

<b>Item No.</b> 6.4	<b>Classification:</b> OPEN	<b>Date:</b> 15 February 2012	<b>Meeting Name:</b> Camberwell Community Council
<b>Report title:</b>	<p><b>Development Management planning application:</b> Application 11-AP-1139 for: S.73 Vary/remove conds/minor alterations</p> <p><b>Address:</b> GROUND FLOOR, SOUTH CITY COURT, 52 PECKHAM GROVE, LONDON, SE15 6AL</p> <p><b>Proposal:</b> Variation of condition 10 (approved plans) which was added by non-material amendment reference: 11-AP-0551) of permission reference 06-AP-0796 dated 8th February 2010 for 'Change of use of the ground floor from vacant commercial units into 15 self-contained flats; provision of 6 additional car parking spaces (to create 24 spaces in total)' to allow the following minor material amendments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Removal of a private 1-bedroom flat (reducing the total number of flats on the site to 14);</li> <li>• Retention of existing water tank;</li> <li>• Retention of existing substations;</li> <li>• Relocation of refuse store;</li> <li>• Relocation of cycle parking;</li> <li>• Provision of one additional parking space (to provide 19 in total);</li> <li>• New door to rear of building serving flat 4;</li> <li>• Provision of solar panels to roof.</li> </ul>		
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>	Brunswick Park		
<b>From:</b>	Head of Development Management		
<b>Application Start Date</b> 1 July 2011		<b>Application Expiry Date</b> 30 September 2011	

## RECOMMENDATION

- 1 (i) Grant Planning Permission subject to the applicant first entering into an appropriate legal agreement on or before the 7 March 2012.
- (ii) In the event that the legal agreement is not entered into by 7 March 2012, the Head of Development Management be authorised to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in paragraph 76 below.

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

### Site location and description

- 2 South City Court is a five storey building with accommodation in the roofspace, T-shaped in plan and situated on the western side of Peckham Grove at its southern end near its intersection with Southampton Way. The main bulk of the building fronts Peckham Grove with a five storey extension (see planning history) having been added at the rear. The application relates to the ground floor of the main building which is

currently unoccupied and boarded up, and there are flats on the upper floors of the building. There is a row of 18 parking spaces in front of the building which has a dropped kerb onto Peckham Grove.

- 3 The site forms part of the urban density zone and an air quality management area.

### **Details of proposal**

- 4 On 8th February 2010 planning permission was granted to change the use of the ground floor of the building fronting Peckham Grove from vacant commercial units to 15 self-contained flats (reference: 06-AP-0796). This permission involved relocating two existing substations and water tank at the front of the building. It has since come to light that it is not possible to relocate these, therefore the application before Members is for an amendment to the earlier permission which would enable the substations and water tank to remain, and to provide 14 flats instead of 15.

- 5 The mix of dwellings would be as follows:

2 x studio flats  
2 x 1-bed flats;  
8 x 2-bed flats;  
2 x 3-bed flats.

- 6 Flats 11, 12, 13 and 14 would be affordable (shared ownership, and comprising 2 x 2 bed and 1 x 3-bed) and flats 12 and 13 would be wheelchair accessible (2 x 2-bed).

- 7 The proposal involves the following other alterations:

#### Relocation of refuse store:

- 8 On the approved plans for permission reference 06-AP-0796 the refuse store was shown as being located at the front of the building, immediately next to the main communal entrance door into the building. The plans now being considered show the refuse store for the 14 flats being located next to parking space 11, but also at the front of the building.

#### Relocation of cycle parking:

- 9 On the approved plans for permission reference 06-AP-0796 the cycle parking is shown as being located at the front of the building, immediately next to what should have been the refuse store and close to the communal entrance to the building. It is now proposed to locate the cycle parking near to parking space 12 at the front of the building.

#### Parking spaces to front of building:

- 10 The approved plans for application reference 06-AP-0796 showed 27 parking spaces at the front of the building including two accessible parking spaces, although when permission was granted at Community Council it was subject to an additional condition requiring a revised parking layout showing 24 parking spaces only (including two disabled parking spaces) to be submitted for approval.

- 11 When first submitted the application now before Members proposed 26 parking spaces in the front of the building, but this has since been reduced to 19 at the request of officers, to enable additional landscaping to be provided.

#### New door to rear of building serving flat 4:

- 12 This door is understood to be already in place at the rear of the building, and flat four would be accessed from the rear.

Provision of solar panels to roof:

- 13 The consented scheme for 15 flats showed 16 solar panels located broadly in the centre of the front block. It is now proposed to provide 26 panels on the northern end of the front block (this is an amendment during the course of the application).

Other amendments sought during the course of the application:

- 14 Alterations have been made to the layout of the wheelchair accessible units (flats 12 and 13). Two of the originally proposed one-bed flats were amended to studio flats (units 8 and 9) as they were significantly below the unit size standards for one-bed flats.

**Planning history**

- 15 11-AP-0551 - Non-material amendment to planning permission reference: 06-AP-0796 dated 08/02/2010 (for 'Change of use of the ground floor from vacant commercial units into 15 self-contained flats; provision of 6 additional car parking spaces (to create 24 spaces in total)) comprising the addition of a condition listing the approved plans. Amendment AGREED on 17th March 2011.
- 16 06-AP0796 - Change of use of the ground floor from vacant commercial units into 15 self-contained flats; provision of 9 additional car parking spaces. Planning permission was GRANTED on 8th February 2010 following the completion of a section 106 agreement.
- 17 Planning permission (Lbs.Reg.No:0001199) with legal agreement was granted on 05/10/2001 for conversion and erection of 5 storey extension of existing industrial building to provide 86 self-contained flats; construction of 3 storey office building (B1) and 3 storey residential building comprising of 20 residential units with 106 off-street car parking spaces, 52 cycle storage spaces plus landscaping at 48 - 52 Peckham Grove (now known as South City Court). This consent was implemented although the ground floor commercial units (Use class B1) were never occupied since they were completed.
- 18 Planning application (Lbs.Reg.No: 05-AP-1336) was withdrawn on 23/09/2005 for erection of a new residential block comprising 13 apartments - 8 X 1 bed, 4 X 2 bed and 1 X 3 bedroom at Site A, 50 Peckham Grove.
- 19 Planning application (Lbs.Reg.No: 05-AP-1339) was withdrawn on 07/10/2005 for erection of two X two-storey semi-detached dwelling houses at Site B, 50 Peckham Grove.

