**RECOMMENDATION**

1. That planning permission is GRANTED subject to conditions.

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

**Site location and description**

2. The site, measuring 0.4 hectares, is occupied by the existing Elephant and Castle Leisure Centre building which is currently being demolished following closure in June this year. It forms the western half of the site previously occupied by both the former Leisure Centre building and the adjoining swimming pool building (linked by a footbridge) which has been closed for approximately fifteen years.

3. It is bordered by Brook Drive to the north, Churchyard Row to the west and St Mary's Churchyard Park to the south. The site of the former swimming pool building to the east is the subject of a separate planning application for a pre-dominantly residential development including a 37 storey tower building. Nearby residential properties are located in streets to the west and north west of the site. The, now empty, site of the former London Park Hotel is located immediately to the south west. The Grade II Listed Metropolitan Tabernacle building is situated to the north east and the London College of Communication is immediately to the north on the opposite side of Brook Drive. The area of residential properties to the north west of the site is designated as
the proposed Elliot's Row Conservation Area.

4 The A3 and Southern Junction are located to the east and beyond which are the Elephant and Castle shopping and commercial centre. The site is well accessed by public transport with bus stops, railway station and underground station located in close proximity to the site. A Cycle Super Highway runs along Churchyard Row adjacent to the west of the site.

Details of proposal

5 This detailed planning application proposes a replacement public leisure centre. Measuring 5592 sq ms in gross floor area, it comprises a 25m community pool, separate learner pool, gym, four court sports hall, studio spaces, indoor cycle room, cafe and crèche.

6 The building has been designed of two, three and four storey sections with the lowest point at the north west corner adjacent to the existing residential properties in Brook Drive and then stepping up to four storey at its western side adjacent to the proposed ‘St Mary’s development on the adjacent site. Its maximum height will be 21.2m. The design intends for the building to be interpreted as four separate but joined blocks, each with its own internal function that is clearly legible from the outside. The proposed external materials are a mixture of brick, timber and metal cladding. The internal arrangement of the building revolves around a central open ‘courtyard’ area from which all the main facilities will be able to be accessed.

7 The double height pedestrian entrance to the proposed building is located in its south east corner, which will be visible from the Elephant and Castle via a hard and soft landscaping pedestrian plaza that will be shared by users of the Leisure Centre, residents and visitors to the adjacent St Mary’s development and users of St Mary’s Churchyard park.

8 There is no car parking proposed other than four disabled parking spaces within the ‘shared surface’ located between the proposed leisure centre and the St Mary’s development. This shared surface has been designed for use by pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles. Twenty six cycling parking spaces are proposed for the use of visitors to the leisure centre with additional secure cycle parking space for staff located within the building. The main service entrance to the building will be from its western elevation accessed via Churchyard Row.

Planning history

9 Prior Approval has previously been granted for the demolition of the existing leisure centre buildings. For the avoidance of doubt the demolition of the existing building is not part of the current planning application. Demolition is currently taking place and is due to be complete in February 2013.

10 A Screening Opinion has previously been made by the Council that the proposal for a new leisure centre does not require the submission of an Environmental Impact Assessment.
Planning history of adjoining sites

11 As outlined above, a separate detailed planning application (Ref. 2012/2139) has been submitted concurrently with this application (and also appears on this agenda) for a predominantly residential mixed use development on the site of the former swimming pool to the east of this application site. This will be referred to as the ‘St Mary’s’ development in the remainder of the report. It comprises a 37 storey residential building in the centre of the site, an adjoining four storey ‘L’ shaped building fronting both the Elephant and Castle and the proposed pedestrian extension of Brook Drive incorporating 284 residential units, 809 sq ms of retail (Classes A1, A2 or A3) floorspace and 413 sq ms of commercial (Class B1) floor space. That application also includes the shared pedestrian/cycle/vehicle space which is integral to both developments and has been included in both applications, and the pedestrian plaza area adjacent to St Mary’s Churchyard.

