

Item No.	Classification:	Date:	Meeting Name:
6.3	OPEN	9 October 2012	PLANNING COMMITTEE
Report title:	Development Management planning application: Application 12/AP/2332 for: Full Planning Permission Address: 1-27 AND 28-59 WOLVERTON, SEDAN WAY, (SITE 7 AYLESBURY ESTATE REGENERATION) LONDON, SE17 2AA Proposal: Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment of the site to provide 147 residential units including flats, maisonettes and houses (30 x 1 bed, 71 x 2 bed, 13 x 3 bed, 28 x 4 bed, 5 x 5 bed) of which 58% would be affordable housing. The proposed residential blocks range between 3 and 10 storeys in height (10 Storeys at Thurlow Street) with a basement car park together with new vehicle access, plant, landscaping, cycle storage and refuse/recycling facilities.		
Ward(s) or groups affected:	Faraday		
From:	HEAD OF DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT		
Application Start Date 19/07/2012		Application Expiry Date 18/10/2012	

RECOMMENDATION

- 1 That planning permission be granted subject to conditions, and the applicant first entering into an appropriate legal agreement by no later than 18 October 2012.

In the event that the legal agreement is not entered into by 18 October 2012, the head of development management be authorised to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in paragraph 91 of the report.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Site location and description

- 2 The site is situated at the northern boundary of the Aylesbury Estate bounded by Thurlow Street to the west and Taplow to the opposite site of Thurlow Street. The site is bounded by East Street to the north, Sedan Way to the east and to the south of the site is Wolverton, with an estate road serving garages within this block. The site has an area of 0.88 hectares.
- 3 The site currently consists of a 4-5 storey residential block set back from the street that contains 59 residential units. In total 41 of the units in the block were social rented housing. The majority of the units are now vacant, however some leaseholders and housing tenants remain. A hard surfaced fenced play area is situated within the site, however this now appears to be disused. There are a number of mature trees on the site and areas of grassed open space fronting East Street and Thurlow Street. The area immediately surrounding the site is predominantly residential consisting of housing blocks ranging between 3 and 14 storeys. To the north of the site, on East Street, is a two storey terrace with retail uses to the ground floor and residential

above.

Details of proposal

- 4 Following a competitive tender process, the applicant London and Quadrant Housing Trust (L&Q) were selected as the council's partner to develop Aylesbury site 7. L&Q were also the developers of site 1a in the south west corner of the estate, which is now largely complete. The proposals have been worked up taking into account the guidance within the AAAP, to ensure any proposed development would meet the aspirations for the Aylesbury Estate and create a mixed tenure community with high quality homes and spaces.
- 5 The application proposes to demolish the existing building at the site and redevelop the site to provide 147 residential units consisting of 30 x 1 bed, 71 x 2 bed, 13 x 3 bed, 28 x 4 bed and 5 x 5 bed homes. It is proposed that 57.9% of the habitable rooms provided would be affordable housing. The proposal would provide a basement car park area (with 44 car parking spaces) with a new vehicle access from the south of the site.
- 6 The proposed site layout seeks to address the street frontages and the proposed buildings are arranged as two perimeter blocks set around landscaped courtyard areas. The proposed residential blocks range between 3 and 10 storeys in height (10 storeys at the corner of Thurlow Street and East Street). A mews street runs centrally through the site linking East Street to the north and the existing estate road to the south. The site layout allows the retention of 3 existing high value trees on East Street and Thurlow Street.

Planning history

- 7 Application ref: 12-AP-0087 for: 'Screening Opinion in order to establish whether the proposed development would require an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)'.
Decision – EIA not required.
- 8 Application ref: 12-PA-0023. Prior approval sought for 'Demolition of existing buildings to provide a cleared site for future residential development in accordance with planning application 12-AP-2332'
Decision – application currently under consideration.

Planning history for adjoining sites

- 9 None relevant.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Summary of main issues

- 10 The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:
 - a) the principle of the development in terms of land use;
 - b) density;
 - c) the impact of the development on adjoining occupiers;
 - d) the impact of adjoining uses on the proposed development;
 - e) design issues, including impacts on heritage assets;

- g) housing mix and affordable housing provision
- h) quality of the accommodation proposed;
- i) the impact of the development in relation to traffic
- j) sustainability and energy
- k) section 106 implications.

Planning policy

- 11 Under the Southwark Core Strategy, the site is situated in the Urban Density Zone, an Air Quality Management Area and a Flood Risk Zone. The site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 3 which indicates moderate access to public transport.
- 12 The site is identified as 'Site 7' within the Aylesbury Area Action Plan (AAP) which sets out a vision for the regeneration of the Aylesbury Estate over the next 15-20 years. For more than a decade, the estate has been falling into decline and numerous options to redevelop or refurbish the estate have been explored. In September 2005, having studied the structural condition of the estate, the quality of the environment and the costs of refurbishment, the council concluded that refurbishment of existing homes to a decent standard would not be feasible and the costs too high. As such, the decision was taken to demolish and redevelop the estate to provide a better place for residents to live, within a high quality mixed tenure neighbourhood.
- 13 The AAP was prepared in several stages with extensive community consultation. Each stage of the AAP was subject to a sustainability appraisal and an equalities impact assessment. An examination in public was held in September 2009, and the Inspector subsequently concluded that the AAP was sound. The AAP was formally adopted by the council in January 2010. The AAP is in general conformity government guidance, London Plan policies and Southwark policies. However, in some instances the AAP sets out different standards to London Plan and Southwark policies and SPDs. In these cases, the AAP guidance will generally take priority since it provides policy specific to this location. However, where there have been policy changes since the adoption of the AAP, for instance in terms of unit sizes, the more recent policy guidance will have significant weight as a material consideration. The AAP policies in relation to specific issues such as density, height and housing mix are outlined in further detail within the relevant paragraphs below.

Core Strategy 2011

- 14 The relevant strategic policies of the core strategy include:
 - 1 – Sustainable development
 - 2 – Sustainable transport
 - 5 – Providing new homes
 - 6 – Homes for people on different incomes
 - 7 – Family homes
 - 10 – Jobs and businesses
 - 11 - Open spaces and wildlife
 - 12 – Design and conservation
 - 13 – High environmental standards.

Southwark Plan 2007 (July) - saved policies

- 15 The relevant Strategic Policies of the Southwark Plan include:
 - SP1 – Sustainability, equality and diversity;

SP3 – Quality and accessibility;
SP6 – Accessible services
SP10 – Development impacts;
SP11 – Amenity and environmental impact;
SP12 – Pollution;
SP13 – Design and heritage;
SP14 – Sustainable buildings;
SP15 – Open space and biodiversity;
SP17 – Housing
SP18 – Sustainable transport.

- 16 The relevant Policies of the saved Southwark Plan include:
- Policy 2.5 – Planning Obligations;
 - Policy 3.1 – Environmental effects;
 - Policy 3.2 – Protection of amenity;
 - Policy 3.3 – Sustainability assessment;
 - Policy 3.4 – Energy efficiency;
 - Policy 3.6 – Air quality;
 - Policy 3.7 – Waste reduction;
 - Policy 3.8 – Waste management;
 - Policy 3.9 – Water
 - Policy 3.11 – Efficient use of land;
 - Policy 3.12 – Quality in design;
 - Policy 3.13 – Urban design;
 - Policy 3.14 – Designing out crime;
 - Policy 3.15 – Conservation of the historic environment
 - Policy 3.16 – Conservation areas;
 - Policy 3.17 – Listed Buildings;
 - Policy 3.19 – Archaeology;
 - Policy 3.28 – Biodiversity;
 - Policy 4.2 – Density of residential development;
 - Policy 4.2 – Quality of residential accommodation;
 - Policy 4.4 – Affordable housing;
 - Policy 4.5 – Wheelchair affordable housing;
 - Policy 4.6 – Loss of residential accommodation;
 - Policy 5.1 – Locating developments;
 - Policy 5.2 – Transport Impacts;
 - Policy 5.3 - Walking and Cycling;
 - Policy 5.4 – Public transport improvements;
 - Policy 5.6 – Car parking;
 - Policy 5.7 – Parking and standards for disabled people and the mobility impaired.