**Planning history of adjoining sites**

69a Peckham Grove (Site opposite application premises to the east)

- 20 08-AP-2613 - Variation of condition 6 on approved application 06-AP-1600 to allow parking spaces to be offered to surrounding residential blocks in the vicinity. Planning permission was REFUSED on 27th January 2009 for the following reasons:
1. *There is insufficient justification to allow the removal of Condition 6 to permit the parking spaces to be sold off to people not living within the development. It is considered that the monetary value placed on the spaces is not indicative of the demand from residents living in the development and suitable alternatives to promote their use by occupiers of the building have not been fully explored. As such the proposal would result in continued on street parking by residents of the development within an area that is heavily parked, in a low Public Transport Accessibility Level and where demand for on-street parking is likely to increase*

*due to new development under construction. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to Policies 5.2 Transport impacts and 5.6 Car parking of the Southwark Plan 2007.*

2. *The management of the use of the car park by others not resident within the development has not been detailed within the application. It is unclear what impact this may have on the amenity and security to the existing residents. As such the proposal is considered contrary to Policies 3.2 Protection of amenity and 3.14 Designing out crime of The Southwark Plan 2007.*

21 06-AP-1600 - Demolition of existing workshops and erection of part 4 and part 5 storey buildings containing 110 flats with parking at semi-basement level (approved 22/9/05 under ref 04-ap-1601): amendments to include changes to fenestration/elevation, relocation of cycle parking and a scheme of natural ventilation to car park and resultant amendment to ground floor external landscape layout. Planning permission was GRANTED on 2nd April 2008.

22 Planning permission (Lbs.Reg.No: 04-AP-1601) with legal agreement was granted on 22/09/2005 for demolition of existing workshops and erection of part 4 and part 5 storey buildings containing 110 flats with parking at semi-basement level.

#### Unit 2, 199 Southampton Way

23 11-AP-4053 - Use of premises as a place of worship (Use Class D1) and removal of two windows to ground floor front elevation - UNDER CONSIDERATION.

24 11-AP-1807 - Use of premises as a place of worship (Use Class D1) and removal of two windows to ground floor front elevation. Planning permission was REFUSED on 22nd August 2011 for the following reasons:

*1. The proposed development, owing to the potential for large numbers of people to congregate outside the building in close proximity to a number of dwellings and at evenings and weekends when the area would generally be quieter, would result in an unacceptable level of noise and disturbance to neighbouring occupiers, contrary to saved policy 3.2 'Protection of amenity' of the Southwark Plan (2007) and strategic policy 13 'High environmental standards' of the Core Strategy 2011.*

*2. In the absence of a transport assessment detailing how people would travel to and from the site and given the limited availability of public transport in close proximity to the site, it is considered that the proposal would increase demand for on-street parking in the area, to the detriment of existing occupiers and contrary to saved policies 3.2 'Protection of Amenity' 5.2 'Transport Impacts' and 5.6 'Car parking' of The Southwark Plan UDP (2007) and strategic policy 2 'Sustainable transport' of the Core Strategy (2011).*

25 An appeal has been lodged and is **under consideration** by the Planning Inspectorate (reference: APP/A/5840/A/11/2166609).

#### **KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

##### **Summary of main issues**

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

a) principle;

b) amenity;

- c) design and appearance;
- d) transport;
- e) planning obligations (s106).

## **Planning policy**

### Core Strategy 2011

- 27 Strategic policy 1 - Sustainable development
- Strategic policy 2 - Sustainable transport
- Strategic policy 5 - Providing new homes
- Strategic policy 6 - Homes for people on different incomes
- Strategic policy 7 - Family homes
- Strategic policy 12 - Design and conservation
- Strategic policy 13 - High environmental standards
- Strategic policy 14 - Implementation and delivery

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

- 28 2.5 Planning Obligations
- 3.2 Protection of Amenity
- 3.7 Waste reduction
- 3.9 Water
- 3.11 Efficient Use of Land
- 3.12 Quality in Design
- 3.13 Urban Design
- 3.14 Designing Out Crime
- 4.2 Quality of Residential Accommodation
- 4.3 Mix of Dwellings
- 4.4 Affordable Housing Provision
- 5.1 Locating Developments
- 5.2 Transport impacts
- 5.3 Walking and Cycling
- 5.6 Car Parking
- 5.7 Parking Standards for the Mobility Impaired

Residential Design Standards SPD (October 2011)

Planning Obligations SPD

Sustainable Design and Construction SPD

Affordable housing SPD

- 29 London Plan 2011

Policy 3.3 Increasing housing supply

Policy 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments

Policy 3.8 Housing choice

Policy 3.9 Mixed and balanced communities

Policy 3.10 Definition of affordable housing

Policy 3.11 Affordable housing targets

Policy 3.12 Negotiating affordable housing on individual private residential and mixed use schemes

Policy 3.13 Affordable housing thresholds

Policy 5.3 Sustainable design and construction

Policy 5.7 Renewable energy

Policy 6.9 Cycling  
Policy 6.10 Walking  
Policy 6.13 Parking  
Policy 7.3 Designing out crime  
Policy 7.4 Local character  
Policy 7.5 Public realm  
Policy 7.6 Architecture  
Policy 8.2 Planning obligations

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

- 30 PPS 1 Delivering Sustainable Development  
PPS 3 Housing  
PPS5 Planning for the historic environment  
PPG 13 Transport  
PPG 25 Development and Flood Risk
- 31 The draft National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published at the end of July 2011 for consultation until 17 October 2011. The Government has set out its commitment to a planning system that does everything it can do to support sustainable economic growth. Local planning authorities are expected to plan positively for new development. All plans should be based on the presumption in favour of sustainable development and contain clear policies that will guide how the presumption will be applied locally.
- 32 The NPPF builds upon the Government's 'Plan for Growth' which was published in March 2011. The overall theme of this document is to support long term sustainable economic growth and job creation in the UK. This is set out as a clear and current Government objective (and accordingly should attract significant weight).

**Principle of development**

- 33 The principle of providing residential units on the ground floor of the building has already been established through the granting of planning permission for 15 flats (reference:06-AP-0796). This application is before Members owing to the inability to remove a substation and water tank which means that it is only possible to build 14 flats. This does not raise any land use issues and it is noted that the 14 flats for which permission is sought are largely complete on site.
- 34 Strategic policy 5 of the Core Strategy advises that a density of between 200-700 habitable rooms per hectare is permissible in the urban density zone, of which the site forms part. Based solely on the land to which the application relates, i.e. the ground floor of the front block, the proposal would achieve a density of 330 habitable rooms per hectare and would therefore comply with strategic policy 5.
- 35 Strategic policy 6 of the Core Strategy states requires developments in the Brunswick Park ward to provide 35% private housing and 35% affordable housing (the remainder is for the applicant to decide).
- 36 The consented scheme for 15 flats secured 4 affordable housing units (intermediate housing/shared ownership) including two wheelchair accessible units. This equated to 25% provision but policy 4.5 of the Southwark Plan, which has been saved, allows one affordable habitable room less for every affordable housing unit which complies with the wheelchair design standards, therefore the affordable housing provision was policy compliant. The same is applicable now, as the scheme would still provide 4 affordable units, with a total of 13 habitable rooms which equates to 32.5% affordable housing (based on there being 40 habitable rooms in the proposed development). Taking into

account that two wheelchair accessible affordable units are proposed, the proposal remains policy compliant in respect of affordable housing. Concerns have been raised by a neighbouring resident regarding impact on property value, but this is not a material planning consideration and cannot be taken into account.