12 Detailed planning permission was granted in 2008 for a predominantly residential scheme on the former London Park Hotel site to the south east of the application site. This includes approval for a 44 storey tower building and adjacent four storey terrace which will face the proposed replacement leisure centre. Although the site has been cleared and the planning permission has been technically implemented, the main construction works are yet to commence.

13 Two separate applications have also been submitted for the regeneration of the Heygate housing estate:

- An application for outline planning permission (12/AP/1092) seeks planning permission to provide a mixed use development comprising a number of buildings ranging between 13.13m (AOD) and 104.8m (AOD) in height with capacity for between 2,300 (min) and 2,469 (max) residential units together with retail (Class A1-A5), business (Class B1), leisure and community (Class D2 and D1), energy centre (sui generis) uses. New landscaping, park and public realm, car parking, means of access and other associated works. (A separate application has also been submitted for the demolition of the existing buildings on the site.

- Rodney Road Phase 1: A detailed planning application (12/AP/2797) has also been submitted a development of eight buildings ranging between 4 and 10 storeys in height (maximum building height 38.5m AOD), comprising 235 residential units, 204 sqm (GEA) of retail use (Class A1-A3), car parking beneath podium level, cycle storage, servicing, plant areas, landscaping and public realm improvements.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Summary of main issues

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

- The principle of the proposed development in terms of land use and conformity with strategic policies
- The acceptability of the replacement leisure proposals
- The design and visual appearance of the proposals
- The landscaping and public realm of the proposals.
- Impact upon the setting of listed buildings
- The impact upon the living conditions of surrounding residents
- Transportation, servicing and access considerations
- Energy use and sustainability implications
- Ecological implications
- Archaeological implications

Planning policy

15 Core Strategy 2011

Strategic Targets Policy 1 - Achieving growth
Strategic Targets Policy 2 - Improving places
Strategic Policy 1 - Sustainable development
Strategic Policy 2 - Sustainable transport
Strategic Policy 3 - Shopping, leisure and entertainment
Strategic Policy 10 - Jobs and business
Strategic Policy 11 - Open spaces and wildlife
Strategic Policy 12 - Design and conservation
Strategic Policy 13 - High environmental standards
Strategic Policy 14 - Implementation and delivery

16 Southwark Plan 2007 (July) - saved policies

Policy 1.1 Access to Employment Opportunities
Policy 1.7 Development within town and local centres
Policy 2.2 Provision of new community facilities
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 3.9 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 3.18 Setting of listed buildings, conservation areas and world heritage sites
Policy 3.19 Archaeology
Policy 3.22 Important local views
Policy 3.28 Biodiversity
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 standards for disabled people and the mobility impaired
Policy 2.5 Sub-Regions
Policy 2.9 Inner London
Policy 2.10 Central Activities Zone - Strategic Priorities
Policy 2.11 Central Activities Zone - Strategic Functions
Policy 2.12 Central Activities Zone - Predominantly Local Activities
Policy 2.13 Opportunity Areas And Intensification Areas
Policy 2.15 Town Centres
Policy 2.18 Green Infrastructure: The Network of Open and Green Spaces
Policy 3.9 Mixed And Balanced Communities
Policy 3.19 Sports Facilities
Policy 4.6 Support for and enhances of arts, culture, sport and entertainment provision
Policy 4.7 Retail and Town Centre Development
Policy 4.12 Improving Opportunities For All
Policy 5.1 Climate Change Mitigation
Policy 5.2 Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions
Policy 5.3 Sustainable Design And Construction
Policy 5.5 Decentralised Energy Networks
Policy 5.6 Decentralised Energy In Development Proposals
Policy 5.7 Renewable Energy
Policy 5.8 Innovative Energy Technologies
Policy 5.9 Overheating And Cooling
Policy 5.10 Urban Greening
Policy 5.11 Green Roofs And Development Site Environs
Policy 5.12 Flood Risk Management
Policy 5.13 Sustainable Drainage
Policy 5.14 Water Quality and Wastewater Infrastructure
Policy 5.15 Water Use And Supplies
Policy 5.16 Waste Self-Sufficiency
Policy 6.1 Strategic Approach (Transport)
Policy 6.3 Assessing Effects of Development on Transport Capacity
Policy 6.9 Cycling
Policy 6.10 Walking
Policy 6.11 Smoothing Traffic Flow And Tackling Congestion
Policy 6.12 Road Network Capacity
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 7.7 location and Design of Tall and Large Buildings
Policy 7.8 Heritage Assets and Archaeology
Policy 7.13 Safety, Security And Resilience To Emergency
Policy 7.14 Improving Air Quality
Policy 7.15 Reducing Noise And Enhancing Soundscapes
Policy 7.18 Protecting Local Open Space and Addressing Local Deficiency
Policy 7.19 Biodiversity and Access to Nature
Policy 7.21 Trees and Woodlands
Policy 8.2 Planning obligations
Policy 8.3 Community Infrastructure Levy

