

Item No. 6.4	Classification: OPEN	Date: 27 March 2012	Meeting Name: Planning Committee
Report title:	Development Management planning application: Application 11-AP-4206 for: Outline Planning Permission Address: SURREY QUAYS SHOPPING CENTRE, REDRIFF ROAD, LONDON, SE16 7LL Proposal: Hybrid outline/full application for the erection of an extension to the existing shopping centre comprising retail floorspace (approximately 10,564sqm of Use Classes A1 retail, A2 services, A3 cafe/restaurant, A4 drinking establishments and A5 hot food takeaways), alterations to the appearance of the existing shopping centre, landscaping, and reconfiguration of part of the existing car parking and associated highway works (full) together with the erection of a single level car parking deck above part of the existing car park, incorporating additional retail floorspace (approximately 450sqm of Use Classes A1, A2, A3, A4 and A5) (outline)		
Ward(s) or groups affected:	Rotherhithe		
From:	HEAD OF DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT		
Application Start Date 05/01/2012		Application Expiry Date 05/04/2012	

RECOMMENDATION

- 1) That a split decision be issued:
 - a. **Granting full planning permission** for the extension to the shopping centre (phase 1A), subject to conditions and the applicant entering into a legal agreement; and
 - b. **Refusing outline planning permission** for the car park deck with 450sqm of retail floorspace (phase 1B).
- 2) In the event that the legal agreement attached to the application to extend the shopping centre (phase 1A) is not entered into by 30th March 2012 then the Head of Development Management be authorised to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in paragraph 133 of this report

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 2) Circular 11/95 'The Use of Planning Conditions in Planning Permissions' at paragraph 44 explains the concept of Hybrid Outline Planning Applications. The term 'Hybrid' essentially means that an Outline Planning Application is submitted with some details supplied which could otherwise have been treated as a 'reserved matter'. An applicant can choose to submit as part of an outline application details of any of the 'reserved matters', and in this case, the reserved matters would relate to the detailed appearance of the extension to the Shopping Centre. Where details are provided, the Secretary of State has taken the view that the authority may not reserve their approval

but must grant or refuse permission on the basis of the submitted material, and that there is no power to reserve matters of which detail has been provided in the outline application, and this approach was approved by the High Court in *R v Newbury District Council Ex p. Chieveley Parish Council 1997* and this was upheld in the Court of Appeal [1995].

- 3 The applicant can still provide additional detail for 'illustrative purposes' only, and where the application includes details that are clearly illustrative, these matters will be reserved by the application. For the purposes of this current application, this means that the details provided on the extension to the Shopping Centre are to be determined without any matters reserved, but that the details relating to the car park deck are to be determined in outline only, with maximum and minimum parameters of the size of deck determined, but the detail of its appearance reserved. The drawings included in the application relating to the appearance of the car park deck have been provided by the applicant for 'illustrative purposes' only, and therefore the appearance would still form a reserved matter if permission were granted for the deck.
- 4 The recommendation for this application, is that a 'split decision' be issued, which means that one part of the application is granted (in this case the extension to the Shopping Centre), while another part is refused. In relation to this application it is recommended that permission for the car park deck be refused. It was established in the case of *Kent CC v SoS for the Env and Burmah Total Refineries Trust Ltd [1976]* that where a planning application consists of a number of separate elements, it is lawful for the planning authority to deal with them separately by only granting permission for that part of the development it considers should be permitted. However, before a split decision is issued, the applicant should be invited to make representations about this form of decision. Another case that provides a clearer test that should be applied when determining whether it is appropriate to issue a split decision, is *Wheatcroft v SoS for Environment [1981]*. This case established that the test should be whether the substance of development for which permission is sought would remain unchanged by issuing a split decision. As the car park deck does not form an intrinsic part of the development, and relates to a separate phase that may never be built out, the omission of this part of the application from any grant of consent for the other elements, would not change the substance of the development for which permission is sought. In summary, as the key component of this application concerns the construction of an extension to the shopping centre, the refusal of the car park deck would not alter that part of the development, and the substance is therefore unchanged.
- 5 The applicant has been in discussion with officers regarding the determination of this application, and whilst they would clearly wish that planning permission be granted for the entire proposal, they are content that a split decision is to be issued rather than a refusal of the application in its entirety. The applicant's right to appeal remains unaffected by a partial approval of the scheme.

Site location and description

- 6 The site is located within the Rotherhithe Peninsula and is part of a collection of sites designated within the draft Canada Water Area Action Plan (CWAAP) as forming the Canada Water Town Centre.
- 7 The Surrey Quays Shopping Centre extends over part 1 and part 2 storeys, with the BHS and Tesco Stores forming bookends to the internal mall. The shopping centre is fully enclosed and currently provides 31,951sqm (GEA) of retail, circulation and servicing floorspace over the two levels. To the west of the building is a 1,337 space surface level car park.

- 8 To the north of the site there is the Canada Water Basin, the Decathlon retail units, the new Canada Water Library and the Canada Water Underground Station. Deal Porters Way runs the length of the west of the site, with low rise residential dwellings beyond, and Southwark Park further to the west. To the South of the site there is the Surrey Quays Overground Station and the existing Lower Road shopping centre, as well as residential dwellings, and a number of bus stops which also appear to the southern area of the car park. To the east of the site there is the Greenland Dock and commercial buildings forming part of the leisure site.
- 9 The site is in the centre of the Canada Water Major Town Centre and has a public transport accessibility level (PTAL) of 5 (where 1 is low and 6 is high). There are two main stations adjacent to the site, the Canada Water Station to the north comprising of a main bus interchange station, overground station and Jubilee Line station, and the Surrey Quays overground station to the south.

Details of proposal

- 10 The application is in a 'hybrid' form, with a full permission sought for part of the development and the remaining aspects provided in outline only. The two parts of the application are described below and are identified as two phases, Phase 1A concerns details provided in full, for the shopping centre, while Phase 1B concerns details in outline only, for the car park deck.
- 11 Extension of the Shopping Centre (Phase 1A)
The application seeks full planning permission for an extension to the existing shopping centre building amounting to an additional 10,564sqm giving a total of 43,574sqm GEA (42,515sqm GIA or 34,530sqm NIA) of retail floorspace within uses classes A1, A2, A3, A4 and A5. The floorspace would be divided into units, ranging in size from 28sqm to 1,007sqm allowing them to accommodate a variety of commercial operators. Six larger units are proposed ranging from 305sqm to 1,007sqm and would contain well known 'high street' retail brands, while a further 7 units ranging from 28sqm to 138sqm are envisaged to accommodate smaller convenience or kiosk type stores. A further 7 units are proposed to front onto the car park and Basin area, and would be occupied by restaurant / cafe operators, and these units range from 108sqm to 307sqm.
- 12 The floorspace as existing and proposed is shown in the table below:

Use	GEA (sqm)*	GIA (sqm)**	NIA (sqm)***
Existing Shopping Centre area excluding Supermarket	32,883	31,951	25,772 [Of which 24,106 is A1 use (Tesco supermarket forms 10,724), 643 is A2 use and 1,023 is A3 use]
Proposed Shopping Centre area extension	10,691	10,564	8,760 [Of which 6,784 is A1 use and 1,976 is flexible A1 - A5 use (notional figures)]

Total	43,574	42,515	34,530
--------------	---------------	---------------	---------------

**GEA - Gross External Area is the area of a building measured externally at each floor level;*

***GIA - Gross Internal Area is the area of a building measured to the internal face of the perimeter walls at each floor level; and*

****NIA - Net Internal Area is the usable area within a building measured to the internal face of the perimeter walls at each floor level.*

- 13 The proposed retail extension would be located to the front of the existing shopping centre, and results in the loss of 277 car parking spaces, with the remaining car park reconfigured as a result. In addition to the retail extension and reconfiguration of the car park following the loss of spaces, it is also proposed to undertake the following works as part of the full planning permission:
- Improvement to pedestrian routes to and from Canada Water Underground and Surrey Quays Overground Stations;
 - Works to the route from Lower Road to the Site;
 - Provision of a public space adjacent to Canada Water Basin;
 - Re-surfacing of pedestrian route to the Mast Leisure site and Decathlon retail units, along the Canada Water dock edge;
 - Re-alignment of Deal Porters Way at the southern end of the site including the relocation of bus stops;
 - Creation of segregated cycle routes towards Greenland Dock and Canada Water Underground Station and creation of a shared surface along the frontage of the centre; and
 - Shared cycle and pedestrian routes to Redriff Road and Surrey Quays Overground Station with wider paths.
- 14 Car Park Deck (Phase 1B)
The application also seeks outline permission for further works to the car park area, to replace the car parking spaces lost in Phase 1A with a deck car park, allowing parking at ground and first floor levels. In total, the car park deck could provide full replacement spaces for those lost in Phase 1A. The matters reserved under Phase 1B are appearance, means of access, landscaping and layout. The application seeks approval for minimum and maximum parameters for scale and floorspace quantum.
- 15 Phase 1B proposes the reconfiguration of existing car parking within a decked structure and the provision of retail units / kiosks at ground floor, along part of the frontage facing the shopping centre. In total, the car park deck could provide the 277 replacement car parking spaces displaced by the construction of the extension (Phase 1A) and any additional spaces lost as a result of the car park deck structure.
- 16 This application seeks approval of parameter plans that demonstrate the maximum and minimum extent of the car park deck:
- As a minimum, the deck is proposed to be 9.5m high, consist of 7,830sqm (GEA) of floorspace, create 300sqm (GEA) of retail floorspace, and replacement car parking as described above;
 - As a maximum, the deck is proposed to be 13m high, consist of 10,720sqm (GEA) of floorspace, create 450sqm (GEA) of retail floorspace, and replacement car parking as described above.
- 17 As this part of the application is in outline only, the appearance of the deck forms a matter that would be reserved, and if outline permission was granted, a further reserved matters application would need to be submitted to provide detail on this. Illustrative material for the car park deck has been submitted, but does not give a clear or binding picture of the appearance of the deck. A Design Code has been developed by the applicant which describes the vision and objectives for the appearance of the deck, and this is set out in the Design and Access Statement and Strategic Masterplan

for the site. It is intended that any reserved matters application for the appearance of the deck would follow the guidance in the Design Code. However until a reserved matters application was submitted, the final appearance of the car park deck would not be known.

- 18 If members were to determine to grant permission for the deck, then it would be necessary to control the delivery of the car park deck by legal agreement. This would need to include triggers through would require a demonstration that the existing car park was at full capacity prior to the deck being constructed on the site. These triggers are described further below in the planning obligations section of this report at paragraph 129.

19 **Planning history**

11-AP-2643 - Request for Screening Opinion - Environmental Statement not required.

08-AP-0758 - Planning permission granted for the amendment to permission 04-AP-0238 for extension to the existing Tesco Store to create a new sales, storage and ancillary offices (3,463sqm); new glazed canopy together with covered walkway.

04-AP-0238 - Planning permission granted for extension to the existing Tesco Stores to create a new sales, storage and ancillary offices (3463sqm); new glazed canopy together with covered walkway.

07-AP-0947 - Planning permission granted for installation of a single storey extension to form an ATM pod on south west elevation close to main entrance.

07-AP-1188 - Planning permission granted for erection of new single storey maintenance building at Tesco Store (on Surrey Quays Road).

07-AP-1135 - Planning permission granted for change of use of one unit from class A1 (retail) to class A2 (financial and professional services) for use as estate agency.

S/86/181 - Planning permission granted for erection of retail shopping centre with car parking, petrol filling station, ancillary accommodation and separate two storey building of up to 12,000sq ft gross floorspace for retail / pub / restaurant or related leisure use adjacent to the eastern edge of Canada Water. (Site bounded by Lower Road / Redriff Road / Canada Loop Road).

20 **Planning history of adjoining sites**

The existing developments on Sites C, E, the Surrey Quays (Mast) Leisure Site, and the Surrey Quays Shopping Centre were approved by the London Docklands Development Corporation during the mid to late 1980's.

Outline permission was granted in 2007 at Site A & B (05-AP-2539) for the following:

Development of the site for mixed use purposes comprising residential flats, community use/public library (Class D1), offices , studio workshops and retail, in buildings up to a maximum of 10 storeys in height; creation of new areas of open space, construction of new roads, pedestrian and cycle routes and new access to the public highway together with associated works including the provision of parking, servicing and plant areas and a replacement entrance to London Underground Station

In 2007 the Council granted permission within Site B (07-AP-1174) for:

Erection of a Library building on northern edge of the Dock (within Site B), comprising a public library, cafe, community and performance space, and incorporating a new entrance to Canada Water Underground Station; laying out of an adjacent Civic Plaza; together with associated enabling works and highway alterations.

Construction of the library is now complete.

Reserved Matters were approved by the Council in 2008 at Site B1 (07-AP-2588) for:

External appearance, internal layout, and access to buildings, following Outline Planning Permission dated 4 May 2007 (05-AP-2539) for the erection of an eight storey building comprising 63 dwellings and Class A1 (retail) and B1 (office/commercial) accommodation within the ground floor.

Site B1, now known as Toronto House, and is now occupied.

An application was made for detailed permission at Site B2 which was granted in 2009 (08-AP-2388) for:

Erection of a part 7, part 8 storey building to provide 169 residential units (Class C3), 938sqm of retail and/or food/drink (Class A1/A3) and 300sqm of ancillary residential floorspace (residents gym), 46 basement car parking spaces, together with access, hard and soft landscaping, and other associated works incidental to the development.

