

Item No. 5.1	Classification: OPEN	Date: 18 October 2011	Meeting Name: Planning Committee
Report title:	Development Management planning application: Application 11-AP-1107 for: Full Planning Permission Address: THE BELL, 57 WEBBER STREET, LONDON, SE1 0RF Proposal: The erection of a five storey building on the site of the former public house, comprising of an office unit (Class B1) on the ground floor with cycle and refuse storage and the provision of 3 one bedroomed flats and 5 two bedroomed flats on the upper floors, together with the provision of terraces on the front and rear of the building.		
Ward(s) or groups affected:	Cathedrals		
From:	Head of Development Management		
Application Start Date 26/05/2011		Application Expiry Date 21/07/2011	

RECOMMENDATION

- 1 Grant conditional planning permission subject to a unilateral undertaking to change the Traffic Management Order to prevent future occupiers of the property from obtaining parking permits.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Site location and description

- 2 The application property comprises of a two/three-storey public house situated on the north side of Webber Street. The properties are predominantly residential to the east of the property. The adjoining building to the west comprises of commercial on the ground floor and residential above, there are a number of commercial properties in Blackfriars Road. There is a range in the height of buildings in the area from 2/3 storeys to the six storey residential block opposite and the adjacent 4 storey mansion block dating to 1893. To the rear and flank of the property is the Friars Primary School.
- 3 The property is not situated within a conservation area or in the vicinity of listed buildings, however it has been proposed to add it to the locally listed buildings list which is still in draft form. The site is within the Central Activities Zone and the Borough and Bankside and Borough District Town Centre, the Opportunity Area and the Air Quality Management Area.

Details of proposal

- 4 The proposal is for the erection of a part four, part five storey contemporary building. The ground floor comprises of office space, refuse/recycling area and cycle storage. A rear terrace of 24.1 square metres is proposed for the office unit.
- 5 The first floor provides three, one bedroom flats comprising of:-

Flat 1, has a living area of 27.6 square metres with a bedroom of 12.1 square metres (54.5 sq m)

Flat 2 has a living area of 27.9 square metres and a bedroom of 12.6 square metres (52.7 sq m).

Flat 3 has a living area of 25.5 square metres with a bedroom of 12.1 square metres (50.5 sq m) This flat has two terraces of 2.1 and 2.2 square metres.

- 6 The second floor provides 2, two bedroom flats with small balconies to the front and comprise of:-

Flat 4 comprises of a living room of 34.6 square metres and bedrooms of 12.3 square metres and 10.1 square metres (72.5 sq m)

Flat 5 comprises of a living room of 37.4 square metres and bedrooms of 12.1 square metres (82 sq m)

- 7 The third and fourth floor provides two Duplex units over two levels and a two bedroom flat comprising of:-

Flat 6 comprises of a living room of 25.3 square metres and bedrooms of 12.3 and 10.1 square metres with a small balcony (63.1 sq m)

Flat 7 comprises of a living room of 34.7 square metres and bedrooms of 13.5 square metres with a terrace of 17.7 square metres (84.7 sq m)

Flat 8 comprises a living area of 36.5 square metres, bedrooms of 12.1 and 14.5 square metres with a terrace of 28.6 square metres (90.3 square metres).

- 8 The entrance to the residential development is positioned in the centre of the front elevation at ground floor level and leads through to a lobby with a stair case and lift.

- 9 The proposal uses yellow London Stock Brick on the main elevations, with natural timber composite panel, frameless glazing and zinc at fourth floor level. A new London Stock Brown Brick is proposed at ground level on the elevations. Photovoltaic panels are proposed on the roof.

- 10 Cycle storage for 16 cycles is provided at ground floor level. The refuse storage for the flats is at ground floor level and accessed by residents from the entrance hall and collected from Webber Street.

- 11 At 1040 habitable rooms per hectare the proposal falls within the density standards for the area of 650 to 1100 habitable rooms per hectare.

Planning history

- 12 No previous planning history.

Planning history of adjoining sites

Friars Primary School Webber Street

- 13 Permission was granted in 2003 at Friars Primary School Webber Street for the relocation of a portacabin classroom to the north-east corner of playground for a temporary period of four years, and reconfiguring of school entrance to Webber Street including new vehicular entrance, fence and gates, four car parking spaces and associated landscaping works.