18 Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) and Guidance (SPG)

Elephant and Castle SPD/Area Action Framework (2012)
Design and Access Statements SPD (2007)
Section 106 Planning Obligations SPD (2007)
Sustainable Transport SPD (2008)
Sustainability Assessments (2009)
Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (2009)

19 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

The NPPF came into effect on 27 March 2012 and is a material planning consideration.

20 Key Planning Policy Designations

- Elephant and Castle Regeneration Area
- Central Activity Zone
- Elephant and Castle Major Town Centre
- Elephant and Castle Opportunity Area
- Air Quality Management Area
- Archaeological Priority Zone
- Flood Zone 3A

Principle of development

21 The need for a replacement leisure centre at the Elephant and Castle is recognised by Policies SPD7 and SPD21 of the Elephant and Castle SPD/OAPF stating that a new leisure centre should be provided, replacing the existing centre. The building comprising the swimming pool has been closed for approximately 15 years and the facilities building, which closed in August, is no longer able to provide suitable modern facilities to meet current and future leisure demand in the area. As well as being unable to provide suitable leisure facilities, the design and appearance of the existing leisure centre buildings are poor with little articulation and no active frontages, resulting in a negative impact upon the built environment and visual amenities of the area. In addition to providing a much needed replacement leisure facility, the proposed redevelopment provides a significant opportunity to enhance the built environment in this central location and make a key contribution to the overall regeneration of the Elephant and Castle Opportunity Area.

22 In considering the most suitable site for a replacement leisure centre, the Council initially identified four sites – the existing leisure centre site, Stead Street car parks, Heygate plot 8 and Heygate plots 17/18. The site appraisal concluded that only the existing leisure centre site has the capacity to meet the Council’s aspirations for a new leisure facility.
23 The provision of public leisure facilities is supported by London Plan policy 3.19 (Sports Facilities) which seeks to increase participation in, and tackle inequality of access to, sport and physical activity in London particularly amongst groups/areas with low levels of participation. Development proposals that increase or enhance the provision of sports and recreation facilities will be supported and multi-use public facilities for sport and recreational activities should be encouraged. Southwark Core Strategy Policies 3 (Shopping Leisure and Entertainment) and 4 (Places for Learning, Enjoyment and Healthy Lifestyles) encourage leisure facilities in Town Centre locations and support the retention and improvement of facilities which encourage physical activity and ensuring that development promotes healthy lifestyles.

24 The site is located within the central character area of the Elephant and Castle SPD/AOPF which sets out the following key strategies which are of particular relevance to this proposal:

- Provide a range of arts, cultural, leisure and entertainment uses.
- Require developments to be mixed use and introduce active uses at ground level wherever possible.
- Transform leisure opportunities by building a new leisure centre.
- Take opportunities to activate and soften key public spaces around the central area.
- Provide the potential to link key sites, including the shopping centre and leisure centre, within a district CHP/communal heating network.
- Ensure all development and public realm enhancements are of the highest quality to provide a positive perception of the area.
- Use tall buildings to signal the regeneration of the area, help define gateways into the central area and create an interesting skyline. Potential sites for tall buildings include the shopping centre and leisure centre sites.