This development is now complete and occupied, it is now known as Montreal House.

Detailed permission was granted in 2011 at Site C - Decathlon (09-AP-1783) for:

Redevelopment of existing retail warehouses and erection of 6 buildings varying in height from 4 to 10 storeys comprising 430 residential units (Class C3), 9104sqm retail store (Class A1), 1287sqm of other Class A1/A3/A4/A5 space, 644sqm of office space (Class B1a), 528sqm of Class D1 community space, access, basement car park for 340 cars, public realm, landscaping and communal amenity space.

The permission has not been implemented.

Outline planning permission was granted in 2010 at Surrey Quays (Mast) Leisure Site (09-AP-1999) for:

Demolition of all existing buildings and erection of buildings ranging from 2 to 10 storeys comprising 11,105sqm leisure floorspace (including cinema) (Class D2), 2,695sqm retail floorspace (Class A1-A3), 49,276sqm of private and affordable residential accommodation (approximately 509 flats) (Class C3), 495 car parking spaces (142 for residential and 350 for leisure uses) and associated works including public and private open space, as well as detailed design for 123 rooms (4,250sqm) of student housing (Class Sui Generis), 2,500sqm commercial floorspace (Class B1), 86 residential units (included in the 509 flats referenced above) (Class C3) and the external appearance of any elevation facing Harmsworth Quays Printworks.

No reserved matters applications have been made, and the permission has not been implemented.

Full permission was granted for Site A at Canada Water in 2010 (09-AP-1870) for:

Erection of a series of buildings comprising a 26 storey tower, with ground floor mezzanine (maximum height 92.95m AOD), and 9 individual buildings ranging from 4

to 8 storeys in height to provide 668 residential units, 958sqm of retail (Class A1, A2 and A3), and 268sqm of community use (Class D1), creation of a new open space and construction of new roads, pedestrian and cycle routes and new access to the highway, together with associated works including the provision of public cycle facility, basement car parking for 166 cars and cycle parking, servicing, landscaping and plant areas.

Phase A1 is occupied, and phase A2 is structurally complete. Construction of the foundations and structure for phases A3 and A4 is underway.

Full permission was granted at the Mulberry Business Park, Quebec Way in 2008 (07-AP-2806) for:

Demolition of existing buildings and the erection of a series of buildings up to 8 storeys comprising 256 residential units, 5105m² of Class B1 (Office) floorspace, basement car park with access to Canada Street, and landscaping works.

An application for a certificate of lawfulness in 2011 established implementation of the planning permission.

Planning Committee determined to approve a full planning application at Quebec Way Industrial Estate, Quebec Way on 28th February 2012 (11-AP-2565) for:

Demolition of three existing warehouse buildings and construction of 7 blocks between 3 and 6 storeys high (max 21m AOD); containing 366 residential units (142x 1 bed, 113x 2 bed, 98x 3 bed and 13x 4 bed) and commercial floorspace for Class A1 (shops) / A3 (restaurant/cafes) / D1 (non-residential institutions) / D2 (assembly and leisure)uses; with basement car parking, motorcycle and cycle storage, ancillary storage spaces and a new route through the site into Russia Dock Woodlands. New vehicle and pedestrian accesses to be created from Quebec Way.

The application is now waiting the signing of a legal agreement.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

21 Summary of main issues

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

- principle of the proposed development in terms of land use and conformity with strategic policies and the Canada Water Area Action Plan;
- design issues including layout, heights, massing and elevations;
- impacts upon the regeneration of the Town Centre, including retail choice, employment, environment;
- impacts upon surrounding retail centres;
- traffic issues, including congestion, and justification for parking deck;
- impact on the amenities of occupiers of adjoining properties;
- energy and sustainability; and
- planning obligations

22 Planning policy

Core Strategy 2011

- 1 - Sustainable development
- 2 - Sustainable transport

- 3 - Shopping, leisure and entertainment
- 10 - Jobs and businesses
- 11 - Open spaces and wildlife
- 12 - Design and conservation
- 13 - High environmental standards

Southwark Plan 2007 (July) - saved policies

- 1.1 Access to employment opportunities
- 1.7 Development within town and local centres
- 1.8 Location of developments for retail and other town centre uses
- 1.9 Change of use within protected shopping frontages
- 2.5 Planning obligations
- 3.1 Environmental effects
- 3.2 Protection of amenity
- 3.3 Sustainability assessment
- 3.4 Energy efficiency
- 3.6 Air quality
- 3.7 Waste reduction
- 3.11 Efficient use of land
- 3.12 Quality of design
- 3.13 Urban design
- 3.14 Designing out crime
- 3.15 Conservation of the historic environment
- 3.26 Borough open land
- 3.28 Biodiversity
- 5.1 Locating developments
- 5.2 Transport impacts
- 5.3 Walking and cycling
- 5.4 Public transport improvements
- 5.6 Car parking
- 5.7 Parking standards for disabled people and the mobility impaired
- 7.2 Canada Water Action Area

Supplementary Planning Documents

Submission Version of the Draft Canada Water Action Area Plan 2010 (*Proposal site CWAAP 7: Decathlon Site, Surrey Quays Leisure Park, Surrey Quays Shopping Centre and overflow car park.*)

Sustainable Design and Construction 2009
Section 106 Planning Obligations 2007

London Plan 2011

- 4.1 Developing London's Economy
- 4.7 Retail and Town Centre Development
- 4.8 Supporting a Successful and Diverse Retail Sector
- 4.9 Small Shops
- 4.12 Improving Opportunities for All
- 5.1 Climate change mitigation;
- 5.2 Minimising carbon emissions;
- 5.3 Sustainable design and construction;
- 5.5 Decentralised energy networks;
- 5.6 Decentralised energy in development proposals;
- 5.7 Renewable energy;
- 5.11 Green roofs and development site environs;
- 5.12 Flood risk management;

5.13 Sustainable drainage;
6.3 Assessing effects of development capacity and safeguarding land for transport;
6.9 Cycling;
6.10 Walking;
6.13 Parking;
8.2 Planning obligations.

Intensification Area 34: Canada Water
Canada Water District Town Centre

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

PPS 1: Planning for Sustainable Development
PPS 4: Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth
PPS 5: Planning and the Historic Environment
PPS 9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation
PPG 13: Transport
PPS 22: Renewable Energy
PPG 24: Planning and Noise
PPS 25: Development and Flood Risk

Planning for Town Centres: Planning Guidance on need, impact and sequential approach

23 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Bill

The NPPF Bill was published at the end of July 2011 for consultation until 17 October 2011 and is capable of being a material consideration. The Government has set out its commitment to a planning system that does everything it can do to support sustainable economic growth. 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.

The presumption in favour of sustainable development is a new policy designed to ensure that the planning system as a whole focuses on opportunities. The presumption, in practice, means that significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth through the planning system and local planning authorities should plan positively for new development and approve all individual proposals wherever possible. But development should not be allowed if it would undermine the key principles for sustainability in the Framework. The draft NPPF makes clear that the policies should apply 'unless the adverse impacts of allowing development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits'.

The draft NPPF also states that 'The primary objective of development management is to foster the delivery of sustainable development, not to hinder or prevent development' and that local authorities should look for solutions to problematic applications, so they 'can be approved wherever practical to do so'.

The draft NPPF also sets out core principles that should underpin both plan-making and development management. It states that 'every effort should be made to identify and meet the housing, business, and other development needs of an area, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth'.

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.

The draft NPPF sets out that in relation to town centres 'Planning policies should be positive and set out policies for the management and growth of centres. Local planning authorities should recognise town centres as the heart of their communities and pursue policies to support the viability and vitality of town centres.'

Principle of development

- 24 The application has been submitted as an Outline Hybrid, which means that the information is provided separately for the two parts: first phase 1A, the new extension building, with full detailed information provided, and then phase 1B, the car park deck, with outline detail only being provided. Because of the very different characteristics and impacts of each part of this application, it is appropriate to assess each part separately, and this report will provide an assessment of each of the phases under the relevant headings in the report.
- 25 Phases 1A and 1B are suggested as the first phases of a more comprehensive development of the shopping centre site and its associated car park. The applicant has submitted an indicative masterplan, showing possible future phases of development around the existing shopping centre, car parks and service area. This masterplan does not form part of the current proposals, but is intended to demonstrate that any early phases would not undermine the potential to deliver a wider regeneration of the Canada Water Town Centre, as envisaged in the Area Action Plan. Policy 16 and proposals site 7 of the CWAAP require a masterplan to be brought forward with any application for the first phase phase of development on the shopping centre. The masterplan submitted has limited detail, but it does indicate a pattern of development across the car parks, and potential for links into and across neighbouring sites (in separate ownership) and demonstrates that a wider redevelopment would not be prevented by the proposed shopping centre extension.
- 26 The CWAAP seeks to create a distinctive and vibrant town centre, with a 'high street' feel, well-connected to the surrounding street network, and providing a more diverse range of shops. It aims to use car parks more efficiently, and restrict car parking in order to ease the impact on the transport network.
- 27 Extension of the Shopping Centre (Phase 1A)
Strategic Policy 3 'Shopping, leisure and entertainment' of the Core Strategy states that we will maintain a network of successful town centres which have a wide range of shops, services and facilities, to help meet the needs of Southwark's population. As part of this, Canada Water is identified as a major town centre location, and it is envisaged that through the Canada Water Area Action Plan (CW AAP) the authority will enable the provision of approximately 35,000sqm of additional shopping space.
- 28 The site is identified in the Canada Water AAP as part of proposal site 7: Decathlon site, Surrey Quays Leisure Park, Surrey Quays Shopping Centre and overflow car park. This describes the required land uses on the site as up to 35,000sqm of retail uses (Classes A1, A2, A3, A4); a minimum of 5,000sqm of business use (Class B1); leisure uses (Class D2); residential use (Class C3) estimated capacity of 1,530 residential homes (600 units on the shopping centre and overflow car park, 500 units on the Leisure Park and 430 units on the Decathlon Site); community use (Class D); hotel use (Class C1); public open space; and town centre car parking. Proposal site 7 is made up of a wider masterplan area covering not only the shopping centre site and car park forming this current application site, but also a wider site area as described in the policy designation. The estimated capacity and various uses required as part of the proposal site would therefore be applicable over this entire masterplan area. This application forms just one part of the strategic masterplan area, and forms the focus of retail provision for the area.

- 29 Policy 1: 'Shopping in the town centre' of the CW AAP outlines the vision for Canada Water to move up the hierarchy of centres to establish it as a major town centre, through the provision of around 35,000sqm of additional retail space on the following sites:
- Surrey Quays Shopping Centre;
 - Site A;
 - Site B;
 - The Decathlon Site; and
 - Surrey Quays Leisure Site.
- Policy 2: 'Cafes and restaurants' in the town centre of the CW AAP also supports the provision of new cafes and restaurants on the sites listed above.
- 30 The phase 1A application site boundary amounts to 9.45 hectares and consists of the car park including overflow parking areas and the existing shopping mall, including Tesco's. The site extends from Redriff Road and Deals Porters Way to Surrey Quays Road along the rear of the existing shopping centre. Therefore while this application site only forms part of the Proposal site 7 masterplan area, it is at its centre and is key to the establishment of a major town centre in Canada Water. The other identified land uses for the masterplan area, including residential and community floorspace would not be intended in this part of the masterplan site where the shopping centre is located, and are envisaged as part of the wider strategic masterplan vision for the area. Therefore the proposal for an extension of the existing shopping centre to provide new retail floorspace here is in keeping with the policies and designations of the Core Strategy and CW AAP. However, it is important that the development proposal does not preclude the wider masterplan vision coming forward on the site, and this is discussed further below in the design section of this report from paragraphs 83 and 96.
- 31 In terms of the quantum of additional retail floorspace proposed, this amounts to 10,564sqm GIA, which is well within the 35,000sqm of new floorspace identified for the Canada Water Area. In relation to an assessment of the impact this additional retail floorspace on the area and other retail centres in Southwark and neighbouring boroughs, this is provided below from paragraph 36.
- 32 The shopping centre extension creates a significant opportunity to provide additional permanent jobs for local people. The operational phase of the development will create up to 467 full time equivalent permanent jobs. This is a significant benefit of the scheme that is of considerable weight in the assessment of the acceptability of the extension proposal. The extension will also reinforce the existing centre, and support the wider proposal to refurbish the interior of the mall. A centre which is both larger, and has a more attractive retail environment, would help retain spend in the borough, further supporting local employment.
- 33 Car Park Deck (Phase 1B)
As a result of the construction of the proposed extension to the shopping centre, the car parking provision on the site would be reduced from 1,337 spaces to 1,060 spaces. The applicant contends that these spaces may need to be re-provided in future, should demand for parking indicate additional spaces are needed. The applicant states that the ability to construct the car park deck, if required, would be essential to the health and vitality of the centre, because this would prevent customer 'leakage' (customers choosing not to shop at the centre because of a lack of parking spaces).
- 34 The applicant also suggests within the Transport Assessment submitted with the application, that the provision of additional parking is justified, given parking policies that allow additional parking for new retail floorspace. The applicant has suggested

that if London Plan standards were to be applied to this development, then between 141 and 212 additional spaces would be justified for the new retail floorspace proposed at the shopping centre. However, this neglects to recognise the availability of existing car parking spaces located on the site, and that this car parking area has capacity well in excess of any additional spaces that may be required by the shopping centre extension. Furthermore, standards within both the Southwark Plan and London Plan describe the maximum levels that might be expected for new developments. These maximum figures are not representative of required parking levels, or even expected parking levels for any given use, but are an upper limit that should be applied alongside an assessment of need to provide an indication of how much parking is necessary to support a particular use. The applicant has applied these standards, without the related assessment of need. Therefore the argument made in the Transport Assessment is flawed, failing to assess actual parking availability in existence on the site, and merely asserting that a blanket provision of spaces should be provided with the extension regardless of existing parking capacity on the site.