- 37 In terms of tenure and mix, the consented scheme for 15 flats permitted 2 x 2-bed wheelchair accessible affordable units, 1 x 2-bed affordable unit and 1 x 3-bed affordable unit. The current scheme is for exactly the same mix of affordable and wheelchair accessible units.
- 38 Strategic policy 7 of the Core Strategy requires developments of 10 or more residential units in the urban density zone to provide at least 60% of units with 2 or more bedrooms and 20% of units to have 3, 4 or 5 bedrooms.

The proposed development would achieve the following:

- 2 or more bedrooms - 71%
- 3, 4 or 5 bedrooms - 14%.

- 39 Whilst the proposal would fall below the Council's current requirement in terms of the percentage of 3, 4 and 5 bedroom dwellings within the scheme, given that the proposal is essentially to amend an existing permission to allow one less flat to be built, officers consider that this provision is acceptable in this instance.

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

- 40 Saved policy 3.2 of the Southwark Plan seeks to ensure that developments achieve an adequate standard of amenity for existing and future occupiers, and 4.2 requires residential developments to be of a good standard.

#### Existing occupiers

- 41 Concerns have been raised regarding impact on security via the provision of new doors into the building, additional wear and tear as a result of additional occupants, and concerns regarding the construction, maintenance and cost of the solar panels. This last matter is dealt with separately in the sustainability section of this report.
- 42 The integral refuse and cycle stores proposed at the front of the building are not that dissimilar to the arrangement permitted under the consented scheme for 15 flats. Access would be for residents only, and when the flats are occupied, there would be additional natural surveillance of this area.
- 43 The consented scheme showed 5 flats being accessed from the rear of the site, three on the southern end of the block and a further two on the northern end. The scheme now before Members proposes 6 flats accessed from the rear of the building, the additional door being to flat 4, and it is not considered that this would result in any loss of amenity for existing occupiers.
- 44 Concerns have also been raised that proposed flat nine would have its front door from within the communal corridor which was not shown on previous plans. Whilst this is noted and it would clearly increase the use of the communal areas, it is not considered that this would result in a loss of amenity to neighbouring occupiers. Use of the communal space is a matter for the landowner and leaseholders and not a matter over which it is possible to exercise planning control.
- 45 An adequately sized refuse store is proposed at the front of the building, in a broadly

similar position to that permitted under the 15 flat scheme, and it is not considered that this would result in any loss of amenity to existing occupiers. Concerns have been raised that there is already more than adequate refuse storage on the site, and whilst this may be the case, the proposed refuse storage provision would be conveniently located for those flats which would have direct access from the front of the building. The plans contain an annotation that the flats which would be accessed from the rear would use existing stores at the rear of the building, and no objections are raised in this regard.

#### Future occupiers

- 46 Concerns have been raised by a neighbouring occupier regarding the size of the proposed flats and the standard of accommodation this would create.
- 47 Minimum flat and room size standards are set out in the Councils' Residential Design Standards SPD (2011) which requires a minimum of 36sqm for a studio flat, 50sqm for a 1-bed flat, 61sqm for a 2-bed flat and 74sqm for a 3-bed flat. The proposal would achieve the following:
- 48 Flat 1 (2-bed) 70sqm  
Flat 2 (2-bed) 63sqm  
Flat 3 (2-bed) 63sqm  
Flat 4 (1-bed) 49sqm (1sqm below standard)  
Flat 5 (2-bed) 69sqm  
Flat 6 (3-bed) 85sqm  
Flat 7 (1-bed) 48sqm (2sqm below standard)  
Flat 8 (studio flat) 40sqm (4sqm below standard)  
Flat 9 (studio flat) 35sqm (1sqm below standard)  
Flat 10 (2-bed) 75sqm  
Flat 11 (2-bed) 59sqm (2sqm below standard)  
Flat 12 (2-bed) 65sqm  
Flat 13 (2-bed) 65sqm  
Flat 14 (3-bed) 79sqm.
- 49 The shortfalls in floorspace standards for flats 4, 7, 8 and 9 and 11 are not considered to be significant. In particular given that the proposal is for an amendment an existing permission, the effect of which would be for one less flat within the development, it is not considered that the small amount of shortfall in relation to these units would be sufficient grounds for refusing planning permission. Officers have reviewed the layout of the proposed wheelchair units and following some minor modifications, they are found to be acceptable and suitable for wheelchair users.

#### **Traffic issues**

- 50 Saved policy 5.2 of the Southwark Plan seek to ensure that developments do not result in adverse transport impacts and 5.6 establishes maximum parking standards. The site has a public transport accessibility level (PTAL) of 2 (low) and a Controlled Parking Zone is in the process of being implemented in this area.
- 51 The layout of the proposed parking spaces would be acceptable and would not result in any harm to highway safety; a condition requiring them to be completed prior to the occupation of the flats is recommended.
- 52 The consented scheme permitted 24 parking spaces (including 2 disabled spaces) to serve 15 flats. When first submitted the application now before Members proposed 26 spaces to serve 14 flats, and this raised concerns regarding an over provision of parking and a lack of landscaping to the front of the site. Following discussions with



officers it is now proposed to provide 19 parking spaces at the front of the building, 12 of which are already allocated to existing residents in the block and the remaining seven would be for occupiers of the new flats, equating to a 50% parking provision (7 spaces for 14 flats).

- 53 In addressing the objections that there is already too much car parking and that the allocated spaces at the front are un-necessary, officers have sought clarification about the existing number of flats within the development as a whole, and the amount of parking. These matters are set out below, for information.

- **Existing number of flats in the entire building;**

This application relates to the ground floor of Block A (see red line on attached plan SITE-01 Rev A), where 14 units are proposed as opposed to the 15 previously consented. The remainder of the T-shaped building fronting Peckham Grove contains 86 flats as approved by planning application Ref. 0001199 dated 05/10/2001.

