

Item No:	Classification	Committee:	Date:
	Open	Planning Committee	18 October 2011
From: Head of Development Management		Title of Report: Addendum Late observations, consultation responses, and further information.	

PURPOSE

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

RECOMMENDATION

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

FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION

- 3 Late observations, consultation responses, information and revisions have been received in respect of the following planning applications on the main agenda:
 - 3.1 **Item 6.2 : 2-10 Steedman Street, London SE17 3AF**
 - 3.2 **Additional neighbour consultee responses**

Flat 110, 9 Steedman Street

Complain about the late notice given of the planning committee. Received the letter yesterday on the 12 October which has given less than 24hrs to give comments on the application (letter is dated 07/10/2011).

1. Area will not benefit from such a dense concentration of students. The area of Steedman Street (0.014 km²) contains the following buildings:

- 9 Steedman Street – 270 residents approx
- Dashwood Studios (120 Walworth Road)– 230 students approx
- Julian Markham House – 300 students approx
- Proposed development at 2-10 Steedman Street – 221 students

This means a split in the local population of students to residents of 750 / 270 and gives a population density of 72000 people per square kilometre. With problems to London's surface water drainage noted by DEFRA and the EA another high-rise building in a densely populated area is not the answer.

2. There is a need for more affordable housing for local people, especially with the removal of residents from the Heygate Estate. There is no need for more student accommodation in this small area. There is development space to the east around the Heygate Estate as well as a large plot near St Mary's Churchyard.

3. Given the pressure on street car parking that already exists, does not see anywhere in the proposal mention of parking spaces within the premises.

4. Steedman and Hampton Streets are already very busy during the evenings and weekends with the amount of traffic dangerous to local residents. Another large building will add to the amount of traffic.

5. Demolition of the existing building will create a lot of noise and disruption to the local area. The existing building could be redeveloped. This would cause less of an environmental impact. A smaller development which makes use of the existing building would be much better for the local area.

3.3 Additional Consultation Response from LBS Transport Planning Team:

In response to previous concerns with regards to the capacity of the student cycle storage area [as set out in paragraph 118 of the officer report], the applicant has submitted a revised ground floor layout plan (drawing PL_1201 Rev P) showing 93 spaces rather than 122 spaces as originally proposed. A sum of £3,200 is also proposed to be paid to the Council to meet the cost of installing an additional 20 Sheffield Stands on the street.

It is normally expected that adequate cycle facilities are provided on the site. However in this instance much of the ground floor of the building is taken up with much needed Class B1 incubation space. To reduce the size of the refuse store would have an impact on servicing of the development. In this instance the financial contribution would enable additional cycle provision to be provided on-street to ensure that the total required number of cycle spaces can be provided.

A condition requiring details of the cycle storage on-site will be required as the revised plan shows a mix of Josta two tier cycle stands and Josta wall hooks. The wall hooks are not considered acceptable as some users find it difficult to lift their bike into place. It would be preferable for horizontal cycle parking to be used.

3.4 Further clarification to Officer Report relating to S106

At paragraph 82, relating to affordable housing, the report states that the S106 contributions would total almost £1.174 million, made up of £673,845 of S106 payments and £500,000 as an affordable housing contribution.

However, this does not fully reflect the full range of benefits potentially being provided. The S106 'offer' of £650,001 set out in the table at para 149 excludes a number of additional payments which would come forward in certain circumstances, or works being provided by the applicant which are of benefit to the area. These include the public realm works to create a new route linking to Robert Dashwood Way, which was costed at £227,418; a health contribution of £109,630 which would become payable if the University are not able to demonstrate adequate health facilities on their campuses for their students; and clarification on the provision of sports facilities, which could potentially result in an additional £54,445 being required for sports development.

Inclusion of the public realm improvement costs alone would take the overall value of the agreement (including affordable housing) to £1,377,419. If the health and additional sports contributions were required, this would take the total value to £1,541,494. In these circumstances the contributions being offered are very close to the maximum level the District Valuer suggests the scheme could reasonably support (being £1.5 million), or in the case that all of the payments were required, in excess of this figure. In this circumstance, it is recommended that, when the viability of the scheme is taken into account as required by the draft Affordable Housing SPD, the contribution for affordable housing, whilst significantly short of that suggested in the SPD methodology, is acceptable. Any outstanding differences of opinion between the applicant and the DV in terms of the inputs into the financial appraisal would be of lesser concern given the relatively small (or non-existent) difference between the

amount being offered and the DV's conclusions about the maximum contributions which the scheme could reasonably support. .

3.5 **Suggested additional condition**

1. Add the following condition concerning cycle storage:

Before any work hereby authorised is carried out, details (1:50 scale drawings) of the facilities to be provided for the secure storage of cycles shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the cycle parking facilities shall be provided as approved and shall be retained and the space used for no other purpose and the development shall not be carried out otherwise in accordance with any such approval given.

Reason

To ensure that satisfactory safe and secure bicycle parking is provided and retained for the benefit of users of the development in order to encourage the use of alternative means of transport and to reduce reliance on the use of the private car in accordance with Strategic Policy 2 – Sustainable transport of the Core Strategy 2011 and Saved Policy 5.3 Walking and cycling of the Southwark Plan 2007.

2. Amend Condition 26 to take account of revised ground floor layout plan:

The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the following approved plans:

Proposed Plans

Basement	PL_1211 Rev C
Ground Floor	PL_1201 Rev P
First Floor	PL_1202 Rev G
Second Floor	PL_1203 Rev F
Third & Fifth Floor	PL_1204 Rev C
Fourth & Sixth Floor	PL_1205 Rev C
Seventh Floor	PL_1208 Rev F
Eighth Floor	PL_1209 Rev F
Roof	PL_1210 Rev E

Proposed Elevations / Sections

Section A-A	PL_2200 Rev C
Section B-B	PL_2201 Rev B
Front Elevation	PL_3200 Rev C
Steedman Street	PL_3201 Rev F
Hampton Street	PL_3202 Rev B
Rear Courtyard	PL_3203 Rev C

3. Add the following Informative concerning cycle storage:

The proposed Josta Wall Hooks are not considered acceptable and an alternative storage solution will need to be submitted to discharge details concerning cycle storage.

REASON FOR LATENESS

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

REASON FOR URGENCY

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

Lead Officer: Gary Rice - Head of Development Management

Background Papers: Individual case files.

Located at: 160 Tooley Street London SE1.