London Plan 2011

- 17 The relevant policies for the London Plan include:
- Policy 3.3 - Increasing housing supply
 - Policy 3.4 - Optimising housing potential
 - Policy 3.5 - Quality and design of housing developments
 - Policy 3.6 - Children and young people's play and informal recreation facilities
 - Policy 3.7 - Large residential developments
 - Policy 3.8 - Housing choice
 - Policy 3.9 - Mixed and balanced communities
 - Policy 3.10 - Definition of affordable housing
 - Policy 3.11 - Affordable housing targets
 - Policy 3.12 - Negotiating affordable housing
 - Policy 3.13 - Affordable housing thresholds
 - Policy 5.1 - Climate change mitigation

Policy 5.2 - Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
 Policy 5.3 - Sustainable design and construction
 Policy 5.7 - Renewable energy
 Policy 5.8 - Innovative energy technologies
 Policy 5.12 - Flood risk management
 Policy 5.16 - Waste self-sufficiency
 Policy 5.17 - Waste capacity
 Policy 6.1 - Strategic approach
 Policy 6.3 - Assessing effects of development on transport capacity
 Policy 6.4 - Enhancing London's transport connectivity
 Policy 6.5 - Funding Crossrail and other strategically important transport infrastructure
 Policy 6.7 - Better streets and surface transport
 Policy 6.9 - Cycling
 Policy 6.10 - Walking
 Policy 6.13 - Parking
 Policy 7.1 - Building London's neighbourhoods and communities
 Policy 7.2 - An inclusive environment
 Policy 7.3 - Designing out crime
 Policy 7.4 - Local character
 Policy 7.5 - Public realm
 Policy 7.6 - Architecture
 Policy 7.8 - Heritage Assets and Archaeology
 Policy 8.2 - Planning obligations.

Adopted Supplementary Planning Documents

- 18 Relevant documents include:
- Aylesbury Area Action Plan (2010)
 - Residential Design Standards (2011)
 - Affordable Housing (2008) and draft Affordable Housing SPD (2011)
 - Sustainability Assessment (2009)
 - Sustainable Design and Construction (2009)
 - S.106 Planning Obligations (2007).

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

- 19 Relevant documents include:
- Section 1 'Delivering Sustainable Development'
 - Section 4 'Promoting Sustainable Transport'
 - Section 6 'Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes'
 - Section 7 'Requiring good design'
 - Section 12 'Conserving and enhancing the historic environment'.

Principle of development

- 20 The Aylesbury Area Action Plan (AAP) sets out aspirations for the regeneration of the Aylesbury Estate. The plan sets out principles for the redevelopment of each of the sites anticipated to come forward over the next 15-20 years. The AAP outlines that site 7, forms part of phase 1 of the Aylesbury Estate regeneration and that site 7 is designated for residential use, with an estimated capacity of up to 165 homes.
- 21 The proposal is a housing regeneration scheme and therefore the loss of the existing residential accommodation must be considered. Saved policy 4.6 'Loss of residential accommodation' in the Southwark Plan 2007 seeks to resist the net loss of residential floorspace. More specifically in relation to affordable housing, Policy 3.14 'Existing Housing' in the London Plan 2011 resists the loss of housing and in the case of estate renewal, where redevelopment of affordable housing is proposed, it should not be

permitted unless it is replaced by better quality accommodation, providing at least an equivalent floorspace of affordable housing.

- 22 The existing housing provision on the site is 59 units, of which 18 were or still remain as leaseholder properties. As such, the affordable housing provision on site totals 41 rented units. The proposed scheme would provide 76 affordable housing units of which 75% (by habitable room) would be social rented accommodation. Overall there would be no net loss of residential floorspace, or affordable housing floorspace across the site and therefore the proposal complies with policy, providing that high quality replacement housing is provided.
- 23 The site is currently in residential use and the surrounding uses are predominantly residential. The principle of residential uses on this site is appropriate given the existing uses in the area and in accordance with the requirements of the AAAP.
- 24 The redevelopment of this site would result in the loss of an existing multi use games area (MUGA). The AAAP accounts for the playspace needs across the masterplan area and provides indicative locations for doorstep playable space, local playable space, neighbourhood playable space and youth space. There is no requirement within the AAAP to re-provide the existing MUGA at site 7, and therefore it is acknowledged that an equivalent or similar facility will not be re-provided until future stages of the masterplan come forward for redevelopment. The site is within close proximity of numerous open space facilities and provides playspace on site for residents of the development. Furthermore, the applicants have agreed to provide a £127,299 financial contribution towards sports facilities in addition to the AAAP infrastructure tariff. Overall, whilst the short term loss is regrettable, the longer term benefits of bringing the scheme forward on balance mean this can be accepted in this case.

Environmental impact assessment

- 25 A screening opinion has been issued for this site, which concluded that the development would not constitute EIA development as the development does not fall within Schedule 1 or 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 1999.
- 26 The proposed development does not constitute EIA development as defined under Schedule 1 of the Regulations. The proposal does constitute an 'Urban Development Project' under Schedule 2 10(b) on the basis that the site area falls above the 0.5 hectare threshold. An assessment of the proposal based on the 'selection criteria' set out in Schedule 3 of the Regulations suggests that the proposal would not give rise to significant environmental effects. The development is outside any designated 'sensitive site' for the purposes of the regulations, rendering the development non-EIA development. Nonetheless, the local context will be an important consideration when assessing the impacts of the development generally. Overall, it is considered that the proposal falls outside of the formal definition of EIA development and therefore an EIA would not be required. The likely environmental effects (which would be localised in nature) could be addressed and mitigated where required as part of the planning application procedure. There are no aspects of the detailed design of the scheme as submitted as part of this planning application, that have altered the view regarding the schedule 3 criteria for screening.
- 27 The site forms part of the Aylesbury Area Action Plan (AAAP) area. Whilst the site forms part of an area expected to be redeveloped over the next 15-20 years, there are no current proposals within close proximity under consideration within the Aylesbury Estate and nearby sites are not expected to come forward for a number of years. The application does not form part of an outline application for a wider area, and is being

considered as a stand alone application. Whilst there is an implemented planning permission at phase 1A of the Aylesbury Estate, this is a significant distance away from site 7, and the combined scale of the developments would not give rise to significant environmental impacts.

Density

- 28 The site is situated within the 'Urban Zone' where a density of between 200 and 700 habitable rooms per hectare is expected. The AAAP outlines a density range of 601-700 habitable rooms per hectare for site 7.
- 29 Based on the site area of 0.88 hectares, the development of 541 habitable rooms equates to a density of 615 habitable rooms per hectare. The density sits within the required density range, which is considered acceptable in principle, subject to an appropriate quality of accommodation, design, and all other material considerations being found acceptable.

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

- 30 Saved policy 3.2 'Protection of Amenity' within the Southwark Plan seeks to protect the amenity of existing and future occupiers in the surrounding area or on the site.

Overlooking

- 31 Southwark's Residential Design Standards SPD recommends that developments achieve a minimum distance of 12 metres between facing buildings across a highway and a minimum of 21 metres as a back to back distance, to avoid unacceptable overlooking. All of the windows would exceed the 12m minimum across a highway to neighbouring buildings, which is acceptable. Within the proposed development itself, minimum back to back distances where windows directly overlook each other are met. The only exception is the mews street, which is 9m wide. However, this accords with the AAAP which set out a desire for a narrow Mews Street, to create a different character and an intimate streetscene largely designed for pedestrian movement. Windows have been designed to keep direct overlooking to a minimum and therefore in this case the scale of the mews street is considered acceptable.

Outlook and sense of enclosure

- 32 Given the scale of the building and distance from neighbouring occupiers, which meets the minimum separation distances set out in the Residential Design Standards SPD, the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of outlook and sense of enclosure and would not have an unacceptable impact on neighbouring residential amenity. Within the development itself, the layout and scale is considered appropriate and would not give rise to unacceptable outlook or sense of enclosure to future occupiers.

Daylight and Sunlight

- 33 The applicant submitted a daylight and sunlight report prepared by XCO2 Energy dated January 2012. The report assessed an earlier version of the scheme, and although the massing was largely similar, an addendum was submitted dated September 2012, which assessed the scheme again using the exact massing of the scheme proposed within this application. The report assesses the daylight and sunlight levels into the surrounding dwellings against the relevant BRE guidelines 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice' (1991). The BRE guidelines are a recognised mechanism within Southwark's Residential Design

Standards SPD to establish the impact of development in terms of daylight and sunlight.