- 35 The applicant has not sought permission for the car parking deck based upon evidence of need, but upon a conjecture that need may arise in the future. It would not be appropriate to grant permission for the deck at this time, with no clear evidence of need, or impact on the viability of the shopping centre. The existing car park has surplus spaces capable of accommodating additional shoppers to an expanded centre. If at some point in the future, shortage of parking space did begin to impact on the centre, it would be possible to apply for planning permission for additional parking spaces on the site. However, until such time that this need is demonstrable, there is an in principle objection to the provision of replacement parking on the site, which is not needed at this current time, and therefore is contrary to strategy policy 2 'Sustainable Transport' of the Core Strategy which states that as part of improving places, the authority will 'encourage walking, cycling and the use of public transport rather than travel by car'. The existing car park does not experience high demand for car parking spaces, and the evidence suggests that at most times the car park is occupied at below 50%. A further assessment of the need for parking on the site is set out below in the Transport section of this report from paragraph 49.

Retail assessment

- 36 Extension of the Shopping Centre (Phase 1A)
Planning Policy Statement 4: 'Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth', gives guidance to Local Authorities in the determination of applications for employment uses. Policy EC10: 'Determining planning applications for economic development' advises local planning authorities to adopt a positive and constructive approach towards planning applications for economic development.
- 37 The policy goes on to advise that all planning applications for economic development should be assessed against the following impact considerations:
- a) whether the proposal has been planned over the lifetime of the development to limit carbon dioxide emissions, and minimise vulnerability and provide resilience to, climate change;
 - b) the accessibility of the proposal by a choice of means of transport including walking, cycling, public transport and the car, the effect on local traffic levels and congestion (especially to the trunk road network) after public transport and traffic management measures have been secured;
 - c) whether the proposal secures a high quality and inclusive design which takes the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of the area and the way it functions;
 - d) the impact on economic and physical regeneration in the area including impact on deprived areas and social inclusion objectives; and
 - e) the impact on local employment.

- 38 The policy statement also outlines the processes that should be followed in assessing the suitability of land for retail uses outside existing centres, or on sites that are not designated within an up to date Development Plan for large scale retail use. Because this application site is located within the existing Canada Water Major Town Centre, currently functions as a shopping centre, and is designated for retail expansion, a sequential test or retail impact assessment is not required for the proposed scheme. However impacts of the proposal should still be investigated and any relevant mitigation should be put in place if required.
- 39 The applicant has prepared a PPS 4 Assessment (Retail Assessment) for the Surrey Quays Shopping Centre and proposed extension, and this assessment has been submitted with the application. The Retail Assessment considers the application proposal under Phase 1A against criteria a) to e) of policy EC10 of PPS 4 set out above.
- 40 The predominant existing retail offer at Canada Water is comparison goods, primarily located within Surrey Quays Shopping Centre. The submitted retail assessment describes the relative 'health' of the shopping centre, and as an indication of this compares the level of vacancies in the mall to national vacancy levels. The Shopping Centre has a vacancy level of just 4% which is very low when compared to the 13% national average. Because of the good public transport links surrounding the site and the extensive parking area, the centre has a reasonably large potential catchment area. However Southwark as a whole experiences high expenditure leakage (i.e. potential custom that goes outside of the borough for purchases), as the borough retains only 16% of resident's comparison retail expenditure. Retaining resident expenditure within the borough, and providing a retail offer which encouraged residents to shop within Southwark, would be of significant benefit to the economy of the borough and the viability and vitality of its town centres. However it is necessary to ensure that the provision of a wider retail offer at any particular centre, this does not inadvertently result in harm to another nearby centre, because customers are diverted from shopping and supporting that other town centre location.
- 41 As a major town centre, Canada Water is expected to attract a significant proportion of the shoppers in the borough, however it is not currently performing to it's full potential. The Core Strategy and CW AAP identify this, and encourage the establishment of Canada Water as a major town centre through the provision of additional retail floorspace. The CWAAP recognises the potential of additional retail floorspace to claw back expenditure into the borough and enable the regeneration of the area. This application requests a flexible permission to cover a range of retail uses, however it is envisaged that the scheme will comprise 6,784sqm (NIA) of A1 Class retail and 1,976sqm (NIA) of flexible A1 - A5 Class retail floorspace. While encouraging additional retail floorspace at Canada Water it is still necessary to ensure that the provision of additional floorspace here will not harm the other identified town centres surrounding the site.
- 42 The submitted Retail Assessment includes an analysis of centres surrounding the site, to determine possible impacts upon these centres. These include Peckham, Elephant and Castle / Walworth Road, Camberwell, West End, Canary Wharf, Lewisham, Croydon and Brixton. The Retail Assessment concludes that some of these surrounding centres would experience an impact upon their trade draw and resultant turnover as a result of the proposed extension to Surrey Quays Shopping Centre. However this impact is negligible, when compared to the overall turnover experienced in these centres, their relative strength as individual centres when comparing vacancy rates to national averages, and the expected growth that many of the centres are expected to experience in coming years, which is likely to improve their performance and turnover to the positive. For example, the largest trade diversion would be from

the West End, however given the large turnover of that centre, the impact would be negligible in terms of the vitality and viability of that centre. Other examples are the Elephant and Castle, Lewisham and Canary Wharf which will all be impacted in a similar way, with existing customers from these centres drawn to the Surrey Quays Shopping Centre following the extension. However these centres would not experience any detrimental effects as a result of this trade draw to Surrey Quays, with the amount of custom being drawn to Surrey Quays from these centres expected to be just 4.1% to 5.1%. It is also relevant that the Elephant and Castle area is designated for regeneration and as part of this, development proposals are expected to redevelop the centre and expand the retail offer there, which will off-set any small impact that the Surrey Quays Shopping Centre extension would have on the Elephant and Castle centre.

- 43 The proposed development has been tested against the policy requirements in PPS 4 and it has been demonstrated that the extension is likely to bring benefits to the existing Canada Water Centre, without detracting from the vitality and viability of existing centres. Therefore the retail impacts of the extension are acceptable. The centre is in a location with good transport links, as expected by PPS4, and it will have significant positive benefits for employment and regeneration. The improved offer will also support the growing population in the area, as a result of development and wider regeneration schemes surrounding the site.
- 44 Car Park Deck (Phase 1B)
The proposed car park deck would include a small amount of retail floorspace in the form of kiosks, which would not be of any significant size and therefore as retail floorspace, would not impact the vitality and viability of the shopping centre or surrounding centres.
- 45 The applicant contends that the car park deck itself is required to support the vitality and viability of the shopping centre, providing car parking spaces for customers visiting the centre. The applicants Transport Assessment states that "The commercial reality is that a scheme of the scale and ambition of Surrey Quays Shopping Centre requires an appropriate level of parking to attract a suitable tenant mix. Without an appropriate tenant mix the scheme will be neither a regeneration nor commercial success. Retailers will reject the site if parking and car travel is deemed inadequate. Insufficient parking spaces for commercial visits could therefore seriously impact the deliverability of the scheme." It is recognised that where need exists, the provision of parking is appropriate to support retail functions on a site. However on the application site, the evidence demonstrates extensive parking capacity in existence on the site, before and after the construction of an extension (even with the associated loss of 277 spaces). The ability of the existing car parking area to support additional capacity is explained further below in the Transport section of this report.
- 46 In summary, there has been no substantive evidence provided to support an argument that the loss of 277 spaces on the site will impact the vitality and viability of the centre, even with the expanded retail offer. The evidence provided supports the conclusion that sufficient capacity exists on the site to meet car parking demand after the construction of the extension. If that situation were to change at some point in the future, it may be appropriate at that time to give permission for additional spaces. However, that decision would need to be based on clear evidence of need, linked to the viability of the centre. No such evidence is available at this time, so it would be inappropriate to give permission for additional spaces, even with the inclusion of triggers attached to any permission for the car park deck. The CWAAP stresses the importance of making efficient use of parking spaces and encouraging people to visit by foot, cycle or public transport. Objective T1 also notes the need to restrict car parking in order to ease the impacts on the transport network. The proposal for the parking deck would not comply with this objective, and no material considerations, in

terms of need, have been presented which would outweigh the expectations of the policy. The Inspectors report into the CWAAP endorsed changes to the AAP to recognise the issue of viability in assessing car parking provision. However, no clear case has been put forward by the applicant that failure to replace the lost spaces would undermine the viability of the shopping centre, and the extent of excess capacity in the existing car park would suggest that sufficient space would exist to cater for the reasonable needs of the extended centre.

Environmental impact assessment

47 Extension of the Shopping Centre and Car Park Deck (Phase 1A & 1B)

A request for a Screening Opinion was submitted under Regulation 5 of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) regulations, in order to determine whether the development proposed at the shopping centre site would be considered EIA development. The request was received in August 2011. According to the Regulations, the site could be classified as a Schedule 2 'urban development project' by virtue of its site area which exceeds 0.5ha. The area of the proposed development is approximately 9.15ha, although the area covered by the retail extension is only 1.05ha. The site area is made up of the existing shopping centre and phase 1B concerns the additional parking area of 1.2ha. Assessment has been made as to whether the development is likely to have a significant effect upon the environment by virtue of its nature, size or location, based on a review of the Schedule 3 selection criteria for screening Schedule 2 Development.

- 48 It was determined that the proposed development was not of a nature, scale, or location, which would be likely to give rise to environmental effects of more than local significance. The site is not located within a 'sensitive area' as defined by the Regulations. The application site is an existing retail centre, and the additional floorspace will not significantly alter the impacts that currently exist from operations on the site. It is therefore concluded that an Environmental Impact Assessment is not required.

Transport issues

- 49 Saved policies 5.1 'Locating developments', 5.2 'Transport impacts', 5.3 'Walking and cycling', 5.6 'Car parking' and 5.7 'Parking standards for disabled people and the mobility impaired' of the Southwark Plan, require the impacts that a development may have upon the transport network, be taken into account in the determination of planning applications. Strategic policy 2 'Sustainable transport' of the Core Strategy details that developments should seek to encourage walking, cycling and the use of public transport rather than travel by car.

50 Extension of the Shopping Centre (Phase 1A)

The application site is located in a PTAL (public transport accessibility level) 5 area. The site is well served by buses, London Underground services (Jubilee Line at Canada Water Station) and London Overground services (at Canada Water and Surrey Quays Stations).

51 *Acceptability of the loss of parking on site*

The proposed extension results in the loss of 277 car parking spaces on the site because of the location of the new building on the car park area. The applicant has submitted a Transport Assessment (TA) to present information on the existing traffic impacts and operations on the site. As part of this, surveys have been carried out to establish existing demand for parking on the site. Below is a table of surveys undertaken in July 2010 which explain parking demand on the site.

Table 2: Summary of current car parking demand at Surrey Quays Shopping Centre

Of total 1,337* spaces in SQ Shopping Centre Car Park	Thur Peak 1300-1400	Fri Peak 1300-1400	Sat Peak 1300-1400	Sun Peak 1300-1400
T o t a l Occupied Spaces	507 (38%)	498 (37%)	570 (43%)	549 (41%)
Total Free Spaces	829 (62%)	838 (63%)	766 (57%)	787 (59%)

* Applicant survey shows 1336, rather than 1337 spaces

- 52 There is no reason to suggest that parking demand has altered significantly since the time this survey was undertaken. The survey clearly demonstrates that since even at peak times at least 766 spaces were empty, there is sufficient capacity within the car park to accommodate the loss of 277 spaces.
- 53 *Provision of additional parking spaces as a result of the extension*
The provision of new retail floorspace is not expected to generate additional demand beyond the identified capacity for car parking on the site. The applicant has included within the submitted Transport Assessment an assessment of assumed future demand for parking should the full retail floorspace aspirations with the CWAAP be achieved on the site, which would effectively double retail floorspace here. This assumed future need shows a required increase in the level of car parking as a result of achieving the AAP aspirations for retail floorspace, but as this application is only for an additional 10,564sqm (GIA) of additional floorspace, it would not generate the need for parking assumed by the additional 35,000sqm of additional floorspace expected by the AAP.
- 54 The applicant also argues that the additional floorspace proposed by the extension to the shopping centre in itself justifies the provision of additional car parking on the site, based upon an uplift in retail floorspace. As part of this, the applicant seeks to apply the maximum standards in the London Plan (one space per 50sqm to 72sqm) to the new floor space, which would result in a calculation of between 141 and 212 new car parking spaces on the site. However as previously explained, these standards are applied as 'maximums' and are a guide only. In any case the number of spaces proposed in the deck would be in excess of the level calculated when applying parking standards in the London Plan and Southwark Plan. These standards should only be applied on the basis of an assessment of need, and because there is identified capacity at the site, there is no need to provide additional car parking as a result of the extension.
- 55 *Trip Generation, Distribution and Assignment*
The methodology included in the TA to described trip generation and impacts follows accepted practices and do not give rise to any cause for concern. The wider traffic impact of the enlargement of the shopping centre together with other anticipated developments in the area was tested in the Rotherhithe Multi-Modal Study. The planning obligations proposed as part of the development include a contribution to mitigate impacts on the strategic transport network, including the Lower Road gyratory, and therefore the proposed extension does not give rise to any cause for concern in relation to impacts across the main road network.
- 56 *Traffic Impact*
The scheme proposes minor changes to the junction of Deal Porter's Way and Redriff Road. The TA presents traffic modelling which demonstrates that the impact of the change and anticipated additional traffic will be minimal. Similarly, the effect of

anticipated additional traffic on the junction of Deal Porter's Way and Surrey Quays Road has been assessed and shown to be minimal.