The Priory 47-55 Webber Street

- 14 Permission was granted in 1999 for the erection of a single storey extension to existing

flat in the rear yard. (00-AP-0181)

Permission was granted in 2002 for the change of use of part of the ground floor to an office together with the provision of 2, one bedroom self-contained flats, provision of two roof lights and alterations to the rear elevation.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Summary of main issues

- 15 The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:
- 16 a) land use issues in respect to the loss of a public house and other policy considerations
- 17 b) impact on neighbouring occupiers and future occupiers of the development
- 18 c) traffic and parking issues
- 19 d) the impact on the appearance of the streetscene

Planning policy

Proposals map 2011

- 20 District Town Centre
Central Activity Zone
Air Quality Management Area
Opportunity Area

Core Strategy 2011

- 21 Strategic Policy 1 – Sustainable development
Strategic Policy 2 – Sustainable transport
Strategic Policy 5 – Providing new homes
Strategic Policy 10 – Jobs and businesses
Strategic Policy 12 – Design and conservation
Strategic Policy 13 – High environmental standards

Saved Southwark Plan Policies 2007 (July)

- 22 1.7 Development within town and local centres
2.5 Planning Obligations
3.2 Protection of Amenity
3.12 Quality in Design
3.3 Sustainability Assessment
3.4 Energy Efficiency
3.7 Waste Reduction
3.11 Efficient Use of Land
3.13 Urban Design
3.19 Archaeology
4.2 Quality of Residential Accommodation
5.2 Transport Impacts
5.3 Walking and Cycling
5.6 Car Parking
7.4 Bankside and Borough Action Area.

London Plan 2011

- 23 Policy 2.12 Central Activities Zone – predominantly local activities
- Policy 2.13 Opportunity areas and intensification areas
- Policy 2.14 Areas for regeneration
- Policy 2.15 Town centres
- Policy 3.3 Increasing housing supply
- Policy 3.4 Optimising housing potential
- Policy 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments
- Policy 4.3 Mixed use development and offices
- Policy 6.9 Cycling
- Policy 7.3 Designing out crime
- Policy 7.4 Local character
- Policy 7.5 Public realm
- Policy 7.6 Architecture
- Policy 7.7 Location and design of tall and large buildings
- Policy 7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology
- Policy 7.14 Improving air quality

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

- 24 PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development
- PPS3 Housing
- PPG 13 Transport
- PPG 23 Planning and Flood Risk

Principle of development

- 25 The application property is located within the Borough and Bankside District Town Centre and therefore the main policy for consideration is policy 1.7 which states;

The LPA will permit a range of uses including retail and services, leisure, entertainment and community, civic, cultural and tourism, residential and employment (B1 uses), where the following criteria are met;

- i) The scale and nature of the proposal is appropriate to the character and function of the centre and catchment area which it seeks to serve.
- ii) The proposal will not harm the vitality and viability of the centre; and
- iii) A mix of uses is provided where appropriate;
- iv) Any floorspace currently in A Class use should be retained or replaced, unless the proposed use provides a direct service to the general public and the proposal would not harm the vitality and viability of the town centre (where the proposal site is located within a Protected Shopping Frontage, the proposal should comply with policy 1.9); and
- v) The proposal should not materially harm the amenities of the surrounding occupiers;
- vi) Where developments that are likely to attract a lot of people are proposed, the site should be highly accessible by sustainable modes of transport; and
- vii) The road network has sufficient capacity to take any additional servicing traffic generated by the proposal without causing adverse effects on the environment, traffic circulation or air quality; and
- viii) The development addresses the street, provides an active frontage on pedestrian routes, and would not erode the visual continuity of a shopping frontage; and
- ix) The proposal provides amenities for users of the site such as public toilets, where appropriate.

- 26 In respect to compliance with this policy, the property is located in a quieter area of the town centre. Therefore the proposal is considered to comply with clauses i to iii and vi to ix. However, the proposal does result in the loss of A4 class floorspace with a use which does not provide a direct service to the general public being an office use (Class B1), the proposal is therefore not compliant with clause vi of this policy. However, given the lack of footfall in the area it is not considered that a proposal involving an A class use, and in particular an A4 Use Class would be particularly viable in this location when there is good and compatible provision in the nearby Blackfriars Road and The Cut.
- 27 Objections have been raised to the loss of the public house as it provided an amenity for local residents. However, there are a number of public houses (Use Class A4) within the area, notably on Blackfriars Road, Union Street and The Cut and therefore it is considered the proposal does not conflict with clause v of the above property. There are also no particular protection in the policy for Public Houses (Class A4 uses)

Environmental impact assessment

- 28 None required due to the scale of the development.