- 34 The principal test used within the report is Vertical Sky Component (VSC). This test assesses the level of daylight entering existing rooms by considering the amount of available daylight from the sky reaching a window and is measured on the outside of that window. The target figure for VSC recommended by the BRE is 27% which is considered to be a good level of daylight and the level recommended for habitable rooms with windows on principal elevations. The BRE have determined that the VSC can be reduced by about 20% of their original value before the loss is noticeable. If the window fails the VSC test, then a further calculations should be carried out. Average Daylight Factor (ADF), which determines the natural daylight appearance of a room, takes account of the interior dimensions and surface reflectance. The ADF values recommended by the BRE guide are 2% for family kitchens, 1.5% for living rooms and 1% for bedrooms.
- 35 The most affected lower level residential windows in the buildings surrounding and facing the site were tested. The tests were calculated for 211-239 East Street, Dunicco House, 61-84 Wolverton and Taplow (windows fronting Thurlow Street).
- 36 Out of a total of 54 windows tested, 4 windows did not meet the BRE guidelines for VSC. All other windows passed the test and therefore it is concluded that the proposal would not have a noticeable impact on daylight to these occupiers. The 4 windows (3 situated on East Street and 1 window in Wolverton to the south) that fail the VSC test have been tested for ADF and the results show that the windows would receive ADFs in excess of the recommended levels for all types of habitable room. As such, in accordance with the BRE guidelines, the proposal would not have a harmful impact on neighbouring occupiers in terms of daylight.
- 37 The report also assesses the impact of the development on sunlight. The availability of sunlight is dependant on the orientation of the window or area of ground being assessed relative to position of due south. The Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH) is considered for all windows facing within 90 degree of due south. BRE guidelines require that a window should received a minimum of 25% of the annual probable sunlight hours, of which, 5% should be received in winter, or the window should not have more than a 20% loss of its former value.
- 38 In terms of sunlight, 26 windows were tested. The results show that 24 windows would meet the required BRE guidelines for APSH throughout the year. The 2 windows that fall below the recommended BRE criteria, are within 85 degrees of due south and only just fall within the criteria for testing and are heavily shaded by an existing wall. Both windows would still receive 77% and 66% of their former annual sunlight hours as a result of the development. Whilst there is a loss of sunlight to these windows over the recommended BRE guidelines, it is considered that overall, taking into account the urban environment, the existing constraints and the good daylight to these windows, sufficient sunlight levels would remain.
- 39 Overall, the development would not have an unacceptable impact upon daylight and sunlight to neighbouring residential occupiers.

Daylight levels within the proposed development itself were tested and the results show that the large majority of rooms would exceed the BRE guidelines and good daylight levels would be achieved. Whilst 3 of the 18 rooms tested would fall below the BRE criteria for ADF, these are worst case scenario for a very small proportion of the development and overall all units are considered to have good outlook and the majority are dual aspect. As such the quality of accommodation is considered acceptable in terms of daylight.

Overshadowing

- 40 Whilst not specifically tested in the daylight and sunlight report, it is not considered that the proposal would cause unacceptable overshadowing to nearby public open spaces. There would be some overshadowing for part of the day to the existing pavement seating area opposite the site on the corner of East Street, however given the nature of the building, this would be limited to a small proportion of the day and the overall impact would not be sufficient to cause significant concern.
- 41 An overshadowing analysis of the 2 proposed communal courtyards within the development show that there would be overshadowing to the southernmost part of the spaces. However, this is restricted to a limited area and the majority of the courtyard space would have good daylight levels throughout the year and would be an acceptable, useable space for residents.

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

- 42 The area surrounding the site is predominantly residential in nature with the exception of some commercial uses on the opposite side of Thurlow Street and East Street. The site is situated on a well trafficked road, however it is not considered excessive in terms of noise and pollution. The commercial uses surrounding the site are not of a scale that is likely to give rise to unacceptable noise levels to proposed units and given the existing residential uses on and surrounding the site, the impact on future occupiers is considered acceptable.

Design issues

- 43 The AAAP sets out a design approach that seeks to ensure streets are designed as attractive public spaces with landscaping as an integrated part of developments. The AAAP clearly sets out a desire to introduce a finer urban grain to the Aylesbury Estate and move away from the large uniform building blocks that currently exist. Developments should be designed to create variation, active and well overlooked streets and open spaces, using materials that exude quality and permanence. Building blocks should take the form of a 'perimeter block' facing the street with a central and secure communal space, 'mews blocks' fronted with terrace homes and 'special buildings' where it is appropriate to provide a landmark building. Blocks should be designed so that relatively few apartments are served off each core and most apartments should be dual aspect. Homes should look directly onto the street and communal garden areas and contain frequent entrances onto the street.

44 Site layout

The site layout is divided into two perimeter blocks centred around two communal garden areas for residents. A mews street would be created through the centre of the site, providing a predominantly pedestrian and cycle route from north to south. The proposed site layout is considered a logical approach that would establish well defined streets and permeability across the site. The buildings are designed to provide ground floor flats, maisonettes and houses, each with front doors onto the street, having the benefit of increasing street activity and creating a finer urban grain. Whilst the two centrally located communal courtyards would be publicly accessible, the spaces are intended to specifically serve the needs of the development, which is an acceptable approach. It is not considered that this would create a hostile environment or a gated community, given the outward facing design of the scheme which engages with the street, provides public open space to the corner on Thurlow Street, and provides a publicly accessible mews street across the site. Overall the site layout is acceptable.

Scale and massing

- 45 The application proposes an 8-10 storey block fronting Thurlow Street. At the corner with East Street, the proposal would rise to 10 storeys and features a public space directly onto the street corner. The remainder of the site is predominantly 3-4 storeys, with the exception of the block fronting Sedan Way, which rises to 6 storeys in height.
- 46 The concentration of height across the site is focused towards Thurlow Street. This is considered appropriate given the existing context and accords with the guidance within the AAAP, which outlines building heights along Thurlow Street of between 7-10 storeys. The proposed 10 storey building at the corner of Thurlow Street and East Street, would create a strong visual marker to the entrance to the Aylesbury Estate neighbourhood, when arriving from the north. The building is articulated into two vertical parts defined using a brick setback to break up the massing of the building and provide a more interesting form. The building would be located at a junction of local significance and providing the building has high architectural quality, the scale is considered appropriate.
- 47 Two 4 storey blocks are proposed fronting East Street, which is considered appropriate and would respect the change in scale on the opposite side of the street. The 3 storey town houses proposed on the mews street and to the south of the site, are considered appropriate and would emphasise the character of a traditional domestic street. The proposed 6 storey block fronting Sedan Way would replace the existing 5 storey building and would appear as a predominantly 5 storey building, with a set back top floor. Taking into account the existing context to this corner of the site, the proposed height in this location is considered appropriate and would define the western edge and provide a strong street frontage to Sedan Way.

Detailed design

- 48 The proposed 4 storey frontage onto East Street has a strong vertical rhythm to the fenestration pattern, which defines individual plot widths, reflective of the character of the terraces opposite. The 5/6 storey block fronting Sedan Way would use a similar approach with the duplex units at ground and first floor defined by brickwork and window fenestration details. Both blocks would have individual front doors onto the street. The 3 storey houses on the mews street and to the southern elevation would each have rear gardens and to the southern elevation, would have front gardens to provide separation from the street. The houses on the mews street itself front directly onto the mews, which is considered appropriate given this street is proposed for pedestrian and cycles only (except for refuse collection and emergency access) and would create a diversity of streetscapes across the site and achieve the intimate character of a mews as required by the AAAP.
- 49 The buildings across the scheme are predominantly brick, which is considered appropriate to the character of the area. Across the scheme, two types of complimenting bricks would be used to define the base of the buildings and add variation and character across the scheme. Recessed feature brick panels around the windows add visual interest. Where set back top floors are proposed across the site, a light glazed brick is proposed for the top floor, which is considered acceptable subject to samples being secured by condition.
- 50 The taller buildings along Thurlow Street would define the principal north south route through the estate. The ground floor duplex units are articulated by window fenestration and a subtly contrasting brick with individual front doors fronting the street. The 10 storey corner building requires a special quality to ensure it is a successful local marker. Glazed bricks or a high quality white brick is proposed in part on the 10 storey vertical corner of the building, which is considered an acceptable

approach and is likely to be more successful than panelling or render, to achieve quality and distinguish this corner. Subject to conditions, the design approach is considered acceptable.

- 51 The quality of the materials and brickwork is crucial to the success of the scheme. In principle, the proposed approach is acceptable, however further details of features such as balconies, and use of all materials across the elevations are required and the submission of samples for approval will be secured by condition, to ensure a high quality finish is achieved. Further details regarding the hard and soft landscaping generally across the scheme is also required, and will be subject to condition.

Impact on heritage assets

- 52 The closest boundary of the Liverpool Grove Conservation Area is situated approximately 125m from the proposed development. Between the conservation area and the proposal site is Taplow, which is a 14 storey residential slab block extending along the line of Thurlow Street. Given the presence of this block and the separation distance, it is not considered that the proposal would be visible from the Liverpool Grove Conservation Area. It is concluded that there would be no harmful impacts on the setting of the conservation area. Similarly, the proposed development is situated 150 metres from the closest listed terrace of buildings in Surrey Square. Taking into account the distance and existing built form within the area, it is not considered that the proposed development would impact the setting of these listed buildings or any other listed buildings within the area. There would be very limited, if any, views of the proposal from the listed buildings within Surrey Square and therefore it is concluded that the development would not have a harmful impact on local heritage assets.

Design Conclusions

- 53 Overall, the proposed site layout, scale, massing and design approach responds to the context surrounding the site and accords with the aims of the AAAP. Further details regarding materials, detailed finishes and landscaping will be secured by condition to ensure the anticipated and required design quality to ensure the scheme is a success, is achieved.

