporated into report.  
Ecology Officer: Comments incorporated into report.  
Waste Management: No response.

#### Statutory and non-statutory organisations

- 110 N/A

#### Neighbours and local groups

- 111 83 Grove Lane: Objection

- The development proposes car parking spaces. Whilst I would support parking for those with disabilities, the site is located in an area well served by public transport. Grove Lane is a primarily residential road with a primary school nearby, and an increase in car traffic to the site would be undesirable from a safety point of view.

- The removal of eight trees will have a significant impact on CO2 emissions in an area with high pollution from traffic on Denmark Hill. I would urge closer consideration of the necessity of removing so many trees without due consideration for the health and wellbeing of residents in the area.

- The location of access to the site during construction is not mentioned in the application. Past developments saw 20 tonne trucks having to pass through De Crespigny Park due to the weight restrictions over Denmark Hill railway. The impact of this would be fourfold:

a) there is insufficient clearance for large vehicles to make a right turn unless residents' parking is removed.

b) this corner is the main crossing area for pedestrians going to Lyndhurst Primary School.

c) there is insufficient clearance for large vehicles to make a second right turn from Grove Lane to access the training centre site unless residents' parking is removed.

d) there has been damage to water pipes under Grove Lane recently due to heavy traffic accessing the Mary Datchelor site at the bottom of Grove Lane, as well as historically during the last development on this site, the damage is likely to be repeated.

I would therefore urge a reconsideration of access to the site during construction and whether it would be possible to find alternative access routes through De Crespigny Park which will have a less detrimental impact on the safety of local residents.

112 87 Grove Lane: objection.

- The site is within Grove Lane Conservation Area, and I find no sensitivity to that in the design of a building that would add another large building to the site, changing the feel and topography from a two storey building to a four storey building.
- There used to be a high rise nursing home on that hospital site, that was demolished. A new build of the size proposed just recreates the same high rise developments that blighted the site and the neighbours.

113 The consultation prior to the application being submitted, between SLAM and neighbouring residents, was poor, and the summaries of meetings do not accurately reflect my expressions and tone. This lack of transparent and ethical community engagement highlights the need to refuse this application until all are treated fairly, and all residents' views are considered, and problems solved.

The two day SLAM exhibition managed to attract only 75 visitors, of which 50 were staff.

The plan has failed to elicit significant local support and has treated local communication as a marketing campaign rather than a way to generate support and endorsement.

114 My main concerns are:

- The size of the building,
- office orientation of the building,
- Site Access management and the Maudsley Hospital security line.

115 - In the documents, there is no justification for the size increase. Why enlarge to a four storey building? How will training require this size and space? What is the rationale for the building to have an exterior terrace and walled garden that will have use for 6 months a year at best? I believe this building is creating a space with underused areas that add unnecessary volume and size to the building. These add to the impact on the conservation area.

116 - The current building is orientated to maximise privacy to neighbours at 83 to 91 Grove Lane, the homes nearest to the site. The new building has four floors making the building taller than the houses. The new building will overlook the homes. The new office windows will look directly into the windows of homes. Though trees are suggested to obstruct the views, I suggest planners find ways to place screens or shutters to windows to ensure light but retaining privacy to the nearest rooms. The houses would also lose light, but more importantly, privacy and seclusion.

117 - Site access management is a major issue that is not addressed. Though the architects report that the major access to the site is through the Maudsley site, the architects have placed a new gate directly opposite 87/89/91 Grove Lane. Therefore the architects wish to double the access to the site and this fails to reflect the changes in public transport facilities making access from Windsor Walk more important. The new SLAM plans show no improvements to reflect new access from the enhanced railway station access on Windsor Walk, which could make the journey between them more direct and fluid. This seems to show no connected planning from two adjacent SLAM developments to maximise easy access and communications from public transport facilities.

118 - The site access plans state that the gates will be locked from 7pm to 7:30am. In practice, the current gates that are part of the Maudsley Hospital Security Lines are closed at the weekend and do not reflect these times. This ambiguity must be removed.

- 119 - The architects access consultants show only the new gate being used by visiting delegates with flags of countries like USA and Brazil. There is no data to support the number or frequency of these visiting delegates to justify the need for a special gate open 52 weeks a year. This second gate is superfluous to the needs and the flow of staff and visitors to the site and planning permission should be withheld until this has been clarified.
- 120 - Currently the facility is not used at weekends. This new building and increase of access imply a change of use. This ambiguity needs to be clarified or planning permission refused. Weekend usage, late night usage and increased usage in general should be licensed and part of the planning consent. SLAM should make a commitment about the usage but it has not been addressed. This is the same community support and need claimed by the United Reform Church development in Grove Lane therefore the two sites could be meeting the same need as a basis for need for planning permission. No answers have been provided as to how the additional usage would be paid for and how secure it would be. This lack of fact based community need and community management resources means that the Council should ask for clarification before planning permission is granted.
- 121 - Smoking on site is currently banned. Therefore the gates opposite 87/89/912 will be turned into a smoking area, meaning increased litter and people smoking and looking directly into people's homes.
- 122 - It was suggested that additional pedestrian access to the site from Grove Lane should be through the walled garden. Placing the access away from 83c/85/87/89 Grove Lane and ensuring that the garden was used every day the centre was open. However the internal design group rejected this with no formal reason or communication.

#### 83c Grove Lane: Objection

- 123 I second the views in the objection above, and also I am quite opposed to what is being applied for, namely a four storey building to replace what appears to be a more than adequate to its purpose existing structure, blocking out light and invading privacy and being unsympathetic in design to the surrounding conservation area.

#### 91 Grove Lane: Objection

- 124 - The design of the proposed building does not preserve the aesthetic appeal of the neighbourhood. Adding another building to the site would change the way the area looks and feels. A four storey building would dramatically alter the site to one of many high rise buildings.
- 125 - The proposed building would be taller than our house, and look into our bedroom windows and block light.
- 126 I am a SLAM employee, and when I have been on training in the current centre, I am able to witness everything that goes on at my neighbours' houses. We do not want our privacy invaded any more.
- 127 - I do not want a gate directly opposite my house. Surely all visitors to the new centre should pass through the Maudsley reception.
- 128 - SLAM employees constantly walk up and down flicking cigarette butts on the street.

85 Grove Lane: Objection.

129 After many discussions with neighbours, I fully endorse the argument contained within their representations. The proposals put forward by SLAM are unacceptable.

89 Grove Lane: Objection.

- 130 - The proposed new gate / access point into Grove Lane seems unnecessary when there is an existing entrance/ exit to the site a few metres to the north which does not overlook any property. The new gate would not follow a coherent walking route from the station. Having a new gate would allow people to wonder in and out during the proposed opening hours directly opposite our living room.
- The proposals remain unclear as to how access would be controlled after the 7pm watershed when the training centre would be open to the community. Either it is secure or it is open to the community. Having a gate, which would possibly require cameras, would not create a feeling of open-ness but instead enhance the institutional nature of the site. For these reasons we believe the access should remain at the existing position to the north, and if it must be moved, the orientation should shift to the Windsor Walk access point.
- 131 - The design is particularly monolithic and uninspiring and would not blend any better with the conservation area than the existing hotchpotch on the Maudsley site. The proposal is excessively high as it would overshadow our houses. It is by no means clear that it would not block our light and overlook our home.