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

- 29 Objections have been raised from occupiers of residential flats in Markstone House on the grounds that the proposal will impact on views and loss of daylight and sunlight to rooms within the flats and to the communal garden. Markstone House, at the nearest point from the application property, is 41 metres away. The proposed five storey building is also located to the north of this block of flats and given the distance and orientation from the flats, the proposal will not materially impinge on sunlight or daylight. In respect to the impact on the communal garden which is a minimum of 11.5 metres away and is also to the south of the application site, it is not considered that a building with a height of 12 metres with a setback rising to 14 metres will impact on this land, due to its height, orientation and separation distance. Other issues raised by residents and CAMRA (Campaign for Real Ale) in respect to the loss of the public house are addressed above.
- 30 In respect of privacy, objections have been raised by local residents in terms of their flats and the school. In terms of the impact on nearby flats, again, due to the distance between the objectors flats and the application property there will be no material loss of privacy for those residents. The impact on the school will be potentially greater, although no objections have been raised by the school or by the Metropolitan Police. The nearest point of the school building from the application site is 12 metres, across a vehicular access, car parking area and landscaped area. The playground is to the east of the school, on the far side of the application site. As the flats will be mainly occupied when the school is not open, and given the distance to the play area it is considered that the proposal will not harm the privacy of the users of this building.
- 31 In respect of amenity for future occupiers, the units are all designed to lifetime home standards. The flat and room sizes comply with the London Plan 2011 and the Council's Residential Design Standards 2008, the flats would also comply with the Council's draft Residential Design Standards 2011 which is due to be adopted this year. The units are all dual aspect, and are considered to provide a good internal standard of accommodation.
- 32 The residential design standards 2008 requires 50 square metres of communal outdoor amenity space with preferably 10 square metres of private amenity space per

flat. This has not been provided and there would be no communal amenity space. Flats 1 and 2 would have no outdoor amenity space. Amenity space for the other flats would be as follows:

Flat 3 - 4.3sqm;
Flat 4 - 2.5sqm
Flat 5 - 2.5sqm;
Flat 6 - 2.5sqm;
Flat 7 - 17.7 sqm;
Flat 8 - 28.6sqm.

- 33 Whilst below the Council's guidance, the lack of amenity space is due to the constraints of the site and the need to protect adjoining occupiers from overlooking. However, the larger units are provided with a reasonable amount of outdoor amenity space. Furthermore, the provision of additional outdoor amenity space would result in the loss of the photovoltaic panels on the roof and would result in additional overlooking of the school to the rear. There are communal gardens in the vicinity and open space, namely Nelson Square Gardens and Grotto open space and therefore this provision, on balance, is considered acceptable.

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

- 34 The future occupiers are not likely to be affected by the adjoining school, although there will be some noise issues during break time. The adjoining property to the west is in a mixed use as commercial and residential, uses that would not impact on the future occupiers' amenity.

Traffic issues

- 35 The Transport group has raised the following points:

Servicing and refuse collection will be undertaken from Webber Street. Due to site constraints no off-street servicing facilities can be provided. Given the nature of the proposed development and the location of the bin stores it is not thought there will be:

- A) many service vehicle movements associated with the above application:
- B) refuse vehicles stationary in the highway for an extended period.

- 36 Additionally, the servicing and refuse collection associated with the existing permitted use is forecast to have more of an impact than the proposed use.

- 37 The proposed development is not forecast to have a negative highway impact for the following reasons:

- The site benefits from a Central London location and high PTAL rating (6b):
- No on-site parking is provided and overspill parking is to be controlled via the exemption of parking permits:
- The site is forecast to have less deliveries and servicing when compared with the existing permitted use (A4 Public House):

The site benefits from adequate walking routes to and from the site.

Car Parking

- 38 This proposal is located in an area with a high TfL PTAL rating (6b) reflecting the area's high level of access to all forms of public transport. Developments in areas with this PTAL rating are required to be car free in order to promote more sustainable transport choices, reduce congestion and pollution within Southwark.

- 39 The proposal site is situated in a CPZ. Therefore, in order to prevent possible overspill parking from the development, the applicant should be informed that a planning condition will be imposed preventing any occupiers of this development being eligible for on-street parking permits. In order that the Traffic Order can be changed, a sum of £2,750 must be secured from the applicant for the costs associated with amending the Traffic Order, either through a unilateral undertaking.