Impact on trees

- 54 It is proposed to remove 33 existing trees to facilitate the redevelopment of the site. It is acknowledged that a number of these are fair to good quality, and have amenity benefits within the local area. It is proposed to remove 15 'C' category, 8 'B' category, 1 'A' category (Sycamore) and an additional 9 trees which are not considered a constraint to development due to their poor condition and limited retention value. The proposal has been designed to retain 3 large Plane trees (on East Street and Thurlow Street), which offer some of the greatest contribution to visual amenity due to their prominent locations. This retention is welcomed.
- 55 The contribution to amenity and other benefits associated with the trees proposed for removal are noted, however it is also acknowledged that tree removal would be necessary to facilitate feasible redevelopment of this site as retention is likely to constrain future development to an unreasonable extent. The location of the existing trees would severely limit the options for a more intensive development, capable of replacing the affordable units as well as creating new private and intermediate housing. The loss of the trees must therefore be balanced against the requirement to redevelop this site for mixed tenure housing. The current layout already provides for a smaller total number of units than expected under the AAAP (providing 147 rather than 165 units). Retaining more of the trees would further reduce capacity at the site. It is therefore concluded that, on balance, it is acceptable to remove a number of

existing trees, including one Category A tree, only because of the constraints that the positions of the existing trees create. In addition, the loss is only acceptable if appropriate mitigation is provided via suitable replacement. In accordance with London Plan policy 7.21, loss of canopy cover should be mitigated through suitable replacement. The proposed landscaping plan across the site would provide 34 new trees on streets and in open spaces. A number of smaller multistem courtyard specimens together with shrub, ground planting and raised beds are proposed. It is not currently clear whether the proposed trees would provide full replacement of canopy cover, and further information is being sought from the applicant. Updated information on this issue will be provided in the Addendum report. The provision of street trees is proposed on Thurlow Street, the street to the south of the site and on Sedan Way. Subject to clarification on canopy size, the provision of street trees will be secured via the s.106 agreement, and trees with the site area by condition as part of the landscaping details.

- 56 Overall, the applicant's proposal to mitigate the impacts of the loss through replacement trees and planting in communal garden areas, is acceptable in principle. However, additional details are required to ensure that the type and quality of landscaping aspired to is sustainable it needs to achieve a reasonable level of maturity and longevity. This requires ample soil, water and exploitable rooting volumes and raised beds require sufficiently sized planters with appropriate drainage and irrigation. As such, full details will be secured by condition.

Housing Mix and Affordable Housing

- 57 The application proposes the following mix:

	Private (units)	Private (hab rooms)	Inter-Mediate (units)	Inter-mediate (hab rooms)	Social target rents (units)	Social target rents (hab rooms)	Total (by unit)
1 Bed (2P)	21	(42)	4	(8)	5	(10)	30 (20%)
2 Bed (3P)	10	(30)	8	(24)	4	(12)	22 (15%)
2 Bed (4P)	20	(60)	8	(24)	6	(18)	34 (23%)
2 Bed (3P mais)	3	(9)	1	(3)	0	(0)	4 (3%)
2 Bed (4P mais)	5	(15)	6	(18)	0	(0)	11 (7%)
3 Bed (mais)	1	(5)	0	(0)	11	(55)	12 (8%)
3 Bed (house)	0	(0)	0	(0)	1	(5)	1 (1%)
4 Bed (mais)	10	(60)	0	(0)	1	(6)	11 (7%)
4 Bed (house)	0	(0)	0	(0)	17	(102)	17 (12%)
5 Bed (mais)	1	(7)	0	(0)	0	(0)	1 (1%)
5 Bed (house)	0	(0)	0	(0)	4	(28)	4 (3%)
TOTAL	71	228	27	77	49	236	147 (100%)
TOTAL by %	48%	42%	18%	14%	33%	44%	

- 58 Strategic Policy 6 of the Core Strategy 2011, requires a minimum of 35% affordable

housing on schemes of 10 units or more. The AAAP outlines that 59% of new homes should be affordable within this location. It is recognised in the affordable housing SPD, that affordable housing provision should be calculated on a habitable room basis. The proposal would provide 57.9% affordable housing based on habitable rooms. This exceeds the requirements of Strategic Policy 6 in the Core Strategy, however is marginally below the AAAP requirement.

- 59 The split between the social rented:intermediate accommodation is 75:25 based on habitable rooms. This is generally in accordance with the Southwark Plan (which expects a 70:30 split) and accords with the AAAP which requires a 75:25 split. Within the social rented sector, all units would be provided at target rent levels, and this would be secured within the s.106.
- 60 The proposal would provide good affordable housing provision well above the minimum requirements of the Southwark Plan and Core Strategy. Whilst there is a minor divergence from the AAAP requirement, this equates to around one unit, and in the current circumstances where affordable housing is difficult to achieve, the shortfall is not considered significant. The proposal would achieve the AAAP aim of a mixed tenure community, whilst re-providing the existing level of social rent housing at the site in line with the requirements of the London Plan.
- 61 Core Strategy Strategic Policy 7 requires at least 60% of units to have 2 or more bedrooms and 20% of units to be 3, 4 or 5 bedrooms in the Urban Zone. The AAAP contains a more onerous requirement for 70% of homes to have 2 or more bedrooms, 20% of homes to have 3 bedrooms, 7% of homes to have 4 bedrooms and 3% of homes to have 5 or more bedrooms. The proposal would provide 80% of units with 2 or more bedrooms, 9% of units with 3 bedrooms, 19% with 4 bedrooms and 4% with 5 bedrooms. The proposed mix exceeds the requirements of the core strategy, and would provide a high proportion of large family sized homes. Whilst the mix would not comply with the very specific requirements of the AAAP, it provides a greater proportion of 4 and 5 bedroom homes than expected in the AAAP. This provision is considered a benefit of the scheme as there is a recognised need for larger rented homes in the borough. It is unusual to get such a large proportion of 4 and 5 bedroom homes and in particular houses, on sites in the borough.
- 62 Overall a good mix of units is provided across the site and there is a recognised need for family sized homes across the borough, and therefore this is considered acceptable and accords with the aspirations of the AAAP.
- 63 Appendix 5 in the AAAP estimates 49% flats, 19% maisonettes and 32% houses could be provided on this site. The scheme provides 58% flats, 26% maisonettes and 16% houses. The proposal exceeds the percentage for flats and maisonettes and falls below the percentage for houses as set out in the AAAP. However, the proposal provides houses that line the mews street and the street to the south, and to increase the number of individual houses to meet the 32% requirement, is likely to take up over half of the site area. This would have subsequent impacts on site layout, design and scale. The majority of the proposed maisonettes have individual front doors onto the street and private front and rear gardens. The internal space standards are comparable with a house and therefore the maisonettes would have the characteristics of an individual house, albeit with neighbouring accommodation above. The quality of the houses and maisonettes is considered to be good, and the provision is acceptable.
- 64 Overall the proposed tenure mix and housing types is good, providing a range of accommodation in line with the needs of the borough and would meet the overall aspirations of the AAAP.

Wheelchair Accommodation

- 65 Policy 4.3 of the Southwark Plan 2007 requires 10% of units to be provided as wheelchair accessible housing, and these should be fitted out for occupation. The scheme would provide 15 wheelchair accessible units consisting of 4x2 bed flats in the private tenure and 11x3 bed ground floor maisonettes (with internal platform lift) with private gardens in the social rented tenure. A total of 15 wheelchair accessible car parking spaces would be provided and are located in close proximity to the wheelchair units. The provision is acceptable in accordance with policy, and would provide good quality wheelchair housing.

Quality of accommodation

- 66 The overall internal space standards for all dwellings accord with the minimum floor areas set out within the Southwark Residential Design Standards SPD 2011 and in most cases, exceed the minimum standards. The internal space would also meet the AAAP requirements. Overall, 90% of units would have a dual aspect, which is welcomed. All units would have dedicated internal storage space and private amenity space in the form of either a good size balcony or private garden. Two communal amenity spaces would be provided for residents. Whilst some private gardens are modest in scale, all units have access through their garden into the communal amenity space.
- 67 Each perimeter housing block encloses a communal courtyard garden. The west courtyard features 425sqm of central space (excluding paths and perimeter planting and seating) which would provide 300sqm of playable space (for ages 0-11). The east courtyard would provide 165sqm of central space and dedicated doorstep playable space of 100sqm (ages 0-5). All residents would have access to both courtyards. Residents would also be located in close proximity to playspace and open space to the opposite side of Sedan Way and on Surrey Square. Burgess Park is also within walking distance of the site. The overall amenity space provision is considered acceptable, however full details of the layout and facilities to be provided in the proposed playspaces will be secured as part of the landscape details condition.

Traffic Issues

Trip generation and highways impacts

- 68 The impact on the road network is minimal and acceptable. The Aylesbury infrastructure tariff has been designed to meet the infrastructure requirements associated with delivering the masterplan development, including transport. Discussions are ongoing with TfL regarding any required contributions to mitigate the impacts of the development, and the outcome of this will be reported to committee in an addendum report.