25 Facilities provided within the new leisure centre
The new leisure centre will provide the community with a modern facility, including a six lane swimming pool, learner pool, four court sports hall, spinning room, 140 station gymnasium, two exercise studios, crèche and community cafe. This mix of facilities has been proposed following a programme of community consultation. The gross floor area of the proposed leisure centre is 5592 sq ms and that of the previously existing facility (including the abandoned swimming pool building) is 4189 sq ms.

26 The master plan for the redevelopment of the existing leisure centre site splits the site into two sections, the first for the replacement leisure centre building in the eastern portion of the site and the second in the western portion of the site which will comprise the proposed St Mary’s residential development which is the subject of a separate planning application.

27 Whilst the site area for the proposed replacement leisure facility is approximately half that of the existing, the design of the new building provides floors over two, three and four storeys. In addition to the provision of sports and recreational facilities, the internal design has also focused on providing a welcoming and inviting building creating open and transparent spaces that are accessible and attractive to people of all ages and sporting abilities. With the exception of the sports hall in terms of size and capacity only, the new facility will provide a significant improvement upon the
previous facilities in terms of recreational provision, community use, accessibility for all, design and public realm.

28 Sport England initially raised concerns that the proposed four court sports hall would not be sufficient to replace the six court sports hall bearing in mind the current supply and demand situation for sports halls in Southwark and the capacity elsewhere in the existing sports facility network to absorb the displaced demand and to accommodate future growth.

29 In response to this concern the applicant has confirmed that the range of facilities at the leisure centre has been informed by extensive public consultation. The three most requested elements were a swimming pool, teaching pool and gym. The result was that whilst a 4 court, rather than 6 court, sports hall is provided, it allows the provision of a pool and a teaching pool which have been unavailable for the past seven years, plus three studios and a 140 station gym. The centre will be an asset to the area and it is expected to improve the number of visits to this site from an average of 10 to 15 thousand per month to anywhere between 35 and 40 thousand visits per month. In terms of programming, measures will be introduced to enable the sports hall to be fully utilised by encouraging off peak usage through various marketing tools and community outreach programmes. There will also be access available to the Sports Hall on Sunday’s which was not the case with the previous facility and daily opening hours will be extended.

30 In addition to the centre focused initiatives, the Council is embarking on a programme of working with schools and higher education organisations to improve community access to sports activities and it is anticipated that this will increase sports hall provision across the borough considerably over the coming years. One piece of work that has already begun is the provision of links with London South Bank University to improve access to its sporting facilities (which includes a 4 court sports hall) for the local community. Discussions are taking place in relation to a jointly funded new entrance which would make it far easier for the general public to access the site plus making the facility far more visible to passing by traffic. The aim is to work with LSBU on a facility that compliments the new leisure centre. Given the range of measures being progressed to increase Sports Hall provision within Elephant and Castle and across the Borough, the applicant considers there will be sufficient capacity within the existing sports facility network to absorb the small reduction from 6 to 4. The proposals will result in a state of the art facility which has been driven by the results of extensive public consultation.

31 Sport England has withdrawn its objection on the basis of the additional information (outlined above) and the development of a strategy to increase community access to existing sports hall provision at secondary schools and further education institutions within the Borough, in order to mitigate the reduction in sports hall size by two courts. Discussions are ongoing on the wording of a suitable planning condition and a further update on this will be provided to Members.

32 Taking into account the measures outlined above, it is considered that the facilities being provided in the new facility and the benefits that would result, constitute a qualitative improvement in relation to the existing leisure facility. Key benefits (as outlined later on in this report) would also accrue in terms of the impact of the proposed design on the surrounding built environment and it is concluded on this
matter that the proposed facility represents a suitable replacement for the existing facility and accords with the London Plan Policy 3.19, Core Strategy Policies 3 and 4, and Policies SPD9 and SPD21.

**Environmental impact assessment**

33 A Screening Opinion has previously been made (Ref. 11-AP-3212) confirming that the proposed development would not be likely to result in *significant environmental effects* and does not require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Assessment.