Cycle Storage

- 40 Table 15.4 of the Southwark Plan states that the minimum secure parking standard for cycles is 1 per residential unit and 1 per 10 units for visitors. For this development of 8 residential units, a minimum provision of 9 cycles is required for the residential element. Table 15.3, of the Southwark Plan, states that the secure parking standard for cycles is 1 space per 250m² of commercial (A & B1) floor space (minimum of 2). Therefore for the commercial element of the building a minimum provision of 2 cycle parking spaces is required. Ground floor plans show 16 cycle parking spaces. This level of provision (above the minimum standards) is encouraged and welcomed by Transport Planning.
- 41 In order to satisfy Policy 5.3 of the Southwark Plan cycle parking provision must be convenient, secure and weatherproof and to the minimum standards as detailed in Appendix 15 of the Southwark Plan. For reasons of convenience, cycle storage must be of the dimensions as stated in the Manual for Streets, sections 8.2.21-8.2.24 and should comply with best practice guidance. Presently it does not appear that the proposed cycle parking meets the dimensions detailed within the Manual for Streets. Therefore, the applicant is required to submit to the Council, for approval, detailed and scaled drawings to demonstrate the provision of cycle storage in line with the quoted standards. This should include manufacturer details of the proposed cycle parking. Additionally, the storage areas for residential and commercial uses must be separate, for reasons of security. A condition is recommended that further details for the cycle and refuse/recycling provision for both commercial and residential be submitted showing the required separate divisions of the storage area.

Disabled Parking

- 42 Given the site constraints of the proposed development there is no possibility that the any disabled bays can be provided off-street. Also, no specific disabled residential units have been proposed; therefore there is no requirement for any disabled parking provision as part of this development.

Design issues

- 43 Saved Policy 3.13 Urban design, requires that the height, scale and massing of buildings to be appropriate to the local context and not to dominate its surroundings. 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.
- 44 The property not listed, nor is it located within a conservation area. The proposed re-development matches the 4-storey parapet height of the adjacent building, and continues the building-line frontage, which is acceptable in principle. A set-back fifth-level could have been viewed as excessive, but it is considered that the significant set-backs will mitigate for any impacts on the streetscape-block/terrace which this will form the eastern end of, and may actually form a 'bookend' feature to terminate it.
- 45 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.

- 46 The overall design of this proposal is generally acceptable, with an expressed ground-level which houses a B1 unit. Above this there are 8 units of varying size, although the two upper duplexes have access to excellent roof-terraces. The main elevational treatment has three bays of window openings, the outer of which are also recessed balconies, giving depth and modulation to the streetfront facade. There are windows facing over the adjacent site at the rear from the proposed north west elevation. However, these windows do not sit right on the boundary and given the depth and configuration of the adjacent site it is not considered that this scheme will prejudice any future redevelopment potential on this neighbouring site.
- 47 The proposed materials include brick facing with a darker brick proposed for the base and a lighter brick above. This is broadly acceptable and reflects the character and appearance of the area. The windows are arranged in coupled bays to reflect the rhythm of fenestration of adjacent properties and the recessed balconies at the upper storeys gives the design a three-dimensional quality at this prominent corner. The windows are to be in aluminium with coupled fin details and coloured feature panels (also used on the soffits of balconies) to offset the strong geometry of the facade and give the elevation a degree of interest. The set-back uppermost floor is to be clad in zinc. This is acceptable as it will appear as a recessive attic storey. The choice of materials as well as the jointing details to the zinc, the parapet, jamb, cill and head details of openings are important for the quality of this design to ensure that the depth of the facade is expressed in the constructed scheme and a condition for details is recommended.
- 48 In conclusion, the proposed design has many good qualities. It has a high level of dual aspect units, proposes to use sound and appropriate facing materials and has a robust and varied appearance that offers a degree of interest.
- 49 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.
- 50 The existing building on the site is currently proposed to be locally listed building. As such the presumption of this policy is to preserve this building and its contribution to the local context. Paragraph 55 of the Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide for PPS5 (published by English Heritage - March 2010) states that the "process of deciding planning permissions, listed building or conservation area consents may also lead to the recognition that a heritage asset has a significance that merits some degree of protection." PPS5 and its associated guidance therefore encourages Local Planning Authorities to use the process of determining planning applications to identify heritage assets that merit a degree of protection.
- 51 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. This is to be achieved 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.