Car Parking

- 69 The application proposes parking at a ratio of 0.4 spaces per unit, which is in line with the AAAP expectations. A total of 44 parking spaces would be provided in the basement, 6 of which are wheelchair accessible spaces. The layout and entry point to the car park is acceptable. Additional car parking would also be provided on street, including 9 disabled car parking spaces. The location of all disabled parking is considered acceptable and easily accessible for the wheelchair units within the scheme. Whilst wheelchair parking is normally required on-site, given existing demand in the area and that the road to south will remain as an estate road for the foreseeable

future, the parking is considered acceptable in this case.

- 70 A total of 6 on-street parking spaces are proposed on Sedan Way, which is to be offered for adoption as public highway. After the dedication of two spaces for car club use, the remaining four spaces will become residents parking within the existing controlled parking zone. In order to protect the amenity of existing residents in respect of parking, it is recommended that the number of permits available to new residents will be limited to the number of new spaces that the development has created. As such, only 4 residential units to be eligible for a parking permit, and this will be secured via the S.106 agreement.

Cycle parking

- 71 Cycle parking for residents of individual houses is to be provided in lockers (holding 2 bikes) which are accessible from the street and acceptable in accordance with policy. Cycle parking for residents of the flats will be in the underground car park using Sheffield stands, which are arranged in a secure area with adequate spacing between stands. Access to the basement is available via a single lift or stairs from the western communal garden and two lifts from block 2. The access arrangements are not considered easily accessible for the residents of blocks 4 and 5 due to the distance. The applicant has been advised to explore a solution for this, and an update will be provided in an addendum report.

Servicing and refuse vehicle access

- 72 The dedicated waste storage areas are considered appropriate and allow convenient access for residents. A waste collection vehicle will be able to access all collection points, including through the mews. A Construction Management Plan should be secured by condition to include measures to mitigate the environmental and road safety impact of the construction traffic during construction.

Car club

- 73 Two car club bays are to be provided on Sedan Way, which is acceptable. Three year's free car club membership to all residents of the development will be secured via the s.106 agreement.

Travel Plan

- 74 An acceptable Travel Plan will be secured as part of the s.106 agreement. This would include a commitment to surveying residents at 75% occupation of the development and at 3 and 5 years later. A commitment to updating the travel plan following each of the surveys, and commitment to measures identified within the travel plan, would also be sought. A sum of £3,000 would be secured through the Section 106 agreement, for the council's monitoring of the travel plan.

Site layout and Highways matters

- 75 The proposal would realign Sedan Way to the east, which would be offered for adoption as highway maintainable at the public expense. The proposed layout of the road is acceptable and provides sufficient flexibility to be adapted at the Section 278 agreement stage in order to allow the installation of measures to support a possible future 'green links' cycle scheme. The proposed street trees are welcomed.
- 76 The road to the south of the site will be constructed to adoptable standards, however is to remain an estate road until the redevelopment of the block to the south comes forward (not for a number of years), at which stage it would be offered for adoption.

The proposed layout is acceptable and the proposed trees are welcomed.

- 77 In line with the aspirations of the AAP, a north-south mews is proposed through the site, accessible to pedestrians, cyclists, refuse collection vehicles and emergency service vehicles. Vehicular access would be controlled using rising bollards. It is noted that public realm have raised concern that the mews street has not been designed to a sufficient width to allow for adoption as public highway. However, the applicant does not intend to offer the mews street for adoption and therefore subject securing public rights of access over the mews street and requiring the applicant to maintain the street to an acceptable standard (which will be secured via the s.106 agreement), there would be no planning grounds for an objection to the scheme.

Sustainable development implications

- 78 The London Plan and Strategic Policy 13 'High environmental standards' in the Core Strategy require developments to make the fullest contribution to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change, and to minimise carbon dioxide emissions. The applicant has submitted an energy statement completed by XCO2 energy. The proposals have followed the London Plan energy hierarchy as required by policy. The proposal includes a range of passive design features and demand reduction measures to reduce carbon emissions from the proposed development by 7.8%. The applicant has committed to ensuring the development is designed to allow future connection to a district heating network in accordance with the AAAP. As outlined in AAAP policy BH6, until such time as the CHP is fuelled by renewable energy sources and is capable of meeting the London Plan target, developments will be required to use their own CHP compatible on-site renewable energy technologies.
- 79 The applicant proposes gas fired CHP as the main heat source for the site, which would provide CO2 savings of 19%. The CHP would also allow future connection to the Aylesbury Area Heat Network as required by the AAAP. Whilst it is noted that gas fired CHP is not a renewable energy, it can provide significant CO2 reductions and meets the London Plan requirements for decentralised energy. The submitted energy statement carried out a feasibility study of 7 different types of renewable energy for the development; however for various reasons, including lack of compatibility with CHP, it was considered that photovoltaic panels were the most feasible option for the site. The applicant also proposes solar photovoltaic panels on the roof of the buildings which would provide savings of 13.4%.
- 80 CHP will provide the heat for the development, and therefore it would not be viable to require renewable sources over and above what is proposed, as the energy demands of the development are being met. Overall, the proposal provides carbon emissions savings of 35.3%, which exceeds the targets set out in London Plan policy. In accordance with the London Plan, the development will incorporate a range of energy efficient measures including efficient lighting, levels of insulation beyond building regulation requirements and high performance glazing, to reduce carbon emissions. Whilst the specific 20% reduction from renewable energy sources as set out in Southwark's Core Strategy is not met, taking into account feasibility and overall reductions, it is not considered a refusal could be substantiated on this ground. Overall, the energy strategy is considered acceptable.
- 81 The applicant has submitted a code for sustainable homes pre-assessment which confirms that it is anticipated the development would meet Code Level 4 which is acceptable in accordance with policy.
- 82 Prior to the commencement of development, an ecology report will be required that meets best practice and provides mitigation where required. Conditions relating to ecology mitigation will be attached to any planning permission granted. Green and

brown roofs are proposed and will be secured by condition. Bird and bat boxes will also be secured by condition.

Planning obligations (S.106 undertaking or agreement)

- 83 Policy 2.5 of the Soutwark Plan advises that planning obligations can be secured to overcome the negative impacts of a generally acceptable proposal. This policy is reinforced by the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for 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 own merits against relevant policy, guidance and other material considerations when assessing planning obligations.
- 84 Policy D2 within the AAAP sets out that financial contributions will be sought in the form of a tariff scheme, to ensure delivery of key infrastructure to ensure the master plan as a whole can be delivered and impacts adequately mitigated against. Table A7.3 within the AAAP outlines the indicative infrastructure items and costs, which covers items such as public realm improvements, utilities infrastructure, open space and education.
- 85 In accordance with the AAAP Infrastructure Tariff and policy D2 in the AAAP, this development requires a contribution of £2,005,374 (calculated at £13,642 per unit) to mitigate the impacts of the development.
- 86 The Aylesbury Infrastructure tariff does not cover all areas for mitigation as set out in the Soutwark’s S.106 SPD, and therefore additional contributions are requested to ensure all recognised impacts are appropriately mitigated.
- 87 The following table sets out what the applicant has agreed to provide, in order to mitigate the impacts of the development.

Planning Obligation	Amount required by policy D2 in AAAP	Applicant Contribution
Aylesbury Infrastructure Tariff	£2,005,374	£2,005,374 (Cost of works in kind such as public realm improvements can be deducted from this total)
TOTAL	£2,005,374	£2,005,374

Planning Obligation	Toolkit Standard Charge (£)	Applicant Contribution (£)
Employment during construction	£105,672	£105,672 (The applicant may choose to provide a Work Place Coordinator instead of a contribution, providing that the council’s agreed outputs are achieved)
Employment during construction management fee	£8,568	£8,568
Sports development	£127,299	£127,299
Transport strategic	£83,228	£83,228
Health	£160,802	£160,802

TOTAL	£485,569	£485,569
--------------	-----------------	-----------------

88 A 2% admin fee will be applied to the financial contributions outlined above. In addition to the above financial contributions, the applicant has agreed to provide;

- 57.9% affordable housing (75% social target rent and 25% intermediate)
- Travel Plan and £3,000 to the Council for monitoring
- An exclusion for residents (except for x units which would be eligible for a parking permit) from applying for on street parking permits
- 2 on street car club bays
- 3 years free car club membership to each unit
- provision for connection across the boundary to any future area wide CHP plant
- public rights of access along the mews street and the space at the corner of East Street and Thurlow Street.

TfL have requested funding to improve bus services; negotiations on this request are still ongoing, and the outcome will be reported in the addendum report.