57 *Pedestrian Accessibility and Connectivity*

The proposed extension does not fully satisfy the CWAAP desire to improve connectivity through the shopping centre, by creating new routes, including routes to the Leisure Site. However the proposals do not preclude the ability of the site to achieve the AAP aspirations for routes through the site at a later date, as part of the wider masterplan redevelopment of the site.

58 Elsewhere, the general improvements to pedestrian routes is welcomed, however there are some missed opportunities. For instance the opportunity to improve the route to the leisure site, which at present is unpleasant and involves crossing Surrey Quays Road at the Redriff Road roundabout which is not pedestrian friendly, or suitable for users with mobility or sensory impairments because the traffic here approaches from three directions has not been addressed. An alternative passage through the shopping centre could have provided a more appropriate route for pedestrians.

59 *Cyclist Accessibility and Connectivity*

There are general improvements to cycle routes, including specific provision for cyclists on the existing pedestrian route towards Greenland Dock. It is noted that Southwark Cyclists are generally in favour of the improvements, albeit with slight concern over the provision of some shared pedestrian / cyclist spaces. Funding for improvements is identified in the Section 106 agreements Heads of Terms.

60 The applicant proposes an increase in provision for visitor cycle parking, including over half of the spaces being covered. This is welcomed, although the proposed layout does not meet best practice and so it is recommended that the detail of cycle parking is secured by condition. No details have been provided of staff cycle parking facilities, which again should be secured by condition.

61 *Public Transport Impact*

The site is well served by buses, London Underground services (Jubilee Line at Canada Water Station) and London Overground services (at Canada Water and Surrey Quays Stations), and has a PTAL of 5. The impact of additional public transport trips on the existing networks has been assessed and shown to be negligible. This is particularly so because the peak times for trips to and from the shopping centre do not coincide with the traditional weekday morning and evening peaks for commuting.

62 *Bus Accessibility*

The proposal involves relocation of Deal Porter's Way to a line closer to Redriff Road. The bus stops on Deal Porter's Way will therefore be relocated further from the southern entrance to the shopping centre. The TA assesses that this will take walking times to the bus stops from 1 minute and 51 seconds to 2 minutes and 16 seconds. While any reduction in the accessibility of bus stops is regrettable, other improvements including to the environment of the waiting area will mitigate this.

63 *Service Yard Capacity*

The submitted TA assesses the impact of the development on the existing service yard. The analysis shows that the yard has sufficient capacity to cater for the increased demands placed upon it.

64 *Other matters*

A revised Travel Plan should be required by legal agreement in the event that permission is granted.

- 65 In conclusion the impact of the extension of the shopping centre upon the transport network, is considered acceptable, subject to conditions and the applicant entering into a legal agreement, to ensure the submission of details of the cycle parking and a revised travel plan for approval. While the absence of provision of a pedestrian route through the shopping centre to the leisure site is regrettable, it is not considered to warrant refusal given the wider employment and other benefits that result from the extension.
- 66 Car Park Deck (Phase 1B)
The Council's policy on car parking is contained in the saved Southwark Plan policy 5.6. Key points from policy 5.6 are:
- All developments requiring car parking should minimise the number of spaces provided;
 - All developments will be expected to include justification for the amount of car parking sought;
 - Parking for retail and leisure uses within town centres should be shared with public parking, not reserved for customers of a particular development. Maximum stay restrictions are required for all retail and leisure town centre parking.
- 67 Maximum standards for car parking provision are set out in table 15.2, "Maximum car parking standards for town centres". Within an area of Public Transport Accessibility Level 5 the maximum standards are: for a food superstore, one space per 38sqm; and for a local centre or shopping mall, one space per 50sqm. Based on these standards, if the current food superstore (10,724sqm NIA) and shopping centre (16,141sqm NIA) were to come to us today in an application, the standards indicate a maximum of 497 spaces should be provided. Under these standards, the proposed increase in shopping centre floorspace (8,760sqm NIA) would generate a maximum of 117 additional spaces. Together these give a total of 614 spaces.
- 68 The applicant's transport assessment uses London Plan 2011 standards, which are one space per 25sqm for food superstore and one per 50sqm for shopping malls. Using the floorspace (NIA) figures above, and applying the London Plan standards, this would give a calculation total of 752, 175 and 927 car parking spaces respectively. It should also be noted that the applicant has used gross floorspace figures to calculate the number of parking spaces required, which gives higher totals than described earlier in this paragraph, however even when applying London Plan standards to gross floorspace figures, the car park is in excess of normal maximum levels. For example, the resulting total of retail floorspace proposed as part of the extension is 42,515sqm (GIA) of which 10,724sqm is the Tesco Supermarket, and when applying London Plan parking standards (which are higher than Southwark's) this would give a total of 1,065 spaces, and therefore the existing car park would still have 272 car park spaces in excess of these figures.
- 69 In summary, the current food superstore and shopping centre have 1337 spaces. The proposed extension will reduce this to 1060 spaces, and the proposed deck could re-provide the lost 277 spaces to reinstate a total of 1337 car parking spaces on the site. This total number of spaces is higher than both the Southwark Plan and the London Plan would normally permit.
- 70 *Justification for provision of additional parking spaces*
Policy 9: 'Parking for retail and leisure' of the CW AAP states that that car parking for retail and leisure developments within the town centre must be made available to the general public as 'town centre' car parking. The Transport Assessment submitted with the application explains that of the 1,337 commercial spaces at the site, 616 are primarily located and used by the food store. It goes on to states that "The vast

majority of retailers will not factor all of the food store parking spaces into their assessment as they will see those spaces very much as a dedicated food store benefit and will need comfort that there are sufficient additional parking space to meet their own demand requirements." The applicant therefore proposes, that the parking spaces that are lost as a result of the extension to the shopping centre are replaced in a car park deck, should future need arise.

- 71 Parking demand is assessed in the Transport Assessment (TA) submitted with the application, and this indicates that at its busiest period the car park contained 570 cars. The TA goes on to explain the likely increase in parking need and duration of stay arising from the proposed extension. However the TA clearly shows that the car park will be no more than 66% full even after the extension, and that it would be expected that some 361 vacant parking spaces would be available across the car park, which would be sufficient to cater for periods of higher demand such as Christmas. Therefore the evidence submitted does not support a conclusion that future need will arise for additional parking spaces as a result of the extension.
- 72 As described above, the applicant considers that parking is largely affiliated with the Tesco Store. Therefore the 'primary spaces' are defined in Appendix C of the TA as being within 150m of the entrance to the Tesco store, and excludes the section of car park closest to Redriff Road, because this involves crossing Deal Porter's Way. In pre-application discussions the applicant placed a heavy emphasis on the importance of provision of 'primary parking spaces'. This is why the car park deck is proposed in the specific location, being in close proximity to the Tesco Supermarket. As described above, Policy 9 of the CWAAP would expect the entire Surrey Quays parking area to provide parking for the entire town centre area, therefore it is not appropriate to attach spaces, even informally, to the Tesco Supermarket. The provision of additional spaces to ensure proximity to the supermarket is therefore not sufficient justification and is contrary to policy 9 of the Action Plan.
- 73 The TA also assesses possible demand arising from other nearby sites following implementation of extant planning permissions. However such permissions have been granted in the light of an assessment of the parking needs of those sites without reliance on the customer parking provision on the shopping centre site.
- 74 In summary there is no evidence presented that successfully justifies the proposed level of parking provision. This does not preclude the potential for justification for increased parking at a later stage, after the centre extension is built if evidence can be provided that it is needed at that time.
- 75 *Comparison to other centres*
The TA also seeks to justify the proposed car park capacity by comparing the Surrey Quays Parking provision to other shopping centres surrounding the site.
- 76 The comparison with competing centres is set out in section 4.7 of the TA. Table 4.1 in the TA shows the provision of spaces in centres such as Lewisham, Stratford, Bromley and Woolwich, and the ratio of parking spaces to floor space. However it does not show their occupancy, and therefore is not useful as a demonstration of need.
- 77 All of the comparison centres included in the TA charge a fee for parking, which is generally between £4 and £8 for a 6-hour stay, but is as high as £15 at one site. The application of a charge at the Surrey Quays Shopping Centre would encourage greater use of public transport, walking and cycling and thus help to address any future over-demand for spaces if that were ever to happen.
- 78 *Other matters*

The masterplan envisages the creation of a “high street environment” between the extended shopping centre and subsequent development on the car park. This would include some car traffic arising from circulation within the car park. However, the plans do not at this stage accommodate the potential re-routing of buses along this route, as would be expected in a “high street environment”. While it is not necessary or appropriate at this stage to secure any change to bus services, the potential re-routing should not be precluded by any of the development. In particular, if the deck car park were to be approved, it would be necessary to build it in such a way as to ensure that future bus access would be possible.

- 79 In conclusion, the need for the proposed deck car park has not been justified based on the information provided, and it would result in a level of parking exceeding Southwark Plan and London Plan standards. It is therefore recommended that the deck is refused due to lack of evidence of need or impact upon the viability of the town centre.

Design issues

- 80 Strategic policy 12 'Design and conservation' of the Core Strategy states that development should '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'. The policy goes on to assert that development should conserve or enhance the significance of Southwark's heritage assets their settings and wider historic environment. Saved policy 3.13 'Urban design' of the Southwark Plan asserts that the principles of good urban design must be taken into account in all developments. This includes height, scale and massing of buildings, consideration of the local context, its character and townscape as well as the local views and resultant streetscape. Saved policy 3.12 'Quality in design' asserts 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 and high amenity environments people will choose to live in, work in and visit.
- 81 The Canada Water Area Action Plan (CWAAP) describes the ambitions of the council for this area as follows:
“These sites comprise a large part of the town centre and have significant capacity for growth. A new high street should connect the Canada Water basin with Lower Road and this should form the focus for provision of new shopping space. This would help integrate retail on the shopping centre site with Lower Road and provide improved connections to the tube stations. It would also enable a more effective use of the existing car parks and help give the shopping centre site a town centre character.”
- 82 The focus of activity in the area is the Canada Water Basin and the AAP highlights the importance of this natural resource alongside the new library and Plaza, which has an important civic presence in the area.
- 83 Extension of the Shopping Centre (Phase 1A)
The Phase 1a proposal is made up of two parts:
- The part single- part double-storey extension to the south of the shopping centre; and
 - New public realm to the Canada Water Basin, the new 'street' and the eastern flank of the shopping centre.
- 84 *The part single, part double-storey extension to the south of the shopping centre*
The proposal is concentrated at the north-western corner of the shopping centre. In this location the AAP describes that a new public space would be appropriate on the southern flank of the Basin, where important local pedestrian and cycle routes intersect. It goes on to state that the principles set out in the AAP are “core principles which should be applied to any development scheme prepared for these sites” in the

Town Centre.

- 85 The proposal is for five new 'large format', double-height retail units in the front of the existing shopping centre which have been arranged around a new northern entrance extending from the mall into the northern part of the car park. This arrangement has been based on the need for a concentration of this type of retail space in this part of the shopping centre. These large units are then proposed to be edged by new smaller retail / restaurant units that open outward, facing west onto the car park and partly along the Canada Water Basin.
- 86 The footprint of the development has defined a new route diagonally across the site from the southern entrance to the car park from Lower Road, to the south-west corner of the Basin. The quality of this route will be defined by the quality of the public realm: the AAP describes a new high street connecting Surrey Quays Station to the Canada Water transport interchange and this new route has the potential to provide this. The use of trees along its edge and other landscaped measures could better define this route and further details of this can be required by conditions attached to any grant of consent of the development.
- 87 In its scale and massing the extension incorporates an area identified by the AAP as the place where a new public space should be located with an open flank to the Basin. To reflect the ambitions of the AAP the scheme has been amended with a set back at the corner with a rounded face which will provide a widened public realm at this intersection of local routes however, this space is not as generous or as ambitious as that described in the AAP.
- 88 The arrangement of outward-facing retail units brings much-needed active frontages to the car park and the Basin edge which is currently dominated by the predominantly solid flanks of the centre. This new active frontage presents large and generous shop fronts to the pedestrian thoroughfares. It starts at the southern entrance of the shopping centre and is proposed to continue along that western face of the extension and round to the Canada Water Basin. However it is interrupted where the extension abuts the existing centre where the designers have proposed a window to the large format unit. As a consequence this important frontage of the development facing directly onto the Basin, when considered together with the locked off entrance at BHS to the Centre, fails to provide a strong presence for the centre onto the Basin and lacks sufficient active frontage to encourage permeability across the area to the Decathlon site and beyond to the Leisure Site or Plaza area.
- 89 The proposed architectural expression includes materials that are principally brick and glass in a crisp modern detail which will give the dated presence of the shopping centre a more modern appearance. Details like the proposed indented brickwork bays, the timber louvered screens and inlaid brick lettering will give the scheme a tactile quality which it currently lacks. If the council is minded to approve this application the choice of materials, in particular the type and colour of brick and bond, as well as the architectural details are matters that should be reserved by condition to ensure that the crisp modern detailing is reflected in the completed building.
- 90 Whilst the scheme retains the possibility of a pedestrian route across the site, it is disappointing that turns its back on the Canada Water Basin which is such an important aspect of the emerging town centre. Instead the proposal concentrates on improving the appearance and presence of the shopping centre from the car park. The dated architecture of the centre will benefit from a modern facelift and the car park could still be developed in later phases to deliver the ambitions of the AAP. However, as the first phase of the regeneration of the site this proposal's lack of emphasis on the Canada Water Basin, its poor development of the east-west route and lack of provision of an access to the Basin from the Centre remain a concern.