- **Existing number of parking spaces on the entire site;**

The 'entire site' comprises not only the T-shaped building containing the 86 flats described above. There is also a 3 storey office building and a 3 storey residential building containing 20 residential units as approved by planning application Ref. 0001199 dated 05/10/2001. The entire site currently contains 103 car parking spaces (see attached plan titled 'Peckham Grove car parking as existing') for the 106 residential units and 3 commercial/office units within it.

- **Proposed number of parking spaces on the entire site;**

- 54 There are currently 18 parking spaces in front of Block A. This application (as revised) now proposes 19 spaces in front of Block A. The 19 spaces comprise 5 spaces (1 of which is temporary as it is in front of the sub-station access) and 2 disabled spaces between the 14 new flats. The remaining 12 parking spaces will be allocated back to existing residents already parking there as indicated on attached drawing no. 492-900C.

- **Number of parking spaces on the entire site which have already been allocated to existing residents.**

All of the existing parking spaces on the site have already been allocated to existing residents or businesses within the wider site.

- 55 Although the site has a low PTAL of just 2, this provision is considered to be acceptable given that a controlled parking zone is due to be introduced, and overspill parking from the development can be controlled by exempting future occupiers from being able to obtain parking permits; a condition to this effect is recommended. Given that no adverse highways impacts are anticipated and the opportunities that providing less parking presents in terms of landscaping and streetscape, the proposed level of parking is considered to be acceptable and each of the wheelchair accessible units would have its own accessible parking space.

- 56 Saved policy 5.3 of the Southwark Plan requires developments to adequately cater for the needs of pedestrians and cyclists.

- 57 The approved plans for application reference: 06-AP-0796 showed 17 cycle parking spaces plus 1 space per 10 units for visitors and these were to be located in a dedicated cycle store at the front of the building. It is now proposed to provide 16 cycle parking spaces, also within a dedicated store at the front of the building and this provision is considered to be acceptable, equating to one cycle space per flat, plus 10% for visitors. The store would be convenient, weatherproof and secure, and a

condition requiring it to be provided prior to occupation of the flats is recommended.

- 58 Concerns have been raised that across the entire site there would be an over provision of cycle parking spaces, but officers note that for the proposed 14 flats, the provision would be acceptable. In addition, since the application was first submitted the number of car parking spaces has been reduced, therefore the proposed cycle parking is considered to be necessary in terms of planning policy.

### **Design issues**

- 59 Saved policies 3.12 and 3.13 of the Southwark Plan seek to ensure that developments achieve a high standard of architectural and urban design and strategic policy 12 of the Core Strategy, Design and conservation' seeks to create high quality environments.
- 60 The proposed alterations to the exterior of the building are not considered to be significant when compared to the consented scheme for office units at ground floor level (reference: 0001199) or the consented scheme for 15 flats (reference: 06-AP-0796). External facing materials are to match existing and this can be secured by way of a planning condition. The proposed installation of solar panels to the roof of the building are considered to be acceptable in design terms and given the height of the building, would not cause harm to its appearance.
- 61 The front of the site at present is a rather uninspiring row of 18 parking spaces, which contributes very little to the streetscape of Peckham Grove. It is also acknowledged that a considerable amount of utilities work appears to have been undertaken on the pavement outside the site, although this is outside the scope of planning control.
- 62 In order to enhance the streetscape the number of parking spaces proposed at the front of the site has been reduced, so that additional landscaping could be provided. Although no detailed plans have been formulated at this stage in terms of species and planting densities, the proposed site plan shows that 10 new birch trees would be planted along the front of the site, set within planted areas (shrubs). In addition, the pathways to the front of the flats are shown as being paved which would clearly distinguish them from the tarmac parking spaces, and some redundant ramps which are currently in place at the front of the building would have to be removed. It is recommended that a condition be imposed upon any forthcoming planning consent requiring a detailed landscaping plan, including provision for 10 trees, to be submitted for approval. The Council's Urban Forester has reviewed the details submitted to date and has advised that they are acceptable.

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

- 63 Saved policy 3.18 of the Southwark Plan seeks to ensure the setting of listed buildings, conservation areas and world heritage sites is preserved. Numbers 40-46 Peckham Grove which adjoin the site to the north are grade II listed. It is considered that the proposed enhancements to the streetscene by way of provision of landscaping would enhance the setting of these heritage assets.

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

- 64 The previous permission for 15 flats on the site secured the following section 106 contributions:

£80,340.00, which is broken down as follows:

- Education - £16,625

- Strategic transport - £13,563
- Health - £13,515
- Public Realm - £11,250
- Open space - £17,093
- Employment during construction - £6,720
- Administration fee @ 2% - £1,575

65 The applicant had originally proposed that despite the scheme comprising one less unit than had originally been proposed, they would agree to the original s106 being applied. Officers were concerned that applying the s106 charges for 14 units, at the same rate as for the 15 units, would be unjustified given that the CIL regulations do require clear justification for charges based on mitigation of impacts of the scheme. The on-line s106 toolkit for developers was run for the revised scheme. The toolkit carries out the calculations based on the formulae contained in the s106 SPD, but the charges are updated year on year according to indexation (RPI). As a consequence, the s106 contributions came out with some different figures, and the figures are also adjusted owing to the dwelling mix as now varied. The amended contributions based on the revised scheme are as follows.

Total £74 409, which is broken down as follows:

- Education - £12 481
  - Strategic transport - £6528
  - Health - £15 314
  - Public Realm - £10 500
  - Open space - £15 949
  - Employment during construction - £10 064
- (sub-total £72 950)
- Administration fee @ 2% - £1459

**TOTAL £74 409**

66 Officers consider that without the contributions towards local infrastructure provision as detailed below the proposed development would have an unacceptable impact on the local area. The justification for the particular contributions is addressed below.

67 The Council's adopted Core Strategy Policy 14 justifies the planning requirement for contributions towards local infrastructure as a principle. The adopted 2007 S106 Planning Obligations SPD details and justifies the borough wide requirement for employment and training (construction); education; transportation; children's play, sports development; health; public realm on major new developments. These are the primary policies that state the necessity in planning terms for the obligation.

68 The SPD details the borough wide need for education expansion. By 2012 (reception), 2013 (primary and secondary) the boroughs schools will either be at or exceed the DfES 95% capacity levels. The contribution sought is a small contribution relative to the cost of providing additional places and can be used in conjunction with other funding to increase capacity for new developments.

69 The SPD set the policy need and justification for the Employment and Training obligations and associated contributions, ensuring that developers are sustainable in their job creation and help improve the areas they will form a part of. The Council is likely to work with Southwark Works to deliver the work opportunities, unless the developer wishes to undertake the provision themselves.