89 The community infrastructure levy regulations came into force on 6 April 2010. The regulations state under 122 – “Limitation on use of planning obligations” that it is unlawful for a planning obligation to be taken into account when determining a planning application for a development, or any part of a development, that is capable of being charged CIL if the obligation does not meet all of the following tests:

- necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- directly related to the development; and
- fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

90 It is the opinion of the council that the planning obligations sought meet the planning tests of Circular 05/05 and the CIL regulations (122 and 123). The contributions would be spent on delivering school places as a result of the development, job creation during construction, improvements to open spaces and sports facilities, improvements to increase the capacity of transport provision across the borough, improvements to the public realm, funds to secure new health facilities and improvements to community facilities. These are necessary in planning terms, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related to the impacts of the development.

91 In accordance with the recommendation, if the Section 106 Agreement is not signed by 18 October 2012, 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, health care service, the transport network, and employment and the proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy 2.5 of the Southwark Plan and Policy 8.2 of the London Plan’.

Other matters

Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

92 S143 of the Localism Act 2011 states that any financial sum that an authority has received, will, or could receive in the payment of CIL is a material “local financial consideration” in planning decisions. The requirement for Mayoral CIL is a material consideration. However, the weight to be attached to a local finance consideration remains a matter for the decision-maker. Mayoral CIL is to be used for strategic

transport improvements in London, primarily Crossrail. The levy is applied to all developments at a rate of £35 per square metre in Southwark.

The existing floorspace in the building equates to 5,079sqm and the proposed floorspace within the development is 14,353sqm. At the time of writing this report, the building has been used for its primary purpose for 6 of the last 12 months. As such the CIL contribution is based on the additional floorspace created. Based on the areas provided, this would be $9,274\text{m}^2 \times £35 = £324,590$.

Amendments

- 93 It should be noted that during the course of the application a number of minor amendments were made to the scheme. The changes related to the correction of some minor discrepancies between floorplans and elevations relating to window positions. Minor design amendments were also made (including window appearance and fenestration and the use of materials on the face of the building) to the design of the mews street and 10 storey corner building fronting Thurlow Street and East Street. No additional openings were create and overall, the changes did not significantly alter the development in terms of impacts to surrounding occupiers and did not increase amenity impacts or the scale of development. As such, all representations made by local residents are still applicable. Given the nature of the amendments, further consultation was not required.

Issues raised in neighbour consultation responses

- 94 In total, 7 neighbour consultation responses have been received. It is considered that the material planning matters raised have been considered within the main report, or are considered in the paragraphs below.
- 95 It is noted that one of the respondents considers the application should be referred to the Greater London Authority (GLA). The application does not meet the definition of an application of Potential Strategic Importance (PSI) as outlined in the Mayor of London Order 2008 and as such, is not referable to the GLA. Whilst the application site is situated in the AAAP area, the proposal is a stand alone application and doesn't form part of a more substantial proposed development, on the same land or adjoining land. Confirmation from the GLA was sought and it was confirmed that the application is not referable.
- 96 Respondents have raised concern that the proposals do not accord with the council's cabinet decision which agreed the report entitled 'Selection of Preferred Developer for Land Transfer Aylesbury Site 7 (1-50 Wolverton)' on the 17 April 2011. This report states:
'This report recommends that cabinet approves the transfer of this land to the preferred bidder on the basis that it will be developed to provide new mixed tenure homes over 50% will be affordable of which three quarters will be available at social rents'
The proposed development would provide 57.9% affordable housing of which 75% would be social rented and as such, it is considered to accord with the cabinet report.
- 97 Concern has been raised that the site boundary is incorrect. All proposed buildings, including front gardens, sit within the red-edged boundary (which is the area that will be within the applicant's ownership). Works outside the boundary relate to public realm works such as pavements, parking bays, street trees and crossovers. These works directly surrounding the site will be secured within the s.106 agreement. It is acceptable to have such works shown outside the red-line boundary and therefore the site boundary is considered correct.

Conclusion on planning issues

- 98 The proposed development is considered acceptable in land use terms. It would provide an appropriate and sustainable development providing much needed housing in the borough and a high proportion of affordable housing at social target rent levels. The housing proposed is considered to be of a good quality, with a good mix of dwelling sizes and housing types across the site, addressing recognised housing need.
- 99 The quality of proposed accommodation is considered to be good, with generous internal space standards and the scheme has a high proportion of dual aspect units, providing good outlook, light and ventilation. Ground floor units and houses would have front doors directly onto the street, increasing activity and natural surveillance.
- 100 The proposal is considered acceptable in terms of scale and design. The layout will improve permeability across the site and the buildings front the street to provide a strong street frontage. The design, using brick as the primary facing material, is appropriate and uses brick detailing to add interest and variety to the facades. Whilst 3 significant value trees are to be retained, the redevelopment of the site results in the loss of a number of mature trees, and therefore the proposal is only considered acceptable as the proposals would provide appropriate mitigation through tree and planting replacement.
- 101 The amenity impacts have been considered, and overall the proposal would not result in harm to residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers in terms of daylight and sunlight, outlook, sense of enclosure and overlooking.
- 102 Taking into account London Plan policy, Core Strategy policy and AAAP requirements, the approach to sustainability and energy provision is considered acceptable. The proposal has appropriately mitigated against the impacts of the development by securing appropriate financial contributions and mitigation measure in accordance with the AAAP and Southwark Plan policies.
- 103 The transport impacts of the proposal have been assessed and concluded that the proposal would not have a significant impact on the surrounding highway network. To ensure there is not an unacceptable impact on parking pressures within the local area, the majority of units would be excluded from applying for on-street parking permits. This would be secured within the s.106 agreement.
- 104 Therefore it is recommended that permission be granted, subject to conditions and the completion of an appropriate S106 agreement.

Community impact statement

- 105 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. The impact on local people is set out above.

Consultations

- 106 Details of consultation undertaken in respect of this application are set out in Appendix 1.

Consultation replies

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

Summary of consultation responses

A total of 7 letters of objection were received from occupants at 184e East Street, 20 Wolverton, 178 Taplow, 49 Cuddington Deacon Way, 36 Wolverton, 19 Wolverton and 21 Goodwin Close (on behalf of remaining Wolverton residents) raising the following material planning issues:

- Loss of existing residential accommodation
- Unfair to move residents out of their homes
- Unsustainable to demolish the estate. Refurbishment of existing buildings would be of greater benefit and more cost effective. There are numerous examples of successful estate refurbishments.
- Proposal is contrary to the cabinet report dated 17th April 2011 which stated 75% of the affordable housing in the development would be social rented accommodation
- Proposed scale and density out of character with area, would appear monolithic
- Proposed units have a lack of privacy and small rooms
- Loss of trees (associated visual and environmental impacts)
- Overcrowding due to additional residents and impacts on health, increase in crime
- Proposal creates a gated community (central courtyard and playspace are not publicly accessible) and fails to improve permeability and connection with the surrounding community
- Loss of an existing sports pitch is contrary to the AAAP's aspirations
- No indication that the scheme would be 'zero carbon growth' as required by AAAP policy 3.6.1
- Lack of consideration of the C02 implications of redeveloping the estate
- Proposed CHP would not run on renewable energy
- Solar panels proposed only provide 13% of the site's energy supply rather than 20% as set out in policy
- The site should be connected to the existing district heating network
- Lack of proper cycle and pedestrian routes within the area
- Pressure on local bus services and other infrastructure
- Lack of green space within the area
- Increased traffic congestion, traffic pollution and noise pollution
- An EIA should have been required for the proposal
- The application should have been referred to the GLA
- Harm to the conservation area and listed buildings as a result of the scale of development
- Views showing how the proposal impacts the Liverpool Grove conservation area and listed buildings in Surrey Square should be provided
- The application includes no information regarding how the proposal contributes to key infrastructure requirements of the AAAP
- The site boundary appears incorrectly marked out
- Concern that the 58% affordable housing may be subject to change.

The following objections were raised which are not material planning considerations:

- Understood the regeneration was already approved under the previous government. Concern that this may cost more than the original plan and further consultation is costly.
- Unfair CPO processs

- Regeneration should have started on other parts of the estate or on the Heygate first (which has been empty for years)
- How is the regeneration being funded and how much will it cost? Cost implications should be clear
- Object to the unjust way leaseholders are being treated by the Council and believe its not in the public interest to go ahead with the CPO. Contrary to article 8 European law of human rights
- Application would not benefit of council tenants because the rent will increase and the right of secure tenants is not guaranteed under the L&Q housing trust

It is considered that the planning issues raised have been addressed within the report and in some case have been addressed by conditions or s.106 obligations.