- 52 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.
- 53 Policy HE9.2 of PPS5 requires that where the application will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance, local planning authorities should refuse consent unless it can be demonstrated that:
- (i) the substantial harm to or loss of significance is necessary in order to deliver substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss; or
 - (ii) (a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and (b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term that will enable its conservation; and
 - (c) conservation through grant-funding or some form of charitable or public ownership is not possible; and
 - (d) the harm to or loss of the heritage asset is outweighed by the benefits of bringing the site back into use.
- 54 The Bell public house is currently on the council's draft local list and as such is an undesignated heritage asset. The council's local list remains in draft at this time but remains a material consideration.
- 55 Paragraph 83 of the Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide for PPS5 (published by English Heritage - March 2010) states that the desirability of conserving undesignated heritage assets "*is a material consideration, but individually less of a priority than for designated assets or their equivalents. The requirements for recording and understanding any such assets that are to be lost apply to these assets just as they do to designated assets, although the requirement imposed upon any permission will need to be proportionate to the nature and lower level of the asset's significance.*"
- 56 In the view of officers a case can be made for the loss of this heritage asset. The proposed replacement is of a high quality both in terms of materials and design. Whilst regrettable, the replacement scheme is considered to be worthy of replacing the existing building which would preserve the visual amenities of the streetscene.
- 57 The CAMRA organisation have objected to the loss of the public house on design and conservation terms, as have local residents. These issues have been addressed above.

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

- 58 The property is not within a conservation area and there are no listed buildings within the vicinity. However, the application property itself is proposed to be a locally listed building and this has been considered above.

Impact on trees

- 59 There are no trees on site, however, there are on the school land adjoining, therefore a condition is recommended to safeguard the protection of the trees.

Planning obligations (S.106 undertaking or agreement)

- 60 The applicant will need to complete a unilateral undertaking in respect to modifying the Parking Management Order to prevent future occupiers from obtaining parking

permits, commercial or residential.

Sustainable development implications

- 61 The applicant has submitted a code for sustainable homes pre-assessment which demonstrates how the proposal will meet Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4. This is in line with core strategy policy 13.
- 62 A BREEAM assessment covering the commercial element of the scheme has been submitted which demonstrates how the proposal will achieve BREEAM 'Very good'. This is contrary with core strategy strategic policy 13 which seeks to achieve BREEAM 'excellent'. However, this is a small element of the whole proposal and therefore it is considered, on balance, that despite this non-compliance the provision of new housing to Sustainable Homes Level 4 will off-set this.

Other matters

- 63 An objection has been raised by CAMRA on the grounds that the proposal is contrary to Policy 1.10 which seeks to protect the range of services available outside the town and local centres and protected shopping frontages. However, as the property is within a town centre this policy does not apply, but if it had there are other public houses with a 600m radius of the site.
- 64 Residents have raised issues regarding loss of views and problems with existing water and gas services. The former are considered earlier in this report, whilst the latter are not material planning considerations and cannot be considered in the determination of this application.

Conclusion on planning issues

- 65 The loss of the public house is regrettable, being a proposed locally listed building, but the proposal is compliant with policies in relation to town centre locations. The building is of a sufficient quality in terms of design and materials to provide an acceptable replacement to the existing building, which is on the draft list of locally listed buildings. The building is considered to be of a suitable height for a location on the end of the terrace and the design is considered sympathetic to the adjoining properties and the streetscape as a whole.
- 66 Due to the scale and orientation of the proposal it will not give rise to a material loss of amenity for local residents in terms of privacy or loss of sunlight and daylight. The proposal will provide good accommodation for future occupiers of the proposal.
- 67 Parking issues will be addressed by the imposition of a Section 106 unilateral undertaking. Conditions securing improved refuse/recycling storage facilities is recommended.

Community impact statement

- 68 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.
- 69 a) The impact on local people is set out above.

Consultations

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

Consultation replies

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

Summary of consultation responses

- 71 Objections have been raised in respect to the loss of the public house, an amenity for local residents; loss of an attractive building, concerns about the appearance and height of the new building, loss of privacy for residents and the school, loss of sunlight and daylight, construction noise and issues regarding services.

Human rights implications

- 72 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.
- 73 This application has the legitimate aim of providing new commercial floorspace and 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.

SUPPLEMENTARY ADVICE FROM OTHER OFFICERS

Strategic Director of Communities, Law & Governance

None.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Site history file: TP/1231-57 Application file: 11-AP-1107 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: planning.enquiries@southwark.gov.uk Case officer telephone: 020 7525 5453 Council website: www.southwark.gov.uk

APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	Consultation undertaken
Appendix 2	Consultation responses received
Appendix 3	Images

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Gary Rice, Head of Development Management	
Report Author	Michèle Sterry, Development Management	
Version	Final	
Dated	5 October 2011	
Key Decision	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Strategic Director of Communities, Law & Governance	No	No
Strategic Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods	Yes	Yes
Strategic Director of Environment and Leisure	Yes	No
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team		7 October 2011

Consultation undertaken

Site notice date: 09/06/2011

Press notice date: 16.6.2011

Case officer site visit date: 9/6/2011

Neighbour consultation letters sent: 8/6/2011 and 14/7/2011

Internal services consulted:

Transport
Environmental Protection Team
Waste Management

Statutory and non-statutory organisations consulted:

Environment Agency
Metropolitan Police

Neighbours and local groups consulted:

10 Ravenet Court Ravenet Street London SW11 5HE
154-156 BLACKFRIARS ROAD LONDON SE1 8EN
SUITE 207 154-156 BLACKFRIARS ROAD LONDON SE1 8EN
SUITE 311 154-156 BLACKFRIARS ROAD LONDON SE1 8EN
SUITE G05 154-156 BLACKFRIARS ROAD LONDON SE1 8EN
43 WEBBER STREET LONDON SE1 0RF
57 WEBBER STREET LONDON SE1 0RF
SUITE 103 154-156 BLACKFRIARS ROAD LONDON SE1 8EN
SUITE 102 154-156 BLACKFRIARS ROAD LONDON SE1 8EN
SUITE 306 154-156 BLACKFRIARS ROAD LONDON SE1 8EN
SUITE G06 154-156 BLACKFRIARS ROAD LONDON SE1 8EN
SUITE 213 154-156 BLACKFRIARS ROAD LONDON SE1 8EN
SUITE 301 154-156 BLACKFRIARS ROAD LONDON SE1 8EN
SUITE 304 154-156 BLACKFRIARS ROAD LONDON SE1 8EN
SUITE 110 154-156 BLACKFRIARS ROAD LONDON SE1 8EN
SUITE 111 154-156 BLACKFRIARS ROAD LONDON SE1 8EN
SUITE 209 154-156 BLACKFRIARS ROAD LONDON SE1 8EN
1A - 15 THE PRIORY WEBBER STREET LONDON SE1 0RQ
FRIARS PRIMARY SCHOOL WEBBER STREET LONDON SE1 0RF
SUITE 305 154-156 BLACKFRIARS ROAD LONDON SE1 8EN
SUITE 212 154-156 BLACKFRIARS ROAD LONDON SE1 8EN
SUITE 308 154-156 BLACKFRIARS ROAD LONDON SE1 8EN
SUITE 203 AND 204 154-156 BLACKFRIARS ROAD LONDON SE1 8EN
SUITE 108 154-156 BLACKFRIARS ROAD LONDON SE1 8EN
SUITE 101 154-156 BLACKFRIARS ROAD LONDON SE1 8EN
SUITE 113 154-156 BLACKFRIARS ROAD LONDON SE1 8EN
SUITE 200A 154-156 BLACKFRIARS ROAD LONDON SE1 8EN

CHILDRENS PLAY CENTRE TADWORTH HOUSE LANCASTER ESTATE WEBBER STREET LONDON SE1 0RH
59A WEBBER STREET LONDON SE1 0RF
SUITE 112 TO 133 154-156 BLACKFRIARS ROAD LONDON SE1 8EN
RUSHWORTH AND FRIARS PRIMARY SCHOOL WEBBER STREET LONDON SE1 0RF
156 BLACKFRIARS ROAD LONDON SE1 8EN
SUITE 109 154-156 BLACKFRIARS ROAD LONDON SE1 8EN
SUITE G02 154-156 BLACKFRIARS ROAD LONDON SE1 8EN
SUITE 106 154-156 BLACKFRIARS ROAD LONDON SE1 8EN
SUITE 107 154-156 BLACKFRIARS ROAD LONDON SE1 8EN
SUITE 210 154-156 BLACKFRIARS ROAD LONDON SE1 8EN
SUITE 309 154-156 BLACKFRIARS ROAD LONDON SE1 8EN
SUITE 201 154-156 BLACKFRIARS ROAD LONDON SE1 8EN
SUITE 303 TO 307 154-156 BLACKFRIARS ROAD LONDON SE1 8EN
HEALTH CENTRE 151-153 BLACKFRIARS ROAD LONDON SE1 8EL
SUITE G07 154-156 BLACKFRIARS ROAD LONDON SE1 8EN
SUITE G03 AND G04 154-156 BLACKFRIARS ROAD LONDON SE1 8EN
SUITE 200B 154-156 BLACKFRIARS ROAD LONDON SE1 8EN
SUITE 104 154-156 BLACKFRIARS ROAD LONDON SE1 8EN
SUITE 105 154-156 BLACKFRIARS ROAD LONDON SE1 8EN
SUITE 206 154-156 BLACKFRIARS ROAD LONDON SE1 8EN
SUITE 208 154-156 BLACKFRIARS ROAD LONDON SE1 8EN
FLAT 1- 27 TADWORTH HOUSE LANCASTER ESTATE WEBBER STREET LONDON SE1 0RH
R/O 43 WEBBER STREET LONDON SE1 0RF
LIVING ACCOMMODATION 57 WEBBER STREET LONDON SE1 0RF
FLAT 1 -32 MARKSTONE HOUSE LANCASTER HOUSE
FLAT 1 to 24 BROOKWOOD HOUSE LANCASTER ESTATE WEBBER STREET LONDON SE1 0RJ

Re-consultation: N/A.