91 *New public realm to the Canada Water Basin, the new 'street' and the eastern flank of the shopping centre*

The public realm proposals for this site are extensive and propose an enhanced treatment to the new pedestrian route and the south and west flanks of the Basin. In addition, windowless flank of the retained west face and the southern end of the shopping centre are incorporated into the proposal with a canopied structure continuing the theme of the retail street along the face of the western face of the Tesco store. The public realm proposal is drawn round to the public underpass to Greenland Dock at the southern end of the centre and includes wire trellised panels to train planting onto the wall and improved surface treatment. Further, the pedestrian link to Lower Road and the Surrey Quays overground Station has been designed to offer unimpeded access from the pedestrian crossing and to overcome the level changes in the area.

92 The proposed materials are of high quality with an emphasis on granite finishes to the 6m wide pedestrian thoroughfare and a mix of soft and hard landscaping. On the western side of the Canada Water Basin the applicants have proposed to explore lifting and re-laying the existing cobbles to retain the historic finishes around the Basin but ensure that it is accessible for all. Currently the existing cobbles are unevenly laid and do not encourage pedestrian access along the edge of the Basin. The granite treatment of the western side of the Basin will improve the accessibility of the area and will continue on its southern side to give this body of water a more unified appearance.

93 The quality of the public realm will rely on good quality materials, a good choice of species and a well detailed scheme as well as the maintenance regime for the materials and the planting to ensure its longevity. Therefore the details of the landscape proposals, the hard and softscape as well as the long-term maintenance of the public realm are matters that should be reserved by condition.

94 *Design Review Panel Comments*

The Design Review Panel reviewed the scheme on two occasions in September and November 2011, prior to its submission in December 2011, and their comments are included in the appendix of this report. On both occasions the Panel endorsed the principles of the AAP and raised significant concerns over this scheme principally over its lack of ambition in the context of the emerging town centre, and its poor relationship to the Canada Water Basin. The scheme has not been changed since it was reviewed in November 2011. The views of the Panel are advisory in nature and have been considered principally in terms of the architectural and urban design qualities and not in the context of its wider benefits of this development to the area.

95 In conclusion, the proposal is a small part of the wider area. This development does not preclude the ambitions of the regeneration of the town centre as set out by the AAP and retains the possibility of a new pedestrianised thoroughfare across the site in a gentle curved sweep across the site. It is unfortunate that the southern side of the Canada Water Basin is poorly addressed by this proposal given the importance of this feature to the emerging town centre and the regeneration of the area. Perhaps in time this shortcoming could be addressed in a subsequent phase though the current works would have been the best opportunity to secure this.

96 Car Park Deck (Phase 1B)

Phase 1b is for a new car park deck to replace the car parking spaces lost as a consequence of the Phase 1a development going ahead. This application has been submitted in outline and as such lacks architectural detail however, sufficient detail has been provided to understand the impact of this proposal on the Shopping centre and on the emerging town centre.

- 97 The proposal is for a single car park deck over taking up the area to the west of the centre and facing the extension to the centre proposed by phase 1a. The structure is similar in height and massing to the apron of small-scale retail which are intended to be the active edges of the extended shopping centre. The proposal includes three areas of kiosks arranged along the edge of the car deck to compliment the shops in the extended centre and give the 'high street' a sense of enclosure. However these are proposed for just a small part of the car deck and do not extend along the full length of the car park deck, on the remaining stretches, the covered parking area and upper deck would dominate the street.
- 98 The proposed arrangement is set out in the parameter plans and describes the maximum and minimum plot extent and height which, at its minimum is located just 10m away from the edge of the footway at the front of the extended shopping centre. At its maximum the proposed building footprint extends to only 5m away from the edge of the shopping centre building and exterior dining area, and extends across the front of both entrances to the shopping centre. The information submitted with this application confirms that the minimum height is 9.5m above the level of the car park but could be as high as 13m tall (as scaled from the drawing and noted on plan PL-(28)01).
- 99 As such this proposal will have a substantial overdominant and harmful impact, not just on the shopping centre and its open setting but on the town centre as a whole. The visual impact of this substantial structure will not only dominate the presence of the centre and detract from the main entrances but it will affect the character and appearance of the new 'high street' alongside the extended shopping centre. In the opinion of officers it will dominate the local views both in the approach from the Canada Water and Surrey Quays transport interchanges, effectively acting as a substantial barrier to the important link between the Surrey Quays and Canada Water transport interchanges. It will detract from the setting of the Canada Water Basin and potentially places a decked car park at the heart of the emerging town centre contrary to the ambitions of the AAP.
- 100 In conclusion, the proposal to locate a car parking deck, due to its overbearing height, scale and massing, its poor contribution to the street scene, its impact on the local views and its overdominant imposition in this town centre location is contrary to the AAP, Policy SP12 of the Core Strategy (2011) and Saved Policies 3.12 and 3.13 of the Southwark Plan (2007).

Public realm and landscaping

- 101 Extension of the Shopping Centre (Phase 1A)
There are extensive works to the public realm proposed within the site, and additional public realm works outside the site area. These are all proposed as part of phase 1A the shopping centre extension, and can be described as the following:
1. North car parking spaces re-orientated to create a better pedestrian link out of the car park area;
 2. In the main car park, the number of spaces are reduced to enable a new retail frontage;
 3. In the south part of the car park, spaces are re-orientated to provide better pedestrian links towards Tesco;
 4. Existing vent structures are proposed to be refurbished in the car park area, to appear as artwork installations;
 5. Creation of a continuous pedestrian link from Redriff Road / Lower Road (Surrey Quays Station) to Canada Water, with new tree planting and street furniture, including cycle racks;
 6. Creation of a new entrance court, with a meeting space, and on street dining;

7. Provision of new shelters to bus stops;
8. Step and ramp link to Redriff Road;
9. New step and level access link to Surrey Quays Station, new tree planting and signage on site boundary wall with Lower Road;
10. New tree planting and signage wall to define the higher Redriff Road entrance area;
11. Existing drop off point retained;
12. Existing service yard retained;
13. Enhancement of the ground plane to the southern edge of Canada Water Basin, with repainting of existing railings;
14. Historical Dock Edge represented with wide paving units and text showing dates of construction; and
15. Covered cycle parking for visitors.

102 The submitted Design and Access Statement provides detailed information of the public realm works proposed. This includes information on the proposed materials to be used, such as granite paving, concrete inlaid with text, natural stone kerbs, stainless steel cycle demarcation symbols to define routes, brushed stainless steel Sheffield cycle hoops, brushed stainless steel bollards and brushed stainless steel bins. Additional seating areas are also proposed along pedestrian routes and in the new public square at the Basin edge. New hedge planting and a green wall to the south facade of the shopping centre building are proposed to soften the pedestrian underpass below Redriff Road.

103 *Trees*

A Tree Survey Report has been submitted with the application and the Design and Access Statement and Landscape drawings detail the proposed impacts and planting that would result from the development. The arboricultural survey of the site adheres to BS5837 'Trees in relation to construction'.

104 The existing surface car park has shrub planting at edges and some trees interspersed amongst parking spaces. The existing trees on the site have been planted since the opening of the shopping centre, and are only moderately mature. Of a total of 216 trees and tree groups on the site, 81 are proposed to be removed in order to facilitate the extension to the shopping centre. The remaining 135 trees would be retained and protected during construction. In replacement of the removed trees, 116 trees are intended to be planted, giving a net increase of 35 trees on the site.

105 The new tree planting will consist of new semi mature London Plane (*Platanus x hispanica*) to the Redriff Road frontage, extending the character of the new street trees proposed on Lower Road, that replaces those trees removed by the proposal. The pedestrian entrance from Surrey Quays Station will be marked by Silver Birch (*Betula pendula*) that also defines the western edge of the new street. The existing pedestrian walkways through the car park are defined by existing Lime trees that are retained. The proposed planting strategy also includes Lime Trees to reinforce the pedestrian routes through the southern car park. It is also proposed to include Scots Pine (*Pinus sylvestris*) trees and along the southern edge to the Base, Common Alders (*Alnus glutinosa*). The existing cherry trees along the western edge of the Basin are proposed to be retained and enhanced where isolated trees have failed.

106 The retained trees and new tree planting successfully defines the street structure and connects the former docks and other water bodies to the north and south, which would enhance biodiversity in and around the site.

107 *Ecology*

An Ecology Appraisal has been carried out for the proposed development, and a

report has been submitted with the application to explain the findings of this appraisal. There are three Sites of Importance to Nature Conservation (SINCs) within 500m of the site:

- The Canada Water Basin which is adjacent to the northern boundary of the site;
- Greenland Dock SINC 70m to the east of the site; and
- The Southwark Park SINC 100m south-west of the site.

These habitats are generally separated from the site by hardstanding areas, such as roads and housing. Because of this distance, any effects from the development can be managed through the implementation of routine mitigation. The report concludes that there were no protected species recording as part of the appraisal, but that the site does include a small number of habitats that could be of value to protected species, including a small area of scrub and trees to the west of the site, and this area should be protected and enhanced where possible.

- 108 It is recommended that an Environmental Management Plan be provided to mitigate possible impacts upon the adjacent SINC. This can be required by way of condition attached to any planning permission for the development. The scheme will be providing ecological features that will enhance the biodiversity of the proposed development, which consist of the following:
- A net increase of 35 semi-mature trees;
 - A green wall comprising five species to be located on the facade of the existing shopping centre at the southern end of the building;
 - The retention of existing scrub areas within the site; and
 - Provision of ornamental plants and shrubs.
- 109 It is also proposed to install a Bee Hive on the roof of the shopping centre to help assist Bee populations in the borough. Bird and Bat boxes are also proposed to be incorporate into existing and proposed trees.
- 110 The council's Ecology Officer has confirmed that the Ecology Appraisal is acceptable, and it is recommended that in the event planning permission is granted for the development, conditions be included concerning mitigation measures outlined in the Environmental Management Plan, and securing the delivery of the ecological benefits of the scheme, such as replacement tree planting and other planting on the site.
- 111 In conclusion the public realm and landscaping works proposed as part of the extension to the shopping centre (Phase 1A) are a welcome addition to the scheme which should improve the visitor experience to the shopping centre.
- 112 Car Park Deck (Phase 1B)
The location of the proposed car park deck as part of phase 1B necessitates the removal of a significant proportion of public realm and landscaping works undertaken as part of the extension to the shopping centre (Phase 1A). As a result, the proposed car park deck conflicts with the improvements to the landscape and public realm design shown for the extension to the shopping centre (phase 1A).
- 113 *Trees*
A large number of trees and soft landscaping would be removed with minimal mitigation provided as part of this development. There are approximately 33 additional existing trees that would need to be removed, along with 26 newly planted trees that are proposed as part of the extension works, due to the location of the care park deck. Because this part of the application is in outline only, there is little information on what replacement planting would be provided by the development of the deck, however the applicant does propose that clause be included within the legal agreement to require replacement planting should this part of the application be approved. Conditions could also be attached to require a landscape strategy to be submitted at Reserved Matters stage.

114 *Ecology*

Other than the removal of additional trees, there would be no other ecological impacts as a result of the car park deck, in addition to those considerations outlined above as part of the extension to the shopping centre (phase 1A). In the event that planning permission is granted for the deck, it is recommended that conditions be included to require the submission of a biodiversity statement, to explain what benefits the deck could bring to local biodiversity, through the inclusion of ecological features in the development. While the submitted illustrative material for the deck shows the intention that planters and climbing species of plant such as ivy be included to facades, this is illustrative only, and detail would only be required at reserved matters stage for any 'green wall' on these edges. The planting of replacement trees would also be necessary to mitigate adverse impacts on local flora and fauna in the area.

- 115 In conclusion it is considered that the car park deck has potentially significant and harmful impacts upon the public realm and landscape, and particularly the new works undertaken as part of the extension to the shopping centre. Further consideration of the resulting impacts upon the pedestrian route in front of the centre is undertaken below in the section on impacts upon the amenity of adjoining occupiers and visitors to the area, in 120 of this report. Overall the deck would have a negative impact upon the public realm here.

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

116 Extension of the Shopping Centre and Car Park Deck (Phase 1A & 1B)

The site is not located within a conservation area and does not contain any listed buildings. The application would not impact any surrounding conservation areas or listed buildings.

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

117 Extension of the Shopping Centre (Phase 1A)

The shopping centre is not located in close proximity to any surrounding residential dwellings, and therefore would not have any impacts upon the daylight and sunlight of any dwellings. Similarly, any noise resulting from the operation of the shopping centre will be confined to the site, and would not result in any disturbance to surrounding residents.

- 118 The visual impacts of the extension to the shopping centre are considered above, in the design section of the report. It is not considered that visual impact upon visitors to the site would be so significantly harmful, as to warrant refusal of this part of the application.