Human rights implications

- 108 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.
- 109 This application has the legitimate aim of providing a housing development. 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
Site history file: TP/H1059 Application file: 12/AP/2332 Southwark Local Development Framework and Development Plan Documents	Chief executive's department 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH	Planning enquiries telephone: 020 7525 5403 Planning enquiries email: planning.enquiries@southwark.gov.uk Case officer telephone:: 020 7525 5657 Council website: www.southwark.gov.uk

APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	Consultation undertaken
Appendix 2	Consultation responses received
Appendix 3	Images
Appendix 4	Recommendation

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Gary Rice, Head of Development Management	
Report Author	Laura Webster, Senior Planning Officer	
Version	Final	
Dated	28 September 2012	
Key Decision	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments sought	Comments included
Strategic Director of Finance and Corporate Services	No	No
Strategic Director of Environment and Leisure	No	No
Strategic Director of Housing and Community Services	No	No
Director of Regeneration	No	No
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team	28 September 2012	

Consultation Undertaken

Site notice date: 22/08/2012

Press notice date: 02/08/2012

Case officer site visit date: 22/08/2012

Neighbour consultation letters sent: 27/07/2012

959 neighbouring occupiers were consulted, including addresses on Thurlow Street, Dawes Street, East Street, Tatum Street, Beckway Street, Huntsman Street, Flint Street, Wolverton and Sedan Way as shown on the map below:



Internal services consulted: 27/07/2012

Access Officer
Archaeology Officer
Design and Conservation Team
Ecology Officer
Environmental Protection Team [Noise / Air Quality / Land Contamination / Ventilation]
Planning Policy
Transport Planning Team
Urban Forester
Waste Management
Public Realm

Statutory and non-statutory organisations consulted:

Environment Agency
Natural England - London Region & South East Region
Transport for London (NON-REFERABLE APPLICATIONS ONLY)
Thames Water Development Planning

Neighbours and local groups consulted: N/A

Re-consultation: N/A

APPENDIX 2

Consultation Responses Received

Internal services

Archaeology

The Greater London Historic Environment Record contains references to an assumed Roman Road running east from the Old Kent Road through to a suggested river crossing at Westminster.

It is therefore recommended that a programme of archaeological observation and recording, a watching brief, is maintained during groundworks on site. This should be secured by conditions relating to Archaeological Mitigation and Archaeological Reporting

Ecology

- Only 3 of the original trees are being retained. The Sustainability Statement states an ecologist will be employed to assess the value of the site and make recommendations. This assessment should be undertaken before the autumn. The Ecologist would contribute to the CfSH assessment and the relevant credits, so it is unclear where credits are currently coming from.
- I recommend the following enhancements for consideration: Brown Roofs on a minimum of 75% of the roof space, Bird nesting and bat roosting features to be built into the new housing blocks, A SUDs scheme that utilises the open space such as a rain garden and 50% native planting in the soft landscaping areas.
- Conditions relating to Timing of vegetation clearance (breeding birds), Green roofs for biodiversity and Bird and bat boxes are recommended.

Environmental Protection - No comments received to date

Transport

The impact on the road network is minimal and acceptable. The impact of the development on the bus network has been assessed independently by TfL. Across the Aylesbury Estate as a whole an increase of 1,500 homes is anticipated, and the Council has identified a requirement for £4.5M within its CIL Infrastructure Plan for improving bus services to support the Aylesbury redevelopment. This equates to £3,000 for each additional home created on each site, suggesting a contribution of £264,000 for this site.

The application proposes parking at a ratio of 0.4 spaces per unit, which is in line with the AAAP expectations. This is to be provided partly on-street, with an acceptable layout, and partly off-street in an underground car park. The car park has a single-lane ramp which is to be signal controlled with priority to those entering in order to prevent queuing on the street. This is acceptable. With the reconfiguration of the road to the south of the site there will be some loss of estate parking spaces. It is proposed that these be re-provided on a section of land to the south of this road which will become available following the demolition of Wolverton House.

Six on-street parking spaces are to be provided on Sedan Way, which is to be offered

for adoption as public highway. After dedication of two spaces for car-club use, the remaining four spaces will become residents' parking places within the existing controlled parking zone. In order to protect the amenity of existing residents in respect of parking, it is recommended that the number of permits available to new residents will be limited to the number of new spaces that the development has created. This will involve allowing only four residential units to be eligible for one parking permit per household.

Disabled parking is proposed at a ratio of 0.1 spaces per residential unit, with spaces located on the road to the south of the site and in the car park, all within close proximity to the wheelchair-accessible units. While the road to the south of the site is currently an estate road (i.e. no highway maintainable at the public expense), it is the intention that this should be adopted at an appropriate time to fit in with the redevelopment of the next development block to the south, which is likely to be at least 15 years from now. We would normally not allow a development to rely on on-street disabled parking, but consider that the relatively long-term nature of the status of the road as an estate road will mitigate any concerns we might otherwise have. The disabled parking is therefore acceptable.

Cycle parking for residents of individual houses is to be provided in lockers which are accessible from the street (i.e. without having to take bikes through the house), which is welcomed and accords with policy. The lockers seem to be of an appropriate size to accommodate two adult bikes, which meets London Plan standards, and it is assumed these will have flexibility to accommodate children's bikes with careful arrangement. Details of the lockers should be conditioned to ensure that they are suitably secure.

Cycle parking for residents of the flats will be in the underground car park using Sheffield stands, which is welcomed. The stands are spaced at 800mm centres, which is somewhat closer than the ideal (1000mm) but is still acceptable. They are to be provided in locked rooms to provide good security. Access will be via a single lift from the western communal garden and two lifts from two lifts into block 2. While this is not ideal for residents of block 1 or block 3, it is a very poor arrangement for residents of blocks 4 and 5. For these latter blocks the lift cores for each block are at least 80m (a minute's walk) from the lift within the communal garden. This cannot be claimed to meet the Southwark Plan criterion that cycle parking should be "convenient" (policy 5.3iv). The travel plan is of good quality and is acceptable at this stage. Should planning permission be granted it is recommended that the travel plan is secured by Section 106 agreement and through this; commitment to surveying residents and monitoring. It is recommended that a sum of £3,000 is secured through the Section 106 agreement, for LBS's monitoring of the travel plan.

Two car club spaces are proposed on Sedan Way, it is not clear that car club membership is to be offered to new residents. The Council usually secures three years' free car club membership for all residents who meet car club membership conditions (relating to age, length of holding a license, etc.) This should be secured through condition or obligation.

The spaces available for storage of waste comply with the requirements of the Council. Waste would be collected from individual properties (in wheelie bins) and from the core of bigger blocks in "eurobins". A waste collection vehicle will be able to access all such collection points, including through the mews.

A construction management plan should be secured by condition or obligation. This should include measures to mitigate the environmental and road safety impact of the construction traffic, including measures such as requiring hauliers to be FORS members, compulsory training in Safer London Driving (which includes considerable emphasis on cyclist and pedestrian road safety) and environmentally-friendly driving for drivers, and regular checks on driving licences and other permits, and checks on compliance with agreed routes.

Sedan Way

At present Sedan Way is an estate road which runs a little west of the boundary of the housing block to the east, leaving some green space containing a small number of mature trees. It is proposed that Sedan Way is realigned to the east, taking this green space, and offered for adoption as highway maintainable at the public expense. On-street residents' parking places will be provided along the western side as discussed above. The proposed layout of the road is acceptable and provides sufficient flexibility to be adapted at the Section 278 agreement stage in order to allow the installation of measures to support a possible cycle scheme. The proposed trees are welcomed.

Road to the south of the site

This is to remain an estate road until the redevelopment of the block to the south, at which stage it would be offered for adoption. It will therefore be built to adoptable standards. The proposed layout is acceptable and the proposed trees are welcomed.

Thurlow Street

No changes are proposed for Thurlow Street other than the introduction of street trees within the footway. While these are welcomed, it should be noted that no site investigations have been carried out to determine whether it will be possible to introduce these trees, and so their introduction cannot be assumed to be achievable.

East Street

The junction with the mews lies between a length of residents' parking bays and a bus stop. In order to provide a safe exit for cyclists (notwithstanding the comments below) it will be necessary to relocate the bus stop further east (though still west of Sedan Way). No other changes are proposed to East Street.

The Mews

In line with the aspirations of the AAP, a north-south mews is proposed through the site, accessible to pedestrians, cyclists, refuse collection vehicles and emergency service vehicles but with vehicular access controlled using rising bollards. The AAP seeks to secure an environment which is highly permeable for pedestrians and cyclists. However, despite considerable discussion and advice on this matter at pre-application stage, the mews has not been designed to be of sufficient width to provide access for cyclists while retaining space for vulnerable pedestrians (occasional use by refuse collection vehicles is acceptable).

This arrangement will not be suitable for adoption as public highway. It also casts some doubt over the arrangements that will be acceptable for access to the mews from the public highway, to be negotiated as part of the Section 278 agreement.

Urban Forester –

- The site has a number of fair to good quality mature trees that provide valuable

amenity and contribute to canopy cover.