70 The strategic transport contribution would go towards improvements such as towards

Peckham Rye station area. It is proposed to make substantial improvements to the setting of Peckham Rye station. Peckham Rye is identified in the Mayor's Transport Strategy as a strategic interchange and the project will complement planned improvements to the station itself which will become increasingly important with the arrival of London Overground services in 2012. Proposals include improvements to the station fabric and the re-creation of a public square outside the station, improving the setting of the station while reducing journey times. Planned delivery is split into a number of phases from 2012/13 to 2015/16.

- 71 Public realm and Open Space, signage and street lighting surrounding the proposed development will need to be improved as the area will be more intensively used, at different times of the day with an additional residential population. The Council will also look at tree planting, wildlife and biodiversity measures and an expansion of the works to Burgess Park which is within walking distance. In addition, there is a project to 'Revitalise Camberwell'. Southwark and Lambeth Councils in partnership with TfL are to invest in Camberwell town centre to uplift and transform the streetscape, providing stronger links between commercial centres, employment centres and green space. The scheme, while focusing on transport issues, will provide the opportunity for coordination across a range of regeneration activities and initiatives in the area.
- 72 New developments are required to contribute to these improvements, as they would generate a substantial pressure on the local public open space amenities with no corresponding improvement to adequately deal with it. Increased revenue through the rates and Council tax would take time to both feed into the system and to identify the appropriate service area to target. This could lead to a decrease in the quality of open space provision, at a time of increasing use.
- 73 The Southwark Play Strategy 2007-12, shows a deficit against the standard ratios for play provision for 11-16 year olds and family friendly play spaces across the borough. While the Council is committed to enhancing the open space and play provision for the existing population, it is vital new developments make a contribution to improved provision for which they will use and benefit. Contributions will be targeted, but not limited to Elephant and Castle sport centre as it has potential for improvements but is nearly at capacity.
- 74 The levels of the contributions sought are established in the S106 Planning Obligations SPD, and represent only a contribution towards the full cost of the mitigation rather than the full cost. Therefore officers consider that all the obligations sought are necessary in planning terms, reasonable and directly related to the proposed development as per the CIL 2010 Regulations.
- 75 The applicant has agreed to the revised amounts and a s106 is being drafted to secure the above obligations. However, the agreement should be secured in a timely manner. In the event that the legal agreement is not entered into by 7 March 2012, it is recommended that the Head of Development Management be authorised to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out below.
- 76 In the absence of a signed Section 106 Agreement, there is no mechanism in place to avoid or mitigate the impact of the proposed development on the public realm, public open space, the transport network, health facilities and employment and the proposal would therefore be contrary to Saved policy 2.5 Planning obligations of the Southwark Plan 2007 and Strategic Policy 14 of the Core Strategy 2011, and Policy 8.2 Planning obligations of the London Plan 2011.

#### **Sustainable development implications**

- 77 Strategic policy 13 'High environmental standards' of the Core Strategy expects

development will help us live and work in a way that respects the limits of the planet's natural resources, reduces pollution and damage to the environment and helps us adapt to climate change. Major developments must achieve the following:

- Code for Sustainable Homes level 4 for residential developments;
- A 44% saving in carbon dioxide emissions above the building regulations from energy efficiency, efficient energy supply and renewable energy. An energy statement would be required to demonstrate how this would be achieved;
- A reduction in carbon dioxide of 20% from using on-site or local low and carbon zero sources of energy;
- A 50% reduction in surface water run-off.

- 78 In the case of entirely new build schemes, unless there were particular site constraints developments would be expected to meet the above targets. This proposal is for a conversion however, and is in fact an amendment to an existing permission to provide 14 rather than 15 flats.
- 79 The consented scheme for 15 flats included the provision of 16 solar panels on the roof of the building, which would have achieved a 10% renewable energy target used by the Council at the time. It was acknowledged that it fell short of the 20% carbon dioxide reduction target sought under the 2008 London Plan, but the applicant advised that there was no scope to provide further measures as this would impact upon the viability of the scheme. The roof panels are shown on the approved plans as being located within the middle section of the front block.
- 80 Sustainability targets have become more stringent since the permission for 15 flats was granted, and the proposal would remain below current sustainability targets set out in the Core Strategy. It is now proposed to provide 26 solar panels which would all be located towards the northern end of the front block. Consequently the proposal would meet the 20% renewable energy target. In terms of its overall carbon dioxide reduction, the scheme would achieve 35% and the target is 44%, but again, given the constraints associated with the conversion of an existing building, this is considered on balance to be acceptable. The dwellings would also only achieve Code for Sustainable Homes (CfSH) level 2.
- 81 The applicant has confirmed that the proposed PV panels will meet the 20% renewable energy target and result in a 35% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions (as confirmed in the submission documents). The PV panels have been taken into account in the CfSH score. As this proposal is a conversion rather than a new build, there are no building Regulations requirement to achieve any higher than Code Level 2 that is currently proposed.
- 82 Officers recognise that there are practical constraints to the level of energy performance improvement that can be achieved through this scheme, as the project is residential conversion of a former commercial property. The applicant has noted that this being the case, there are a number of CfSH credits that cannot be achieved due to the building's construction (i.e. structure, services and drainage). It is considered however that this scheme has taken a reasonable approach (including the 20% renewable via roof top PVs).
- 83 Concerns have been raised as to whether the additional solar panels would benefit all residents within the building or just those occupying the 14 flats, issues regarding construction and maintenance are raised, and whether they would affect Wi-Fi and result in electro-magnetic and radio frequency interference.
- 84 The applicant's agent has advised that the intention is that the electricity will feed in to the nearest landlords meter and that it would benefit all flats within the building, but

this cannot be confirmed until after a full technical appraisal is undertaken (post planning). The panels would need some degree of maintenance, and ultimately replacement, however as with all such installations, the 'free' electricity the panels provide should offset those costs. The applicant has advised that it is not therefore anticipated that the installation would cause an increase in Service Charges for existing residents. The method of construction & installation has not been determined yet, however is highly likely to involve temporary scaffold, edge protection and craneage. Whilst the completed installation is not expected to cause any problems to the existing flats, the residents are protected by the landlord's obligations within the lease. Solar panels are used on many modern residential developments, particularly schemes for 10 or more units given the Council's sustainability policies, and should not cause any loss of amenity for residents.

- 85 No information has been provided with regard to surface water run-off although again, it is noted that the proposal is for conversion of an existing building, and additional landscaping would be provided at the front.

#### **Other matters**

- 86 There are no other matters arising from the proposal.