119 Car Park Deck (Phase 1B)

Visual amenity of visitors to the area would be significantly impacted by this part of the proposal, and this is described in more detail above in the design section of this report in paragraph 96.

- 120 The legibility of the site is also adversely impacted, with the car park deck effectively obscuring the new entrances to the shopping centre proposed as part of the extension (Phase 1A). At its maximum, the deck could be 13m high, which is equivalent to a three storey building, and therefore the prominent entrances proposed as part of the extension, would become largely ambiguous in appearance. The car park deck would also result in the narrowing of the pedestrian route in front of the shopping centre, which forms the new 'promenade' link between Surrey Quays and Canada Water Stations. The plans for the deck show an illustrative public realm plan for the site that

would retain an 8m wide cycles/pedestrians route here, however the actual parameter plan which would form any consent for the scheme should it be granted, would permit a gap at a minimum of 5.5m and at a maximum of 10m. Should the car park deck be built out to its maximum parameter, a small route of just 5.5m is retained in front of the covered seating / dining zone for retail units that front onto the space, which would be a very tight space for a bustling high street environment. It would also emphasize the size and proportions of the deck, and its overwhelming impact on the townscape environment.

Planning obligations (S.106 undertaking or agreement)

121 Saved policy 2.5 of the Southwark Plan and Policy 6A.5 of the London Plan advise that planning obligations should be secured to overcome the negative impacts of a generally acceptable proposal. Saved policy 2.5 of the Southwark Plan is reinforced by the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on Section 106 Planning Obligations, which sets out in detail the type of development that qualifies for planning obligations, and Circular 05/05, which advises that every planning application will be judged on its merits against relevant policy, guidance and other material considerations when assessing planning obligations.

122 Extension of the Shopping Centre (Phase 1A)

The table below demonstrates the standard contributions generated from the Supplementary Planning Documents s106 toolkit and the contributions proposed by the applicant:

Table 3: Planning obligations

Planning Obligation	Amount of planning gain calculated by toolkit (£)	Applicant contribution (£)
Employment during construction and in the development	150,925	Works in kind equivalent to 156,096 (WPC to be provided by developer a default minimum payment of 150,925 would be secured in the event that WPC not provided by developer)
Employment during construction	162,006	Works in kind to a minimum of 162,006 (WPC to be provided by developer a default minimum payment of 150,925 would be secured in the event that WPC not provided by developer)
Employment during construction management fee	13,136	13,136
Public Open Space, Children's play equipment, and Sports Development	331,317	331,317
Transport Strategic	130,604	130,604

Transport Site Specific	158,460	Works in kind equivalent to 251,670 (a minimum of 158,460 to be secured as part of the s106) [- Allowance for bus stop information system (£43,618); - Legible London signage (£116,316); - Improved crossings of Lower Road, see attached plan (£88,736); and - Southwark Council's monitoring of the Travel Plan (£3,000).]
Lower Road Contributions	n/a	190,000
Public Realm	158,460	Works in kind equivalent to £471,611 (a minimum of 158,460 to be secured as part of the s106) [- Taking up the cobbles and relaying footpath from the station, including steps down and bike path (£52,536); - Repaving of southern footpath along Canada Water (£214,023); - Formation of pedestrian ramps and steps at southern entrance (£88,736); and - Allowance for public art (£116,316).]
Sub total:	1,104,908	1,544,434 (calculation includes works in kind, financial payment is 665,057 and amount secured in s106 in light of minimum payments is 1,132,902)
Admin (2%)	22,098	22,658.04 (as 2% of financial payments and minimum WPC / public realm / transport site specific works)
TOTAL	1,127,005	1,557,735.14 (indicative value - includes works in kind, financial payment to council amounts to 687,818.46, and amount secured in s106 in light of minimum payments is 1,155,560)

123 Skills, Employment and Training Strategy

The construction of the proposed extension will include a range of construction job and supply chain opportunities, and further permanent retail and hospitality and catering jobs, with ongoing supply chain opportunities.

- 124 As part of any legal agreement attached to a planning permission for this application, objectives can be secured to ensure employment and training opportunities within the scheme for local residents. British Land have experience of delivering training and placing local people into jobs through work in other UK cities. Therefore they have elected to provide their own employment and training programme, including a WPC and following negotiations with council officers, the developer has committed to the following objectives as part of the application:-
- 125 To make reasonable endeavours to ensure that:
- Southwark Council residents access up to 10% of construction jobs in the Surrey Quays Shopping Centre development;
 - Contractors can access the construction employees that they require locally;
 - Businesses based in the borough can access supply chain opportunities in the construction phase of the development;
 - Contractors can access sub-contractors in relation to the project supply chain from local businesses;
 - Opportunities are created for local contractors to tender for contracts within the main contract;
 - Southwark Council residents access 30% of jobs in the operational phase of the development, and that 35% of those people will be previously unemployed;
 - That Shopping Centre occupiers can access the employees they require locally;
 - Businesses based in the borough can access the supply chains of occupiers of the Shopping Centre extension; and
 - Occupiers of the shopping centre can access local businesses to support their supply chains.
- 126 It is also proposed to provide 5% of the total job number as apprenticeship places as a result of the extension to the shopping centre. As part of these objectives outlined above, it is anticipated that the main contractor will employ a Workplace Coordinator (WPC), who will establish a Steering Group to meet on a quarterly basis to monitor delivery of this strategy. The Steering Group will comprise British Land representatives, Southwark Council, the Centre Manager, and others as appropriate. The WPC would then report progress to the Steering Group and directly to Southwark Council through quarterly monitoring systems.
- 127 The CWAAP also requires that a proportion of new retail units be made available to independent retail operators. The details of how this can be secured in the legal agreement are still being concluded with the applicant, and further information will be provided in the Addendum report.
- 128 This is a significant benefit of the proposal, and the developer has committed to undertake reasonable endeavours to achieve additional objectives beyond what would normally be expected as part of a development scheme. Therefore this is a welcome feature of the proposed development.
- 129 Car Park Deck (Phase 1B)
The proposed car parking spaces would not ordinarily generate requirements for financial mitigation, and the inclusion of 335sqm of retail would also not ordinarily trigger requirements for planning obligations, however taken in light of the associated extension to the shopping centre, the resultant total of additional retail floorspace does trigger planning obligation requirements. Therefore the uplift of retail floorspace proposed as a result of the car park deck generates additional planning contributions to mitigate impacts, and the amount proposed by the applicant is outlined below. It is based on the uplift of retail floorspace as a result of the car park deck, and is in accordance with standard Southwark SPD requirements.

Table 4: Planning obligations based on maximum retail floorspace 335sqm (GIA)

Planning Obligation	Applicant contribution (£)
Employment in the Development	4,626
Employment during construction management fee	384
Public open space, children's play equipment and sports development	10,156
Transport Strategic	4,003
Transport Site Specific	5,025
Public Realm	5,025
Sub total	29,219
Admin (2%)	584.38
TOTAL	29,803.38

130 *Car park deck triggers*

The applicant accepts that any car park deck ought only to be constructed if it can be demonstrated that the existing car park is close to capacity. In negotiation with officers, the applicant has suggested a series of triggers, or test, which could be used to establish whether the car park was close to operational capacity. If members were minded to grant permission for the parking deck, it is recommended that triggers be incorporated into a legal agreement attached to a grant of consent for the car park deck.

131 In brief, the section 106 agreement would permit the implementation of the parking deck, to provide 277 spaces, on the following terms:

- Two years after the opening of the shopping centre the developer can carry out a survey of the parking area, and this survey must be undertaken by an agreed independent assessor jointly appointed by the Council and Developer.
- The survey must be of a two month period excluding the month of December.
- Within the two month survey period, the occupancy of spaces must be surveyed between 1600 and 1800 hours on Thursday and 1200 and 1400 on Saturday and Sunday.

If the survey shows that the car park has occupancy levels in excess of 90%, for 50% of the time, for on least 50% of the days surveyed, then the developer may construct the car park deck (phase 1B). The survey work would need to follow the implementation of a series of travel planning measures to encourage travel by non-car modes, such as improved cycle provision, time limits on car park stays etc.

132 Notwithstanding the suggested triggers, it is not considered that the car park deck is acceptable for those reasons detailed earlier on in this report, Therefore it is recommended that an agreement be concluded within relates solely to the shopping

centre extension.

- 133 **If in the event the agreement is not signed by the 30th March 2012 then in accordance with recommendation (iii), the application should be refused for the reason below:**

'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, and employment and the proposal would therefore be contrary to Saved policy 2.5 of the Southwark Plan and Policy 8.2 of the London Plan'.

Sustainable development implications

- 134 Strategic policy 13 'High environmental standards' of the Core Strategy 2011 requires developments to meet the highest possible environmental standards, including targets based on BREEAM (Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method) standards. This includes requiring non-residential development to achieve at least a BREEAM 'excellent', with the exception of community uses which should achieve a minimum BREEAM level of 'very good'. Major Developments are also expected to achieve a 44% saving in carbon dioxide emissions above building regulations requirements for energy efficiency, as well as achieving a reduction in carbon dioxide of 20% from using on-site or local low and zero carbon sources of energy.

- 135 Extension of the Shopping Centre (Phase 1A)

A Sustainability Statement has been submitted with the application and this explains that the development proposal can potentially achieve an interim score of 7.12% against the BREEAM 2008 Version 4 Environmental and Sustainability Standard. This translates into an interim BREEAM rating of Excellent.

- 136 It is proposed that 1683sqm of Solar Photovoltaics (PV) be included within the extension development, to generate approximately 215,424 kWh per annum. This would equate to a 20% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions from the site. The submitted Energy Strategy for the extension to the shopping centre, shows that the combined measures proposed in the development will further reduce carbon dioxide emissions on the site by approximately 25.2%, from a combined 'Be Lean' and 'Be Green' approach, when compared against the Baseline emissions rate.

- 137 The proposed extension to the shopping centre is acceptable in relation to sustainable design and construction policy considerations.

- 138 Car Park Deck (Phase 1B)

As this part of the development is only applied for in outline only, information regarding its sustainable design and construction has not been provided. It would be necessary in the event that permission is granted, that conditions are attached to require further explanation of the energy strategy for this phase, which may include, for instance information relating to lighting of the deck as well as the energy needs of the retail units.

Other matters

- 139 Extension of the Shopping Centre (Phase 1A)

Ventilation and Extraction

There are a number of retail units proposed that may operate as restaurants or food preparation outlets, and ventilation shall be required for occupant comfort, health and wellbeing and catering purposes. It is also proposed to include ventilation within new

staff and customer toilet areas. However the exact nature of ventilation requirements of the future occupants of the proposed extension is unknown at this time, because end users are not finalised. While the future occupiers of units are unknown at this time, information has been provided to confirm that mechanical ventilation shall be located at roof level above the shopping centre. The general location for plant is indicated on the submitted roof plans, and will be set in a sufficient distance from the roof edge to reduce the viability of the plant. Any smells from ducting will be filtered, and discharge points will be located to avoid cross contamination. The shopping centre is not located in close proximity to surrounding residential dwellings, and there are no concerns that ventilation will result in adverse impacts upon the amenity of users of the centre or occupiers surrounding the site. In the event that planning permission is granted, it is recommended that a condition be included to require the submission of additional information of ventilation and ductwork, prior to occupation of any food retail units.

140 *External Lighting*

A lighting strategy has been developed for the proposed development, and is designed to reduce environmental impacts through the use of energy efficient lamp sources, efficient lighting control and avoiding the use of unnecessary lighting in areas. Light beams have also been carefully considered to avoid light pollution and the effects of glare. The consideration of the lighting strategy is particularly relevant given the close proximity of the Canada Water Basin and the wildlife that is supported there. There are no concerns raised regarding the lighting strategy, which is considered to effectively and efficiently achieve the right illumination levels without adversely impacting surrounding users, occupiers or wildlife in the area.

141 *Archaeology*

The construction works required for the proposed extension would be confined to the area where the old Canada Water Dock was located, and therefore there would be no impact upon buried archaeological remains.

142 *Air Quality, Noise and Land Contamination*

An air quality assessment, noise assessment and land contamination report have been carried out and the results submitted with the application.

143 All of the submitted reports indicate that impacts from the development would be negligible. Suitable noise conditions can be attached to limit noise level from proposed plant as part of the development.

144 *Flood Risk*

A flood risk assessment has been carried out of the proposal, and confirms that both phases are at a low risk of flooding. It also confirms that surface water from both phases would be drained in such a way to ensure that flood risk is not increased elsewhere.

145 Car Park Deck (Phase 1B)

Archaeology

The construction works that would be required for the proposed car park deck, could potentially impact buried archaeological remains. The geoarchaeology of the Canada Water area is of archaeological interest, and therefore it is recommended that in the event planning permission is granted for this phase of the development, conditions are attached to secure a programme of archaeological observation and recording of geoarchaeological assessment of deposits on the site.

146 As planning permission for the car park deck is sought in Outline only, all other matters could be adequately assessed at Reserved Matters stage.

Conclusion on planning issues

147 Extension to the shopping centre (Phase 1A)

The proposed extension to the shopping centre does not achieve some of the aspirations of the AAP and fails to take full advantage of opportunities to improve routes through the area, particularly routes from the east (Basin edge) into the shopping centre, and through the shopping centre to the north and surrounding sites. While this is disappointing, the proposed extension does not preclude future alterations and developments from achieving the wider masterplan aspirations. In light of the future potential to achieve the masterplan aspirations as part of a wider regeneration of the town centre area, and the significant benefits that result from the application, specifically the large number of jobs that are likely to result for local people, it is considered that on balance, the extension to the shopping centre is acceptable, and it is recommended that it be approved subject to a legal agreement to secure the benefits of the scheme.