Consultation responses received

Internal services

Traffic -

Servicing and refuse collection will be undertaken from Webber Street. Due to site constraints no off-street serving facilities can be provided. Given the nature of the proposed development and the location of the bin stores it is not thought there will be:

- a) many service vehicle movements associated with the above application: refuse vehicles stationary in the highway for an extended period.
- b) Additionally, the servicing and refuse collection associated with the existing permitted use is forecast to have more of an impact than the proposed use.

The proposed development is not forecast to have a negative highway impact for the following reasons:

- The site benefits from a Central London location and high PTAL rating (6b):
- No on-site parking is provided and overspill parking is to be controlled via the exemption of CPZ permits:
- The site is forecast to have less deliveries and servicing when compared with the existing permitted use (A4 Public House):

The site benefits from adequate walking routes to and from the site

Car Parking

This proposal is located in an area with a high TfL PTAL rating (6b) reflecting the area's high level of access to all forms of public transport. Developments in areas with this PTAL rating are required to be car free in order to promote more sustainable transport choices, reduce congestion and pollution within Southwark, as per Strategic Policies 18 and 19.

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

Cycle Storage

Table 15.4, of the Southwark Plan, states that the minimum secure parking standard for cycles is 1 per residential unit and 1 per 10 units for visitors. For this development of 8 residential units, a minimum provision of 9 cycles is required for the residential element. Table 15.3, of the Southwark Plan, states that the secure parking standard for cycles is 1 space per 250m² of commercial (A & B1) floor space (minimum of 2). Therefore for the commercial element of the building we would look for a minimum provision of 2 cycle parking spaces. Ground floor plans show 16 cycle parking spaces. This level of provision (above the minimum standards) is encouraged and welcomed by Transport DC.

In order to satisfy Policy 5.3 of the Southwark Plan cycle parking provision must be convenient, secure and weatherproof and to the minimum standards as detailed in Appendix 15 of the Southwark Plan. For reasons of convenience, cycle storage must be of the dimensions as stated in the Manual for Streets, sections 8.2.21-8.2.24 and

should comply with best practice guidance. Presently it does not appear that the proposed cycle parking meets the dimensions detailed within the Manual for Streets. Therefore, the applicant is required to submit to the Council, for approval, detailed and scaled drawings to demonstrate the provision of cycle storage in line with the quoted standards. This should include manufacturer details of the proposed cycle parking. Additionally, the storage areas for residential and commercial uses must be separate, for reasons of security. This is presently not the case and therefore should be amended.

Disabled Parking

Given the site constraints of the proposed development there is no possibility that the any disabled bays can be provided off-street. Also, no specific disabled residential units have been proposed; therefore we would not request any disabled parking provision as part of this development.

Statutory and non-statutory organisations

Environment Agency - No objection, suggest an informative.

Metropolitan police - combined refuse and cycle store not acceptable, there should be a single security rated door to the store.

Neighbours and local groups

11 Tadworth House Webber Street SE1 - Objects on the grounds that

- the area has seen several developments recently which caused huge disruption lorries travelled up and down Webber Street at all hours of the day and night and cause considerable distress for residents, especially older ones.
- the development is next to a school and more traffic congestion can be dangerous
- every recent development in the surrounding area has been for flats and the loss of the public house and yet more flats will not enhance the area
- the Bell Public House is an attractive building which enhances the area - another block of flats is just another block of flats
- I understand that the area needs housing but this area has been over-developed already and is in danger of losing its character.

Conservation works for CAMRA object to the proposal on the grounds that it is

- Contrary to policy 1.10, CAMRA and Southwark's own policy identify that public houses represents an 'amenity' to local residents and that consequently demolition of the building and redevelopment of the site for other uses constitutes a breach of 1.10.
- The application fails to meet policy 1.10 (ii) which implies a requirement to produce evidence that it is not the only one of its kind within 600m. No such evidence has been provided.
- The application does not provide the necessary evidence implied as a requirement of 1.10 (iii) that there have been adequate -or indeed- any attempts to dispose of the premises as a public house.
- The application fails to meet the requirements of national policy - PPS5 and Southwark Plan saved policy SP13 Design and Heritage
- There has been no significant assessment of any value on the analysis of the impact of the proposed development on the setting of the Grade II Listed Buildings immediately opposite the site, contrary to PPS5.
- Policy HE6.2 is supported by Southwark's 3.18 which states that permission will not be granted for developments that would not preserve or enhance the immediate or wider setting of a listed building.