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

- 87 This proposal has arisen owing to the inability to relocate two existing substations and a water tank within the building, meaning that a consented scheme of 15 flats cannot be built. It is now proposed to build 14 flats instead and to make some other relatively modest alterations to the building, and it is noted that the flats are largely in place on site. The proposal would fall short in terms of its sustainability criteria, but efforts have been made to improve this through the course of the application, and as the proposal is for conversion of an existing building, this is also considered on balance, to be acceptable. The proposal would create 14 dwellings within the currently vacant ground floor of the building and these would add to the housing stock in the borough. The traffic and amenity impacts are considered to be acceptable, and the provision of landscaping would improve the visual amenities of the streetscene. It is therefore recommend that planning permission be granted, subject to a section 106 agreement.

#### **Community impact statement**

- 88 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.
- 89 a) The impact on local people is set out above.

#### **Consultations**

- 90 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.

- 91 Summary of consultation responses

Objections have been received from 5 properties, details of which are set out at Appendix 2 of this report.

### **Human rights implications**

- 92 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.
- 93 This application has the legitimate aim of providing 14 flats. 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**

- 94 None.

## BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Site history file: TP/2247-46  Application file: 11-AP-1139  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 5410 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>	Becky Baker, Planning Officer	
<b>Version</b>	Final	
<b>Dated</b>	3 February 2012	
<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	No	No
Strategic Director of Environment and Leisure	No	No
<b>Date final report sent to the Constitutional Team</b>		6 February 2012



**Consultation undertaken**

**Site notice date:** 19/07/2011

**Press notice date:** 14.07.2011

**Case officer site visit date:** 19.07.2011

**Neighbour consultation letters sent:** 11/07/2011

**Internal services consulted:**

Urban Forester  
Transport Planning  
Planning Policy

**Statutory and non-statutory organisations consulted:** N/A.

**Neighbours and local groups consulted:**

11/07/2011 FLAT 17 ROSEMARY COURT PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6FE  
11/07/2011 FLAT 18 ROSEMARY COURT PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6FE  
11/07/2011 FLAT 16 ROSEMARY COURT PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6FE  
11/07/2011 FLAT 14 ROSEMARY COURT PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6FE  
11/07/2011 FLAT 15 ROSEMARY COURT PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6FE  
11/07/2011 FLAT 19 ROSEMARY COURT PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6FE  
11/07/2011 FLAT 23 ROSEMARY COURT PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6FE  
11/07/2011 FLAT 24 ROSEMARY COURT PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6FE  
11/07/2011 FLAT 22 ROSEMARY COURT PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6FE  
11/07/2011 FLAT 20 ROSEMARY COURT PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6FE  
11/07/2011 FLAT 21 ROSEMARY COURT PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6FE  
11/07/2011 FLAT 13 ROSEMARY COURT PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6FE  
11/07/2011 FLAT 5 ROSEMARY COURT PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6FE  
11/07/2011 FLAT 6 ROSEMARY COURT PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6FE  
11/07/2011 FLAT 4 ROSEMARY COURT PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6FE  
11/07/2011 FLAT 2 ROSEMARY COURT PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6FE  
11/07/2011 FLAT 3 ROSEMARY COURT PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6FE  
11/07/2011 FLAT 7 ROSEMARY COURT PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6FE  
11/07/2011 FLAT 11 ROSEMARY COURT PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6FE  
11/07/2011 FLAT 12 ROSEMARY COURT PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6FE  
11/07/2011 FLAT 10 ROSEMARY COURT PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6FE  
11/07/2011 FLAT 8 ROSEMARY COURT PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6FE  
11/07/2011 FLAT 9 ROSEMARY COURT PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6FE  
11/07/2011 FLAT 56 ROSEMARY COURT FERDINAND DRIVE LONDON SE15 6FF  
11/07/2011 FLAT 57 ROSEMARY COURT FERDINAND DRIVE LONDON SE15 6FF  
11/07/2011 FLAT 55 ROSEMARY COURT FERDINAND DRIVE LONDON SE15 6FF  
11/07/2011 FLAT 53 ROSEMARY COURT FERDINAND DRIVE LONDON SE15 6FF  
11/07/2011 FLAT 54 ROSEMARY COURT FERDINAND DRIVE LONDON SE15 6FF  
11/07/2011 FLAT 58 ROSEMARY COURT FERDINAND DRIVE LONDON SE15 6FF  
11/07/2011 FLAT 62 ROSEMARY COURT FERDINAND DRIVE LONDON SE15 6FF  
11/07/2011 FLAT 63 ROSEMARY COURT FERDINAND DRIVE LONDON SE15 6FF  
11/07/2011 FLAT 61 ROSEMARY COURT FERDINAND DRIVE LONDON SE15 6FF  
11/07/2011 FLAT 59 ROSEMARY COURT FERDINAND DRIVE LONDON SE15 6FF  
11/07/2011 FLAT 60 ROSEMARY COURT FERDINAND DRIVE LONDON SE15 6FF  
11/07/2011 FLAT 52 ROSEMARY COURT FERDINAND DRIVE LONDON SE15 6FF  
11/07/2011 FLAT 44 ROSEMARY COURT FERDINAND DRIVE LONDON SE15 6FF  
11/07/2011 FLAT 45 ROSEMARY COURT FERDINAND DRIVE LONDON SE15 6FF  
11/07/2011 FLAT 43 ROSEMARY COURT FERDINAND DRIVE LONDON SE15 6FF  
11/07/2011 FLAT 42 ROSEMARY COURT FERDINAND DRIVE LONDON SE15 6FF  
11/07/2011 FLAT 46 ROSEMARY COURT FERDINAND DRIVE LONDON SE15 6FF  
11/07/2011 FLAT 50 ROSEMARY COURT FERDINAND DRIVE LONDON SE15 6FF  
11/07/2011 FLAT 51 ROSEMARY COURT FERDINAND DRIVE LONDON SE15 6FF  
11/07/2011 FLAT 49 ROSEMARY COURT FERDINAND DRIVE LONDON SE15 6FF  
11/07/2011 FLAT 47 ROSEMARY COURT FERDINAND DRIVE LONDON SE15 6FF  
11/07/2011 FLAT 48 ROSEMARY COURT FERDINAND DRIVE LONDON SE15 6FF