- In order to facilitate development thirty three such trees will be removed. Three large Planes which offer some of the greatest individual contribution to amenity given their visibility and contribution to the streetscape are to be retained. Removals include fifteen C category, eight B category, one A category and an additional nine trees which are not considered a constraint to development due to their poor condition and limited retention value.
- The landscape plan allows for thirty four new trees on streets and in open spaces, a number of smaller multistem courtyard specimens together with shrub, ground planting and raised beds.
- The contribution to amenity and other benefits associated with trees proposed for removal are of considerable significance and hence loss is only acceptable should mitigation be provided via suitable replacement.
- Of a total of 1.34 square metres of cross sectional stem to be removed an unknown quantity is to be replaced. Although the planting plan is acceptable, amendments are required both to provide a design which is greater merit and to ensure its sustainability, especially where landscaping is shown above the subterranean car park.
- In order to have the required impact and immediate contribution to amenity, planting will require semi-mature specimen sizes. Tree pit specification will require special consideration in order to ensure successful establishment and growth. Plane trees should be specified on Thurlow Street to continue the established avenue of along this key green infrastructure route.
- In order to ensure that the type and quality of landscaping aspired to is sustainable it needs to achieve a reasonable level of maturity and longevity. This requires ample soil, water and exploitable rooting volumes which, in turn, will rely on sufficient weight loading, maintenance and other engineering tolerances. The trees and in raised beds and above podiums will therefore require larger planters than those proposed, with at least 4m³ of soil per tree, together with appropriate drainage and irrigation.
- It is recommended that conditions secure a landscaping plan, tree protection, tree planting details and green/brown roofs / living walls.

Public Realm

- It is the strong preference of the highways authority to adopt and maintain all public streets and spaces.
- The application design and access statement proposes all streets within and adjoining the site to be designed to adoptable standards.
- It is our aspiration that any new highways created as part of the Aylesbury redevelopment forms one uniform highway that can be effectively managed. However currently the proposed new Mews street does not meet adoptable standards. This is because it is too narrow to safely accommodate a route for cyclists whilst maintaining vehicle free footways. Resolving this issue will require either the removal of the proposed route for pedal cyclists, or the widening of this street. Furthermore, the basement sits partly beneath the Mews Street, which the Authority would be unlikely to adopt.
- Planning officers should note that in the event of the application being granted without revision, the Highway Authority would be unlikely to be able to consent to access to this new street for pedal cyclists.

Overall, it is recommended the application be refused in its current form due to the unacceptable width of the proposed new mews street and the consequent inability to construct this to adoptable standards.

- The proposals currently envisage the need to remove or relocate existing CPZ bays and/or the relocation/removal of the bus stop in order to form Mews Street. The relocation and removal of these bays will need to be discussed with our Parking team and Transport for London.
- All proposals for improvements works to any part of the existing highway and newly formed highways including green spaces and tree planting will require prior consent from the highways department. There will be a requirement to enter into a Section 278/38 agreement before any improvement works can commence on any part of the public highway.
- With regards to other existing streets to which improvements meeting adoptable standards are proposed, it is too early to comment upon the acceptability of proposals. However, these can be managed and agreed through the use of an appropriate condition.
- Trees require a minimum 4.5m to be provided between trunk centres and building facades whilst substantial soil volumes must also be achieved. All details and extents of Highway works should be secured through the s106 agreement.

Statutory and non-statutory organisations

Environment Agency - According to the best available information, the site lies outside the area of residual flood risk. No objection is raised to the planning application as submitted, on flood risk grounds. There may be other sources of flooding which affect the site such as surface water sewer and groundwater.

Natural England - No comments as there is no requirement to consult on this type of application.

Thames Water - no comments received to date.

Transport for London

- There is unlikely to be an adverse impact on the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN).
- The low level of car parking and high level of cycle parking is supported. Electric vehicle (EV) charging points should be provided in line with London Plan standards.
- The TA does not provide information on bus service impacts, but the site lies at the busiest point on route 343 northbound in the morning peak where buses are already at full capacity.
- In light of the above information, TfL feel it is appropriate and justified to seek a 'pro rata' contribution towards bus service enhancements to help deliver AAP objectives (in particular objectives P3 and S16), in line with AAP policy D2 (Infrastructure funding). The Southwark Community Infrastructure Levy Infrastructure Plan identifies £4.5m for the provision of new/enhanced bus routes to support new housing in the Aylesbury area. This equates to around £3000 per unit which, when applied to the proposed development uplift in the AAP area (1,500 units), gives a contribution from this development of £264,000. This would provide:
- A new bus shelter on the westbound route 42 bus stop on East Street, directly adjacent to the development – estimated cost £10,000 (no shelter is present at the moment due to the narrow footway on East Street, which will be widened with the development)

- Bus countdown at the three stops serving the site, to improve passenger information provision, at a cost of £10,000 per sign for supply, installation and maintenance (Thurlow Street northbound, East Street west and eastbound)
- A £224,000 contribution towards bus service capacity enhancements

Neighbours and local groups (summary)

Letter from 184e East Street raising the following objections:

- Understood regeneration plans were already agreed
- concern over financial costs of regeneration
- L&Q housing would not be of benefit to existing council tenants

Letter from 20 Wolverton, Sedan Way raising the following objections:

- Loss of existing residential accommodation
- Unfair to move residents out of their homes
- Unsustainable to demolish the estate.
- Proposed scale and density out of character with area
- Proposed units have a lack of privacy and small rooms
- Loss of trees (associated visual and environmental impacts)
- Overcrowding due to additional residents and impacts on health, increase in crime
- Regeneration should have started on other parts of the estate or on the Heygate first (which has been empty for years)

Letter from 178 Taplow, raising the following objections:

- Proposed scale and density out of character with area
- Loss of high value mature trees (associated visual and environmental impacts)
- Overcrowding due to additional residents and impacts on health, increase in crime
- Lack of proper cycle and pedestrian routes within the area
- Pressure on local bus services and other infrastructure
- Lack of green space within the area
- Increased traffic congestion, traffic pollution and noise pollution

Letter from 49 Cuddington, Deacon Way raising the following objections:

- Unsustainable to demolish the estate. Refurbishment of existing buildings would be of greater benefit and more cost effective. There are numerous examples of successful estate refurbishments.
- Proposal is contrary to the cabinet report dated 17th April 2011 which stated 75% of the affordable housing in the development would be social rented accommodation (not affordable rent)
- Proposed scale and density out of character with area, would appear monolithic
- Loss of trees (associated visual and environmental impacts)
- Proposal creates a gated community (central courtyard and playspace are not publicly accessible) and fails to improve permeability and connection with the surrounding community
- Loss of an existing sports pitch is contrary to the AAAP's aspirations
- No indication that the scheme would be 'zero carbon growth' as required by AAAP policy 3.6.1
- Proposed CHP would not run on renewable energy
- Lack of consideration of the CO2 implications of redeveloping the estate
- Solar panels proposed only provide 13% of the site's energy supply rather than 20% as set out in policy
- The site should be connected to the existing district heating network
- An EIA should have been required for the proposal

- The application should have been referred to the GLA
- Harm to the conservation area and listed buildings as a result of the scale of development
- Views showing how the proposal impacts the Liverpool Grove conservation area and listed buildings in Surrey Square should be provided
- The application includes no information regarding how the proposal contributes to key infrastructure requirements of the AAAP
- The site boundary appears incorrectly marked out
- Concern that the 58% affordable housing may be subject to change

Letter from 36 Wolverton, Deacon Way raising the following objections:

- Unfair CPO process
- Object to the unjust way leaseholders are being treated by the Council and believe its not in the public interest to go ahead with the CPO. Contrary to article 8 European law of human rights

Letter from 21 Goodwin Close, on behalf of occupiers at 2, 8, 11, 13, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24 and 36 raising the following objections:

- People are still living at 1-59 Wolverton who have lived there for many years. Southwark has failed to offer these residents suitable relocation housing options. These residents cannot move out for demolition to commence

Letter from 19 Wolverton, Deacon Way raising the following objections:

- Council has not made any reasonable relocation offer to existing leaseholders on site 7
- Heygate could be developed first, to allow leaseholders to move there
- Unsustainable to demolish the estate. Refurbishment of existing buildings could be of greater benefit and this option should have been properly investigated.
- Proposal is contrary to the cabinet report dated 17th April 2011 which stated 75% of the affordable housing in the development would be social rented accommodation
- 'Affordable rent' is not appropriate for residents
- Proposed scale and density out of character with area, would appear monolithic
- Loss of trees and green spaces (associated visual and environmental impacts)
- Proposal creates a gated community (central courtyard and playspace are not publicly accessible) and fails to improve permeability and connection with the surrounding community
- Loss of an existing sports pitch is contrary to the AAAP's aspirations
- No indication that the scheme would be 'zero carbon growth' as required by AAAP policy 3.6.1
- Lack of consideration of the C02 implications of redeveloping the estate
- The site should be connected to the existing district heating network