- The proposed development fails to preserve or enhance 'the characterof Southwark' contrary to SP13 and it adversely affects the historic character of the streetscape to the west, of which it is the last of a good and interesting, architecturally varied terrace of no small visual appeal.
- In respect to the design and access statement, an irregular arrangement of windows or other openings in an otherwise classically-inspired elevation is a signal that the building may be of much greater age than the superficial styling suggests, and is perhaps a refronting of an earlier historic building with irregular fenestration.
- The building has been identified as having previously been in the ownership of Charrington's Brewery. Their chief architect of 1934-59, Sidney Clark, may have been responsible for what appears to be an interwar scheme improvement, and which would have included interior refit. Clark has one entry on the Statutory List at Grade II and other examples of his work are being proposed to English Heritage.
- Saved Policy 3.12 , The proposed scheme is overly dominant in the streetscene and does not add positively to the range of historic buildings to the west of the site contrary to Policy 3.12 which requires that 'new buildings should embody a creative and high quality appropriate design solution specific to their site's shape, size, location.....preserving or enhancing the historic environment'

Occupier of Flat 5 The Priory Webber Street objects on the grounds that

- noise from existing construction sites in Webber Street
- problems with existing water and gas pipes
- the existing property is in keeping with that side of Webber Street, which houses historical buildings such as the Mission and the Priory. This proposal will be a stark contrast to this and what is already built opposite, and on the other side of the crossroads which I would hate to have replicated on the Bell site.
- Hope that the street will be left free of further construction of large property developments

Occupier of 31 Markstone House, Lancaster Street objects on the following grounds:-

- Supports the rebuilding of the Bell, it should be no higher than the Priory building to which it is attached
- The Priory, Hope Mission and Blackfriars Foundry buildings are notable in the area and any attached building should not detract from them.
- The proposed building will dominate because of its height and the disruption of the roof line, caused by the mezzanine flats.
- The building will block light into the primary school playground and building to the north-east especially in the winter months
- I would like the planning officer to ensure that any trees that are damaged or have to be removed during the construction period, are replaced.

Petition has been received with six signatures plus letters from 15 and 16, Markstone House Lancaster Street, objecting to the proposal on the following grounds:-

- Our community will suffer from a loss of amenity - the pub was a focal point and a hub for many local residents, a space to meet for recreational purposes. This function will be lost if the site is developed into offices and flats. We would object to any proposal which does not satisfy this vital need for our community.
- Many residents will suffer a loss of light to the area and blocks of flats opposite, and particularly to the community garden which local residents have worked hard on together, with support from Council initiatives, to create since 2007. Our green growing space and the produce from it will suffer as a result of this development going ahead.

- The School particularly will suffer from a loss of privacy-the proposal refers to terraces on the front and rear of the building, which will inhibit privacy for the school grounds and neighbours opposite.
- The project will cause significant disruption to the pupils and parents of the adjacent School, Friars Primary as the building works will undoubtedly require road and or walkway closure, which increases risk involved in every child and parents' school journey. Neighbours will also suffer from this disruption. The proposed works will also create noise and air pollution (through dust etc) which will acutely affect the school and local residents.
- The project has also displaced previous tenants who would not be able to afford to live in the new properties. The continual gentrification of our area is frustrating and offensive to those of us who are struggling to get by and are faced with the introduction of new tenants who usually have little interest in creating links within our local community-getting to know neighbours and helping out in our community garden. We think it is unlikely that new tenants will be so willing to contribute.

The occupier of 10 Markstone House Lancaster Street added his name to the above petition and also raises the following concerns

- The proposal will block views across the City and also block the sky (about two-thirds of it from my kitchen and bedroom window; I live on the second floor). A building development behind the Bell has already blocked a large part of the view across London and I don't see any of the City now, and many of my neighbours also have experienced this. Since The Bell is only two storeys high any new development should be kept low, so I am not clear why the proposed development is five storeys high, knowing this will obviously affect the view and the ability of neighbours to see the sky from their homes.
- There has already been so much development without increase in open space or green spaces eg. for children to play. In fact some of these spaces have been actively take away to make way for office/flat developments. I do not see what adding yet more blocks will achieve in this area for people who already live here, except more noise, over-crowding and pollution.
- Southwark Planning Department and Southwark Council do not appear to be taking any of these issues into account with this proposed development.