11/07/2011 FLAT 43 57 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 44 57 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 42 57 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 40 55 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 41 57 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 45 57 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 49 59 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 50 59 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 48 57 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 46 57 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 47 57 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 39 55 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 31 55 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 32 55 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 30 55 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 28 55 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 29 55 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 33 55 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 37 55 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 38 55 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 36 55 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 34 55 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 35 55 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 66 59 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 67 59 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 65 59 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 63 59 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 64 59 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 68 59 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 1 ROSEMARY COURT PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6FE  
11/07/2011 FLAT 71 59 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 69 59 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 70 59 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 62 59 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 54 59 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 55 59 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 53 59 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 51 59 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 52 59 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 56 59 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 60 59 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 61 59 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 59 59 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 57 59 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 58 59 PECKHAM GROVE LONDON SE15 6PH  
11/07/2011 FLAT 64 ROSEMARY COURT FERDINAND DRIVE LONDON SE15 6FF  
11/07/2011 109 COLEMAN ROAD LONDON SE5 7TF  
11/07/2011 111 COLEMAN ROAD LONDON SE5 7TF  
11/07/2011 107 COLEMAN ROAD LONDON SE5 7TF  
11/07/2011 103 COLEMAN ROAD LONDON SE5 7TF  
11/07/2011 105 COLEMAN ROAD LONDON SE5 7TF  
11/07/2011 115 COLEMAN ROAD LONDON SE5 7TF  
11/07/2011 123 COLEMAN ROAD LONDON SE5 7TF  
11/07/2011 125 COLEMAN ROAD LONDON SE5 7TF  
11/07/2011 117 COLEMAN ROAD LONDON SE5 7TF  
11/07/2011 119 COLEMAN ROAD LONDON SE5 7TF  
11/07/2011 101 COLEMAN ROAD LONDON SE5 7TF  
11/07/2011 44 GRANVILLE SQUARE LONDON SE15 6DX  
11/07/2011 45 GRANVILLE SQUARE LONDON SE15 6DX  
11/07/2011 43 GRANVILLE SQUARE LONDON SE15 6DX  
11/07/2011 41 GRANVILLE SQUARE LONDON SE15 6DX  
11/07/2011 42 GRANVILLE SQUARE LONDON SE15 6DX  
11/07/2011 46 GRANVILLE SQUARE LONDON SE15 6DX  
11/07/2011 183 SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EJ  
11/07/2011 201 SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EJ  
11/07/2011 47 GRANVILLE SQUARE LONDON SE15 6DX  
11/07/2011 48 GRANVILLE SQUARE LONDON SE15 6DX  
11/07/2011 185C SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EJ  
11/07/2011 187C SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EJ  
11/07/2011 185B SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EJ  
11/07/2011 189C SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EJ  
11/07/2011 185A SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EJ  
11/07/2011 UPPER FLAT 121 COLEMAN ROAD LONDON SE5 7TF  
11/07/2011 GROUND FLOOR FLAT 127 COLEMAN ROAD LONDON SE5 7TF  
11/07/2011 UPPER FLAT 127 COLEMAN ROAD LONDON SE5 7TF  
11/07/2011 GROUND FLOOR FLAT 121 COLEMAN ROAD LONDON SE5 7TF  
11/07/2011 189B SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EJ  
11/07/2011 133 COLEMAN ROAD LONDON SE5 7TF  
11/07/2011 97 COLEMAN ROAD LONDON SE5 7TF







22/07/2/11 (to correct a reference number in the description of development) and  
15/11/2011 (following the receipt of amended plans).

### Consultation responses received

#### Internal services

##### Urban Forester

I can confirm that the design and specifications are acceptable.

##### Transport Planning

##### Cycle storage

The existing level of cycle storage has been proposed. As the development will be losing one housing unit, the developments over all cycle provision will exceed the councils minimum cycle parking standards, which is welcomed,

The applicants have provided semi horizontal cycle parking racks (Broxap Neath) typically the transport team would not accept a whole cycle store with this type of cycle storage as this type of racking may be troublesome for some cycle users who are unable to lift/push cycles up into the proposed racking.

The transport team have not made comment on application 06-AP-0796 in which this type of racking was proposed, therefore in this instance given the previous application, and the fact that no objections were raised to the proposed type of racking, the Transport Team deem it unreasonable to object to this.

##### Car Parking

The above application constitutes a loss in over all dwellings, but the level of on site parking has not been reduced. The provision for on site car parking is still within maximum parking levels stated in the Southwark plan.

Servicing and refuse collection will be under taken from Peckham Grove. Due to site constraints no off street serving facilities can be provided. Given the nature of the proposed development and the central 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.

Transport DC have no objections as there will be no significant negative impact on the highway network, or the performance and safety of the surrounding highways.

For major applications a S106 contribution should be sought using the S106 SPD standard charge formula. Additional site specific mitigating works (listed below) to be negotiated separately to this and calculated by the Transport Group. Any additional S106 money requested by TfL will be negotiated separately.

##### Planning Policy

No response received at the time of writing.

**Statutory and non-statutory organisations** N/A.

#### Neighbours and local groups

312 South City Court

Object to the proposal on the following grounds:

Increase in parking spaces:

1. The increase in parking spaces is not necessary as there is already an over provision of spaces;
2. The same landlord / developer attempted to sell parking spaces built at 69a Peckham Grove but their planning application was rejected;
3. Increased parking is at the expense of the removal of planting;
4. There are already double yellow lines in front of this development and on-street parking outside 69a is soon to be come limited time waiting;
5. The development of the Samuel Jones estate has produced further parking spaces that remain unallocated as the sales / rental process has not been successful;
6. Living on the cusp of zone 1 and 2 gives little need to own a car;
7. The parking was agreed by two community planning meetings in 2010 and there is no logistical change to warrant more spaces.

Reduction in planting - this is unacceptable and there is already a lack of planting in Peckham Grove despite promises being made by the developers:

1. There is a lack of planting at 69a which was constructed by a different division of the same developer / landlord. Breach of planning is currently being investigated because no planting was carried out;
2. There is a planning breach for lack of tree planting in South City Court, with nine new planters installed;
3. The developer knocked down and removed a tree planted on Peckham Grove and this has yet to be replaced;
4. No planting was carried out to the front of the building since occupation began in December 2002;
5. The landscaping was agreed via two community planning meetings in 2010 and to reduce this would be against environmental demands on the street.

Flat sizes:

The smallness of the flats was raised at the first of the two community planning meetings and the number of flats was reduced to 15. This has now been reduced to 14 hence the new submission, however it seems that the size of the flats have been reduced even though there are fewer of them, and it is suggested that they do not give a decent size of living space;

Entry points to flats:

These have been altered so that there are more entry points at the back of the property than agreed at the previous planning meetings. This will cause problems as they will need to access the building and car parks at the back of the property, although there are parking spaces on the social housing side of South City Court there are none on the private side. Why park your car to the front of your home when you cannot get access to it? There are parking problems in South City Court with the landlord bringing in parking enforcement to the front of the building and discussions are ongoing as to how this could be implemented in the secure car parks. There is one flat that has a limited access point to the back of the property whilst having a ramp to a non-existent door at the front of the building. There is a hallway linking these so it is unmistakable and the case officer is investigating it.

