

Item No: 6	Classification Open	Committee: Camberwell Community Council	Date: 11 April 2012
From: Head of Development Management		Title of Report: <u>Addendum</u> Late observations, consultation responses, information and revisions.	

PURPOSE

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

RECOMMENDATION

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

FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION

- 3 Late observations, consultation responses, information and revisions have been received in respect of the following planning application on the main agenda:
 - 3.1 Item 6.1 - 11AP3208 (full application for planning permission)

Assessment

National Planning Policy Framework

On 27 March, the DCLG published the National Planning Policy Framework with immediate effect. As stated at Para 27 of the report, the NPPF replaces previous government guidance including PPGs and PPSs. Full weight should be given to the NPPF as a material consideration in taking planning decisions.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the Government's commitment to a planning system that does everything it can do to support sustainable growth. Local planning authorities are expected to plan positively for new development. All plans should be based on the presumption in favour of sustainable development and contain clear policies that will guide how the presumption will be applied locally.

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.

In accordance with the above, it should be noted that PPS 5 has been replaced by the NPPF. The PPS 5 policies referred to in the report at Paragraphs 58 (which refers to whether the chapel is considered to be a heritage asset) and 59 (which refers to PPS5 Appendices which define 'Heritage asset', are therefore not material considerations any longer. The NPPF does however contain some similar provisions in relation to heritage. In particular, the NPPF definition of 'heritage asset' is defined in a similar way as in PPS5. The same reasoning as set out in the report therefore applies, as there are no material changes arising from the NPPF as to lead officers to consider different matters or to come to a

different conclusion. The full definition of 'Heritage asset' as set out in the NPPF is as follows:

'A building, monument, site, place or landscape, defined as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions. Heritage Assets include designated heritage assets and assets identified by the local planning authority (including local listing).'

Para 39 – there is an error in sentence 2. A s73 application does result in the grant of a new permission. The old permission is still extant but amending the conditions does mean that the developer gets a new permission.

Recommendation and conditions

Recommended condition 7 should be amended to add a clause as suggested in Para 67 of the report, to read as follows:

Condition 7

Prior to commencement of works in relation to the chapel and rear light well area, and notwithstanding the approved scheme 11-AP-3136, details of landscaping showing the planting of 12 new trees on the site including at least four trees to the east or west of the chapel light well area shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, with detailed drawings [scale 1:50] of a hard and soft landscaping scheme showing the treatment of all parts of the site not covered by buildings (including surfacing materials of any parking, access, or pathways layouts, materials and edge details and material samples of hard landscaping). The landscaping shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with any such approval given.

The planting, seeding and/or turfing shall be carried out in the first planting season following completion of building works and any trees or shrubs that is found to be dead, dying, severely damaged or diseased within two years of the completion of the building works OR two years of the carrying out of the landscaping scheme (whichever is later), shall be replaced in the next planting season by specimens of similar size and species in the first suitable planting season.

Reason

In the interests of streetscene and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and in order that the Local Planning Authority may ensure that the design and details are in the interest of the special architectural qualities of the existing building around it in accordance with saved Policies 3.12 'Quality in Design', 3.13 'Urban Design' and 3.28 'Biodiversity' of The Southwark Plan 2007 and Strategic Policy 12 'Design and Conservation' of the Core Strategy (2011).

The applicant has advised officers that the construction method for the retaining the wall to the light well to the chapel will allow for planting either side of the retaining wall. It is understood that the current proposed method for the retaining of the wall is reinforced contig piling which, similar to an interlocking sheet pile, would allow (as there is no strip footing) for the planting of trees right up against it.

Item 6.2 - 11AP3590 (conservation area consent)

Proposal – further information

Although officers have assessed that the applicant was not required to explain the reasons for requesting the demolition of the chapel, as the existing building is not considered to be of an architectural or historic quality that makes a positive contribution to the conservation area, they have provided further information about their rationale.

They state that they have looked at various options for the conversion of the existing building and have proceeded with the original consented scheme. However during construction it became evident that in all cases the costs and intervention required to enact the consent would outweigh the achievable outcome of the conversion. For many years while under Council ownership the building was used as storage shed for the hostel units on the site. They state that during this time that the building was left unheated and unmaintained. This resulted in severe damage to the brick due to invasive ivy growth and water ingress. Whilst some brick can be refurbished using specialist techniques the majority is badly damaged and would present a poor elevation upon completion and does not warrant the extensive works to retain. In summary they consider a high quality refurbishment could not be obtained given the level of dilapidation of the building and the only way to achieve a high quality elevation is through rebuilding.

Secondly they consider that a new high quality house with new handmade brickwork, built within the same volume and profile of the chapel would have a much greater contribution to the outlook of the neighbouring properties and the conservation area as a whole. It has already been stated, by the most adjacent neighbour at 19, that the existing building is an eyesore and should be demolished. The main contribution to the conservation area is via the street facade of the house. This has been damaged by subsidence and they state that they have gone to great length to repair this elevation to its original state. They believe that this is where the main contribution to the conservation area lies and not in the ancillary back building of the chapel which is of poor repair.

Assessment

National Planning Policy Framework

Comments are as per those outlined above in relation to application 11AP3208.

The PPS 5 policies referred to in the report at Paragraphs 39 and 41 (both of which are in relation to consideration of whether the chapel is a 'heritage asset', are therefore not material considerations any longer. The NPPF does however contain some similar provisions in relation to heritage. In particular, the NPPF definition of 'heritage asset' is defined in a similar way as in PPS5. The same reasoning as set out in the report therefore applies as there are no material changes arising from the NPPF as to lead officers to consider different matters or to come to a different conclusion.

REASON FOR LATENESS

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

REASON FOR URGENCY

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

Lead Officer: Gary Rice Head of Development Management

Background Papers: Individual case files.

Located at: 160 Tooley Street London SE1.