148 Car Park Deck (Phase 1B)

The Transport Assessment shows that, even at peak times, only 43% of the existing parking spaces are in use. The proposed car park deck would therefore replace spaces for which there is no demonstrable need, and the applicant has not justified why these spaces should be replaced either in terms of the need for parking or the impact on viability. The structure of the deck causes significant harm to the character of the 'high street', and the wider area, being a dominant feature in views on the approaches to the site. No evidence of need has been presented which would outweigh the concerns relating to harm to the townscape. If, in the future, trading patterns at the centre demonstrated that lack of parking was impacting on viability, then the owner could come forward at that time with an application for additional parking. At present, there is no justification for the parking levels, and therefore it is recommended that this part of the application be refused.

Community impact statement

149 In line with the Council's Community Impact Statement the impact of this application has been assessed as part of the application process with regard to local people in respect of their age, disability, faith/religion, gender, race and ethnicity and sexual orientation. Consultation with the community has been undertaken as part of the application process.

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

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

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

Consultations

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

151 The applicant has also undertaken their own consultation with members of the community, and a Statement of Community Involvement has been submitted with the application to describe the consultation undertaken. It describes the following:

- An on-line section on the Surrey Quays Shopping Centre website set to provide details of emerging proposals, drawings and CGIs;
- Use of social networking websites to distribute information to a wide group of

- people;
 - 1,000 printed leaflets to provide details on the emerging proposals and contact details for the project team in order to respond to any further queries. Leaflets were distributed at the Shopping centre;
 - Information boards with banners summarising proposals, and giving details of the website for information;
 - A public exhibition undertaken from the 15th -27th September, with staff available to answer questions;
 - An advert placed in Southwark News; and
 - Posters placed in the shopping centre and sent to key local stakeholders.
- 152 The following groups participated in the consultation events; Local ward councillors; Canada Water Consultative Forum; Rotherhithe Community Council; Southwark Cyclists; Southwark Disablement Association; and Rotherhithe Area Housing Forum Sub-Group.
- 153 The applicant has summarised concerns received during the consultation as follows:
- Concern over loss of car parking spaces;
 - The need to address access from the east, and the provision of a new Shopping Centre entrance on the east of the building;
 - The need to ensure there is no disruption to existing operations during the construction;
 - The need to improve the environment facing onto Canada Water Basin;
 - The need to mitigate negative impacts on wildlife and habitats;
 - The need to provide retailers that meet existing demands;
 - The need to improve access including access for disabled people;
 - Concern over impacts on congestion and traffic;
 - The need to reduce fear of crime in certain locations; and
 - The relationship between the proposal and the AAP.

Consultation replies

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

155 Summary of consultation responses

46 Letters received in support of the proposals from local groups and residents. The main reasons for support centre on the provision of jobs in the new development and the improvement of shopping facilities. Some concern that parking would be lost.

3 further letters in support of the principle of improving the shopping centre, but voice concern at the lack of new entrances to be provided on alternative facades of the development, to facilitate routes though the site.

Southwark cyclists object to the grant of 'advance permission' for the deck, and want improvements to the high street route and better access for pedestrians and cyclists.

Human rights implications

- 156 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.
- 157 This application has the legitimate aim of providing an extension to a shopping centre and car park deck. 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.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
<p>Site history file: TP/468-1</p> <p>Application file: 11-AP-4206</p> <p>Southwark Local Development Framework and Development Plan Documents</p>	<p>Regeneration and Neighbourhoods Department 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2TZ</p>	<p>Planning enquiries telephone: 020 7525 5403</p> <p>Planning enquiries email: planning.enquiries@southwark.gov.uk</p> <p>Case officer telephone: 020 7525 5597</p> <p>Council website: www.southwark.gov.uk</p>

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	Rachel Gleave	
Version	Final	
Dated	16 March 2012	
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	No	No
Strategic Director of Environment and Housing	No	No
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team		16 March 2012

Consultation undertaken

Site notice date: 19/01/2012

Press notice date: 19-01-2012

Case officer site visit date: numerous

Neighbour consultation letters sent: 16-01-2012

Internal services consulted: 12-01-2012

Design and Conservation Team
Access Officer
Archaeology Officer
Environmental Protection Team
Transport Group
Urban Forester
Ecology Officer
Public Realm
Planning Policy

Statutory and non-statutory organisations consulted: 12-01-2012

Transport for London
Metropolitan Police
London Underground Ltd
Environment Agency
Design Review Panel

Neighbours and local groups consulted:

Southwark Cyclists
Canada Water Forum
907 residents in the surrounding area, including the following streets:
Teredo Street, Tawny Way, Lower Road, Redriff Road, Surrey Quays Road, Hothfield Place, Plough Way, Brunswick Quays, Plough Way, Brunswick Quay, Worgan Street, Hithe Grove and China Hall Mews.

Re-consultation:

None required.

Consultation responses received

Internal services

1 Transport:

The Transport Officer comments have been incorporated into the officers report, however more detailed comments on the Travel Plan are provided below:

Travel Plan

The travel plan proposes a number of physical measures and programmes of advertising and supporting the use of non-car modes of transport, which are welcomed. However, it is not of an acceptable standard and therefore cannot be approved at this stage. It has also failed the TfL ATTrBuTE assessment.

The following areas for improvement have been identified in the travel plan assessment:

Mode split targets for Years 3 and 5 from occupation must be given. A particular emphasis should be on reducing staff travel by car to the site.

As the centre is currently occupied, an interim TPC at the centre must be named and contact details given.

It is not noted how many secure staff cycle parking spaces there will be – or if they are conveniently located for staff to use. This must be noted in the travel plan.

More information must be provided about the ‘travel options booklet’, including who this will be distributed to, when it will be distributed and exactly what it will contain?

Information must be provided about the staff car parking permits for the new development – it is suggested that no new permits are issued to staff except disabled permits, or those living more than 5 miles away and working antisocial hours where public transport provision may not be as good.

There are currently no ‘soft’ measures aimed at customers, and so the potential for influencing their behaviour is low. Measures aimed at customers must be considered, e.g. advertising sustainable travel modes within the shopping centre.

In accordance with TfL’s guidelines, the TRAVL surveying must be carried out by an Independent Field Company and it must be stated that this will be funded by the developer. Indicative costs and procedures can be found at: <http://www.travl.org.uk/>

The travel plan must pass the TfL ATTrBuTE assessment and take into account the above comments before it can be approved.

It is recommended that the following is recommended:

Should planning permission be granted it is recommended that a full travel plan is secured by Section 106 agreement and through this; commitment to surveying staff within 3 months of occupation of the development and at 3 and 5 years should be sought, this must be via a TRAVL-approved Independent Field Company in accordance with TfL policy and funds must be allocated to cover this. Commitment to updating the travel plan following each of the surveys, and commitment to measures identified within the travel plan, should also be sought. If a Section 106 is not applicable then it is recommended that a condition incorporating the above requirements is applied.

Should planning permission be granted, it is also recommended that a sum of £3,000 is secured to cover the Council’s costs in monitoring of the travel plan, through the Section 106 agreement.

Case Officer Comment:

Revised Travel Plan to secured by legal agreement in the event that permission is granted.

2 Ecology Officer

- Agree with the Ecology Appraisal, and its assessment and conclusions.
- Welcome the green wall proposal.

Recommend that conditions are imposed to secure measures / mitigation included in the Ecology Appraisal.

Case Officer Comment:

Conditions are recommended to be included in the event that permission is granted.

3 Urban Forester

Phase 1A

No objection subject to conditions regarding planting strategy.

The design and access statement includes details of an arboricultural survey, which adheres to BS5837 trees in relation to construction.

The landscape masterplan describes existing green infrastructure and amenity which is characterised by an extensive car park and therefore of generally mediocre quality. It outlines ways in which biodiversity and connectivity can be improved and provides a layout and structure which is of design merit.

A total of 216 trees together with other tree groups are found on the site. Eighty one trees are proposed for removal in order to facilitate development, 135 retained and 116 new trees planted, a net increase of 35. This is more than the minimum desired amount outlined in London Plan policy 6.1 (below).

New and retained tree planting is used successfully to define the street structure and connect former docks and other water bodies to the north and south, thereby enhancing biodiversity.

The species selection requires amendments to those which are better adapted to the urban heat island effect and tolerance to reflected heat and pollution:

- *Betula pendula* amend to *Betula Jaquemontii* and/or *Tilia* spp.
- *Pinus sylvestris* amend to *Pinus nigra* and/or *Pinus pinea*

The use of larger canopy and longer lived species is welcome and should provide a reasonable percentage within the structural planting. Plane trees may include more upright varieties such as *Platanus Minaret*, which would help address Councillors concerns about the use of this species (Statement of Community Involvement), and these may therefore be used more freely elsewhere within the design. Bee friendly species such as Lime should also be used, especially those which do not suffer from aphid infestation (e.g. *Tilia cordata* Greenspire, *T. euchlora*, *T. cordata x mongolica*). Cherry should only be used as infilling to replace dead or poor condition specimens.

Other herbaceous and perennial flowers and shrubs are appropriate as are new hedge planting and the proposed green wall.

In order to achieve the desired quality and impact of landscaping shown within the D&A statement, particularly in relation to biodiversity and aesthetic improvements such as screening and shading of the car park, the size of trees must be of a suitably semi-mature size. Below ground and surface details will need to be well specified in order to ensure such landscaping establishes and to sustain future growth.

The following three conditions are therefore required:

- Details of how retained trees and groups are to protected
- Landscaping plans including details of maintenance or management agreements

- Tree pit specifications including cross sections to include soil cells in areas of hard surfacing, and details of uplighting.

In particular, tree pit design will need to include a modular or rafted system of soil cells which will support trafficked surfaces, contain sufficient soil to allow rooting of semi-mature trees and allow surface water drainage or attenuation, including a consideration of how polluted runoff may affect the soil and landscaping that it sustains. Proprietary suppliers are available (Greenleaf, Silvacell, Permavoid - e.g. <http://www.greenleaftrees.co.uk/shopimages/sections/extras/Soil%20Volumes%20for%20Trees.pdf>).

Design and Access Statement Appendix 9:3 C - Outline Specification for Soft Landscape is therefore not suitable and requires amendment where this is to be provided in permanent new public realm. As there is no indication when or if phases 2 to 5 of the new town centre are to be completed, sustainable tree pit design is also required in areas denoted for temporary new public realm as shown within the Canada Water Strategic Masterplan.

The introduction of natural stone paving and sawn setts together with other street furniture enhance the public realm. Lighting to trees is welcome.

Case Officer Comment:

Conditions are recommended to be included in the event that permission is granted.

PHASE 1B

The proposed single storey car deck **conflicts** with the improvements to landscape and public realm design shown for PHASE 1A. A large number of trees and soft landscaping will be removed with minimal to no mitigation in order to facilitate the development.

4 Archaeology Officer

Phase 1A

No archaeological recommendations to make concerning the phase 1A proposal for the extension of the shopping centre. These works appear to be confined to the body of the Canada Water dock and, as such, will have no impact upon buried archaeological remains. The proposals for a wider landscaping scheme to celebrate the heritage of the docks are welcome but potentially should include more of the layers of history evident on the site, for example the original formation of the Canada Dock as timber ponds.

Phase 1B

Phase 1B will have an impact upon buried archaeological remains. The geoarchaeology of the Canada Water area is of archaeological interest due to the formation of this landscape during periods of human occupation. Should you be minded to grant consent for this part of the scheme a conditions should be attached to secure a programme of archaeological observation and recording and geoarchaeological assessment of deposits on site should suitable deposits be observed.

I would recommend that the following conditions are applied to any consent issued for the phase 1B proposals to secure Archaeological mitigation and reporting.

Case Officer Comment:

Conditions are recommended to be included in the event that permission is granted.

5 Public Realm

No objections to the proposals.

The proposals to improve the pedestrian links from Canada Water and Surrey Quays Stations will require approvals from the highway department and will be subject to a

section 278 agreement.

Proposed cycle routes starting from Redriff Road and Surrey quays Road, will be subject to further design considerations and will also be subject to design assessments and approval during the s278 process.

Case Officer comment:

The developer will be required to enter into a section s278 agreement and this will be secured through the s106 agreement attached to any planning consent for the scheme.

6 Environmental Protection Team

No objections to the proposals, subject to conditions on the control of noise from commercial premises.

Case Officer Comment:

Conditions are recommended to be included in the event that permission is granted.

Statutory and non-statutory organisations

7 Transport for London

No objections subject to conditions.

1) The site of the proposed development is approximately 400m to the south east of the A200 Jamaica Road, which forms part of the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN);

2) 277 public car parking spaces will be provided;

3) 10% (28) of all spaces must be for electrical vehicles with an additional 10% (28) passive provision for future use;

4) Request that a Construction Logistics Plan (CLP), as referred to in the London Freight Plan, which identifies efficiency and sustainability measures to be undertaken while developments are being built is submitted to and approved by the LB of Southwark before construction work commences on site. TfL further requests that the submission of the plans should be secure via appropriate planning conditions / obligations;

5) Request that a Delivery and Servicing Plan (DSP), as referred to in the London Freight Plan, which identifies efficiency and sustainability measures to be undertaken once developments are operational is submitted to and approved by the LB of Southwark prior to occupation. Further request the submission of plans should be secured via appropriate planning conditions / obligations.