Bin stores:



The bin store to the front was to suffice for all flats but those now gaining access from the back have to use the bin stores there. I was advised that the new bin store to the front was necessary yet clearly it was not. There remain three bin stores currently not in use, they do not have bins in them, and could be used for additional bin stores.

#### Cycle storage:

There is already an oversupply of cycle storage on the estate and I am unsure why Southwark has insisted on more. My understanding of this was to reduce the need for car usage, which is another reason not to allow more parking spaces.

These comments are restricted to the changes in the plans from those originally agreed in 2010. I would also like to raise that the solar energy panels remain uninstalled. Although I am pleased they have altered their plans to use the power generation for the communal areas, I believe more could be done to increase this. They are not yet up to the 20% demand or using any sizeable part of the roof and its an opportunity to allow the generation of sustainable energy to be at the forefront of this development. There are numerous plans now available which would lead to a cost effective implementation of solar panels to the benefit of all residents, as well as money generation for the landlord.

#### 405 South City Court

##### 22nd July 2011:

- Queries whether it would be possible to extend this flat to provide an additional bedroom, with the possibility for solar panels on the roof;
- It remains unclear as to how the addition of solar panels on the roof will benefit all residents of South City Court;
- What guarantee do we have that the panels won't adversely affect our living conditions? How are they insulated from our flat below? Is there a recommended minimum thickness of insulation or any potentially harmful affects?
- Please confirm if the levels of EMI (electromagnetic interference) and RFI (radio frequency interference) emitted will make any noise or affect Wi-Fi functionality?
- Please provide more information on the proposed time frame for installation and how they will be maintained, as this could prove to be quite a nuisance.

##### 28th November 2011

When I purchased the property in September of last year it was with the understanding that the ground floor would be developed into 15 flats. At that time were not made aware that solar panels were to be installed on the roof of the building. The revised planning application has brought the solar panels to my attention. Please answer the following questions:

- It remains unclear as to how the addition of solar panels on the roof will benefit all residents of South City Court;
- What guarantee do we have that the panels won't adversely affect our living conditions? How are they insulated from our flat below? Is there a recommended minimum thickness of insulation or any potentially harmful affects?
- Please confirm if the levels of EMI and RFI emitted will make any noise or affect Wi-Fi functionality?
- Please provide more information on the proposed time frame for installation and how they will be maintained, as this could prove to be quite a nuisance.

#### No address provided:

We have recently bought a flat within the building and we were assured there weren't any plans for works to be carried out in the near future with the exception of turning the ground floor spaces into flats - which was already underway when we started the legal procedures to buy our flat.

We have now received a letter from Southwark Council with details of other works that seemed part of the same application. We would be grateful if you could confirm the following:

- Removal of a private 1-bedroom flat: is this on the ground floor? What is the reason for the removal and how will that space be used?
- Retention of existing water tank - was there a need to change this?
- Retention of existing substations: what are they specifically?
- Relocation of refuse store - which one does it refer to? Currently there is a large store in the parking space, it is that one, where will it be relocated to? There are lots of flats in the building and it would be unreasonable to locate it inside the building - this would also introduce pest problems.
- Relocation of cycle parking: where do they plan to relocate it and would it be reduced?
- Provision of two additional parking spaces: where? On the front of the property or in the courtyard parking space? Currently all the space available has already been allocated for parking - more parking slots might make it difficult to manoeuvre when parking
- New door to rear of building serving flat 4: is this a private door for that specific flat to the rear of the building?
- Provision of solar panels to the roof: is this for the 52 Peckham Grove building? Concerns over increase of service charges. Also how would we benefit from this since heating and hot water are managed by individual flats?

No address supplied:

- Can you tell me whether the whole building (South City Court Block A) will benefit from the energy captured by the solar panels? It has been rumoured that only the newly created flats on the ground floor would have the benefit of the electricity created.
- Can you clarify which area of the roof the panels are to be located on? I have concerns regarding the installation of the panels and how this will affect the integrity of the flat roof.
- Further to the installation of the panels I would like to know if maintenance and repairs will impact on the roof itself and the residents who live directly below, as I do myself.
- I would like assurances that the cost of the installation will not be passed to the residents.
- With regard to maintenance costs I would like to know who will be paying for these.

No address supplied:

25th July 2011

Object to the application on the following grounds:

1. The quality of the work carried out so far leads me to believe that the work to be continued will not be good enough and may actually be dangerous to the structure of the building (an example being the foam filler of the new ground floor window by the main door).

2. The work carried out so far is not in sympathy with the rest of the building (the new windows at the front do not match the windows at the floors above, the internal door fitted at the main corridor is nothing like the other flat's main entrances) leading me to believe this work will not be either - possibly damaging the values of the other flats in the building, but certainly making the environment not as nice to live in.

3. The plans submitted previously were not followed (as shown with the internal door on the main corridor) leading me to believe that this work will not be either.

4. The solar panels need to power all of the shared internal electrics for the building (for every floor) and the design needs to change to incorporate this.

5. Additions of doors to the outside of the building will compromise its security and may lead to specific targeting by the criminal community, therefore another door should not be added.

30th November 2011

Continue to object for the following reasons:

The initial plan did not show the main door to a flat within the main corridor of the main block but the new one does. This should not be allowed as it gives rise to further entrance to the main building further compromising security and creating wear and tear. The main doors to the ground floor flats should remain on the outside of the main building.

As expressed previously, previous plans were not followed therefore I do not believe these ones will be either, therefore planning should not be allowed unless all aspects are certain to be included, with compensation to residents if not. This is as the overall environment planned will be compromised and may therefore lead to further objections unless plans are followed exactly. An example is the placement of paving ramps to the front of the building which should be to front doors of new flats, but instead lead to walls. These are obviously ludicrous. Previous example given being the main door entrance to a flat in the main corridor (as referenced above).

Also previously expressed, the quality of work done so far is not of an acceptable standard and will be damaging to the value of the properties and the experience of living in the building. I do not believe further work should be attempted / allowed until this is corrected. The new main front door in the main entrance corridor does not match any other front door within the property; foam filler on windows being used poorly on the main fascia, possibly creating a dangerous environment if the window is either not sealed correctly or could move.

Although admirable that there is an insistence that new flats should be affordable, I am concerned that this could devalue the current flats in the property and therefore object to this provision (unless a reasonable compromise is reached).

I am not clear from the new plans whether the solar panels power all of the shared electrics within the building or not. If not (and in fact supply the new flats instead of the building) I object on the grounds that something which would affect all the residents should service all the residents.

I strongly agree with the insistence on the landscaping in terms of additional shrubs, trees and hardscaping and therefore would insist on its inclusion within any permission given. However, continue to object to the overall plans submitted.