8 London Underground

No comments to make on the application.

9 Design Review Panel - November 2011

The Panel welcomed the opportunity to review this important scheme again. They noted the comments of the earlier Panel, recognised the regeneration potential of this site and welcomed British Land's initiative to give the existing shopping centre a new presence. The presentation included plans and elevations of the proposal as well as the presentation of a masterplan document. The Panel raised significant concerns with the proposal's implications for the new town centre, the master-planning approach and its resultant architectural expression and as well as its relationship to its context and the Canada Water Basin.

The Panel noted the council's ambitions for the site as set out in the recently published Draft Canada Water Area Action Plan. Whilst this has still not been adopted by the council, the Draft AAP sets out the council's ambition for the location and seeks to: activate the southern face of the shopping centre; to formalise the east-west pedestrian links between the Surrey Quays Station and the Canada Water Underground and the north-south connections from Hothfield Place to the Leisure site; and provide a new public space at the northern side of the Canada Water Basin

at the intersection of these routes to address the Basin and mirror the space created across the way where the new library is currently being completed. Whilst the notional form of the public space (illustrated in the AAP) is not necessarily prescriptive the Panel felt the ambition of a public space in this location is sound and holds the prospect of an engaging and outward-looking high street arranged around a cohesive hierarchy of spaces led by public realm and most importantly, focusing on the Canada Water Basin. By retreating from this ambition in their masterplan for the site the public space provided on the Canada Water Basin falls short, the Panel felt disappointed that the clear advice of the earlier Panel's concerns had not been addressed.

'In conclusion, the Panel raised serious concerns with this proposal in relation to its massing, its materiality and its architectural expression' and missed the opportunity to use the development proposal to give this important new town centre the impetus and ambition for the future.

As this site is the first site to come forward and it is vital that this proposal provides these ambitions for the town centre at the outset exactly as was expressed in the previous panels report 'They noted that the site plays a very important role in the development of the Canada Water town centre and stressed the importance of getting it right.'

The Panel felt the proposal lacked an architectural presence reflecting the importance of its town-centre location. The panel supported the Local Authority in demanding that the developers raise their ambition for the redevelopment and extension of the existing shopping centre.

Whilst they heard the applicants statements on the commercial and functional requirements of its development partners, these did not persuade the panel that they should accept the poverty of architectural expression being offered by the developers.

They encouraged the designers and their clients to use this opportunity to engage with the new town centre, to explore a bolder architectural form and expression coupled with a mix of town centre uses and tenure to devise a new scheme for this site.

The panel reinforced the previous panels comments confirming a revised approach with reduced footprint, a strong presence onto a new public space facing the Canada Water Basin and the inclusion of a new high street offering uses beyond shopping appropriate to the this well serviced location.

Further, they felt scheme needed to demonstrate how the shopping centre could forge a closer connection to the Canada Water Basin along its northern flank – currently dominated by the blank frontage of the BHS store – and provide access to this important frontage in a meaningful way.

The Panel noted the earlier Panel's comments. They felt the serious concerns raised by the earlier Panel in relation to the masterplan and the concentration of large retail units at the northern end of the site remained significant concerns. In relation to the earlier Panel's remaining concerns they noted the points they raised which were as follows: the materiality of the scheme lacked conviction and a failed to connect with its context. – The Panel noted that this scheme has been revised to include a more contextual brick facing and a more consistent design approach. Notwithstanding this change to the design, the Panel felt their significant concerns over the architectural form will, if addressed in a meaningful way, result in a different design and possibly a different architectural expression altogether, quality of architectural expression is to be encouraged and welcomed the entrance porticos lacked the conviction or the presence – These remained largely unchanged by this proposal and they were not

satisfied to withdraw the concern raised by the earlier report.

Finally, the architectural design of the car park deck was not presented in detail. – The Panel noted that no further information was provided about the detailed design of the car park deck. They retained the earlier Panel's concerns over this significant feature of the scheme which remained unexplained.

In conclusion, the Panel retained fundamental concerns with this proposal in relation to its master-planning, its ambition and its architectural expression and the uses given the importance of this location to the new town centre.

They invited the applicants to amend their scheme in order to address the consistent views of both panels and to bring this scheme back to the Design Review Panel prior to submitting a planning application.

Neighbours and local groups

- 46 letters in support of the proposals.

10 Rotherhithe Area Housing Forum

The Rotherhithe area housing forum sub group had a presentation in November 2011 from British Land and this was taken to full forum in December 2011. The presentation was of the development of the Surrey Quays shopping centre which consisted of a re-vamp of the existing shopping centre plus new shops and a car deck.

The car deck was explained in depth as having kiosks and being kept unobtrusive, the delegates at these meetings agreed that there needs to be a development of the site and the delegates agreed that the shopping centre needed more shops and needed to maintain the parking in the area. They expressed an interest in more upmarket names being brought in as local people have to travel to get to these sort of shops and that in turn would bring more people to the shopping centre as we need more commerce in the area and the developers agreed that there will be more work for local people which is needed in this area. The delegates all agreed that they did not want Canada water to go as the elephant and castle shopping centre did.

Canada water is becoming a town centre and all at the meeting agreed it can be seen every day that we are losing shoppers to the west end via the jubilee line and to the Westfield centre at Stratford. We need to keep these people in the area and create a shopping centre with new shops that will bring in more shoppers, most of the delegates had all ready asked their tenants what their feelings were about the development and said that every one spoken to agreed that there was a need for more shops. The development as the shopping centre looks tired and dated and also they agreed that the development would bring in more shoppers and bring more work for local people, also that it would keep the parking numbers as it is, as people were worried we were losing lots of parking with all the development in the area.

The main reasons that the Rotherhithe area forum agreed on backing the development was that the development will bring in more work for local people, with the opening of more shops. While the development is being built (as it was in the Barratts development) local people will be employed. The shopping centre needs re-developing to make it bigger and better and to bring in more shoppers and a variety of new shops, we feel that this development will be another piece of the jig saw in making Canada water into a town centre.

- 11 Bonamy Tenants and Residents Association
In favour of the redevelopment as the shopping centre is not currently fit for purpose, and needs to be redeveloped to bring it up to local people's expectations of a modern up to date shopping centre.
Needs more shops and a revamp of the exterior and interior of the centre.
Canada Water is a town centre, but currently people leave the area to shop in Bond Street or Westfield.
The new development will also bring more work into the area when it is being built and also give more work opportunities to local people.
- 12 Rotherhithe Angling Club (same as above letter)
In favour of the redevelopment as the shopping centre is not currently fit for purpose, and needs to be redeveloped to bring it up to local people's expectations of a modern up to date shopping centre.
Needs more shops and a revamp of the exterior and interior of the centre.
Canada Water is a town centre, but currently people leave the area to shop in Bond Street or Westfield.
The new development will also bring more work into the area when it is being built and also give more work opportunities to local people.
- 13 By email:
Whilst local people are in favour of an extension to the shopping centre, we are not in favour of losing car parking spaces given that it is full most weekends and peak times.
- 14 41 Letters from different addresses of a reproduced letter with the following comments:
In favour of the development of Surrey Quays Shopping Centre.
So many shoppers currently go to Westfield or Bond Street because of a lack of shopping facilities in the centre.
The development will bring more jobs in the retail sector and bring job opportunities for local people.
Surrey Quays is now becoming a town centre and needs this development to bring more work and commerce in the area.
- 15 29 Somerville Point, 305 Rotherhithe Street
Writing to strongly support the re-development of Surrey Quays Shopping Centre. Rotherhithe is a lovely place to live, but has a major downside of there being very poor shopping facilities and almost zero cafes and restaurants. Moreover there is no single defined centre to the area. The development will provide an excellent opportunity to create such a town centre for Rotherhithe based around the fantastic new library and Canada Water station, linking through to the shopping centre and onto Lower road. I often feel that when people visit the area they are met with an unattractive out-dated shopping centre and nowhere obvious to eat or drink apart from fast food locations in the shopping centre food court. The area is crying out for some decent restaurants.
- 3 respondents support the principle of extension to the Shopping Centre but have concerns over detail of the proposals.
- 16 4 Bray Crescent
Whilst I support the plans to increase the number of shops, I am concerned that the only access to the centre will be from the west. As BHS have now closed their side entrance facing Canada Water, the huge number of people who access the centre from the east will be forced to walk further. This will particularly affect those who do not find walking easy. I would ask that approval of the application be made conditional on the provision of an additional entrance to the centre facing Canada

Water.

Case Officer Comment:

The submitted proposals do not include entrances from the Basin, and the design cannot be altered by condition in this way - a revised proposal would be required to achieve new entrance points.

17 By letter (Local Resident)

Support in principle the plans to refurbish the SQSC, however disappointed that the only access to the centre remains at the front (west). The application does not appear to address the issue of pedestrian access for the people who live in the local area. The application appears to focus more on links to Canada Water bus / tube station and Surrey Quays train station. The application therefore fails to comply with PPG13 which advises that particular attention be given to design and access to help promote walking.

1. Access from the East

The proposed extension will mean that the vast number of people who access the centre from the east will be forced to walk further. BHS's decision to close their entrance abutting Canada Water has already caused massive inconvenience to local people who wish to use the existing SQSC. The proposed extension will further compound the problem. The bus routes from the north west of the peninsula do not serve local residents wishing to access SQSC.

2. Access from Southwark Park - China Gate

Many people currently try to access the SQSC from China Gate / Southwark Park. However the route is hazardous as one has to negotiate numerous pedestrian crossings at busy road junctions. The application does little to improve this much used route.

Restaurants

Any permission must limit the number of fast food outlets. The area is already over supplied with such establishments and there is a significant obesity issue within LBS.

Case Officer Comment:

Conditions are recommended to be included in the event that permission is granted, to limit the amount of potential A3-A5 (restaurant / cafes / takeaway) on the site. Issues concerning access have been addressed in the main section of the report, while shortcomings are recognised; it is considered that the benefits of the extension outweigh these less positive aspects of the proposal.

18 Southwark Cyclists and Southwark Living Streets jointly submit the following comments:

1. We do not think the Council should agree to the application for advance agreement to construct an additional deck over the car park, depending on the usage of the ground level car park. The council should not bind itself to agree in a future which is unpredictable.

The council's policy is, we understand, to encourage modes of travel other than by private car, especially by cycle and on foot. In that context, the council should not give conditional advance permission for additional car parking for the retail development. If advance commitments are to be made, they should be by the developer to promote reduced car travel and increase cycle and pedestrian travel to the store. See also comment 5 below.

The scale of car parking provision needs to be considered by reference to both council policy and current modal split of shoppers. Could you tell us, from the planning application, what this is? We suggest that the scale of car parking to be approved needs to be assessed by reference to:

Current gross retail floor space;

Proposed gross retail floor space;

Current number of car parking spaces;
Proposed number of ground level car parking spaces.
Current car parking occupancy levels.

2. If the Council is minded to grant the advance permission, it should be subject to:

(a) strict and fairly short time limits; and
(b) design of the additional deck to reduce obtrusive and aesthetically displeasing overshadowing (i.e. no more than the minimum footprint hinted at in the drawings), plus other aesthetic design features, such as planting.

2. The pedestrian space between the retail and the carpark is in the nature of a high street and needs to be of the highest standard to be an attractive place for people to meet and shop. At no point should it be less than 4m wide, excluding the 'facilities border' for bike parking, trees, seating, bins, signs, etc, and also excluding any café/restaurant seating. Users currently experience a meagre and tawdry space which must accommodate not just every kind of person but also bikes, prams, buggies, wheelchairs, toddlers, dogs and lots of trolleys and bags full of shopping. There will be a large increase in the number of people using this space – and people are not getting any smaller. The width of the carriageway alongside, between the 'facilities border' and the carpark, should provide a generous two-way cycle route plus only sufficient to allow one-way car egress from the car park.

In summary, we envisage the following minimum widths:

Pedestrian esplanade: 4 metres

Facilities border: 2 metres

Cycle lane one way: 2 metres

Cycle lane other way: 2 metres

Car access to car park: 3 metres

Total, minimum: 13 metres

To this needs to be added sufficient space for pedestrian access to the kiosks shown on the plans submitted for the additional car parking deck.

3. There should be access, by foot and cycle from Hothfield Place, which is not shown on the submitted plans.

4. Provision should be made for cycle parking for at least 5% of users of the store from the outset, increasing to 20% by 2020. (The 5% level should be reviewed in the light of the current modal share of cycling to the store.) The design of the cycle parking should specify that pairs of Sheffield racks are sufficiently far apart for two cycles laden with panniers of shopping to be easily parked between them.

5. There should be easy access between the store and the nearby leisure centre, so that car parking can be shared and thus the scale of the car parking be reduced. The two facilities have different patterns of use, so sharing would make possible reduction in car parking space. Excessive space taken up by car parking dominates and harms the landscape.

6. The plans should provide better access to and from buses, to be agreed with TfL's London Buses directorate.

7. Planning consent should be subject to the developer agreeing to provide within the next five years a pedestrian and cycle route through the land it

owns between Lower Road and the site, in accordance with Southwark council's policy of encouraging cycling and walking.

8. Consent should be subject to section 106 contributions towards improvements for pedestrian and cyclist movement in Lower Road and Surrey Quays Road.