**Design issues**

34 Strategic Policy 12 (Design and Conservation) of the Core Strategy seeks to ensure that new development achieves the highest possible standard of design for both buildings and public spaces to create attractive and distinctive places which are safe, easy to get around and a pleasure to be in. Saved Southwark Plan policies 3.12 (Quality in Design) and 3.13 (Urban Design) share and elaborate upon this objective. Saved Policy 3.18 (Setting of Listed Buildings etc) recognises the importance of safeguarding the setting of heritage assets and Policy 3.14 (Design out Crime) promotes the need for designs to improve community safety and crime prevention.

35 The proposal is located to the rear of the current Leisure Centre site and has frontages onto Brook Drive to the north, and Churchyard Row to the west. The site is not in a conservation area and does not include listed buildings but is opposite the proposed new Elliotts Row Conservation Area and adjacent to the Grade II Listed Metropolitan Tabernacle and as such is within the setting of these two heritage assets. To the south is the St Mary Churchyard playground and public park while to the east is the site of the proposed new St Mary's Residential scheme which includes a 32-storey tower.

36 The design is interesting and engaging with the distinct functions arranged in the form of a 'pin-wheel' around a common atrium space. The main entrance is at the south eastern corner where it is most visible across the St Mary Churchyard playground and public park. On this eastern facade it is separated from the proposed new St Mary's Residential scheme by a shared space which includes limited vehicular, pedestrian and cycle access from Brook Drive. The space includes a landscaped public space which will provide out-door 'spill-out space for the new Leisure Centre cafe. Whilst this eastern flank is the most public face of the new leisure facility, each elevation has been designed deliberately to maximise activation with windows looking out onto all four public frontages.

37 Internally, the heart of the centre is the atrium space which will include a public cafe space and the main arrival point for visitors and patrons. The atrium space is the 'pivot' around which all the facilities are accessed. It is top lit and generous and includes stair - rising around the edge of the atrium - and lift access to all the centre’s facilities. The changing facilities are generous and accommodate the needs of all users including those with disabilities.

38 The pin-wheel arrangement has resulted in an elegant stepped building form made up of simple blocks that appear to 'slide' across each other. The separate functions are expressed in this way with the pool enclosure arranged on the Brook Drive frontage.
stepping up to the gym and studio spaces on the park frontage, then up to the main entrance feature at the south east corner, culminating with the large sports hall which over sails the pool on the north east corner and announces the Leisure Centre complex at this western approach. This tiered and stepped arrangement has created a building that is interesting and engaging which also responds to its context.

39 The building is broken down into distinct forms and each to reflect the changing context. The pool enclosure is clad in brick and is lowest where it abuts the proposed new conservation area. As a consequence this choice of materials and low scale will compliment the scale and appearance of this historic area. Fronting on the park the brick finish becomes the base of the building whilst the predominantly glazed facade is clad in timber to reflect the natural context. Finally, the high level sports hall and associated plant enclosure are clad in metal to reflect the finishes of the proposed tower and to give these higher features a lighter appearance.

40 The 'sliding forms have been strongly expressed with the metal-clad sports hall cantilevering prominently over the lower pool enclosure making it more visible from Brook Drive. In addition, on the park facade the timber-clad form of the gym and studios slides and steps resulting in a feature that reaches out at either end of the building and highlights the main entrance. The choice of facing materials have therefore been deliberately used to articulate the form and to reflect the sensitive historic and natural context. The quality of the design will rely to a great degree on the choice of material and the architectural detailing and should be reserved by condition.

41 \textit{Relationship with Heritage Assets}

Saved policy 3.17 of the Southwark Plan (2007) states that “permission will not be granted for developments that would not preserve or enhance: The immediate or wider setting of a listed building; or ii. An important view(s) of a listed building iii. The setting of the Conservation Area; or iv. Views into or out of a Conservation Area; or v. The setting of a World Heritage Site; or vi. Important views of /or from a World Heritage Site.”.

42 Further, the NPPF states that “protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment" is an important part of delivering sustainable development and in paragraph 132 states that a heritage asset’s “significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting.”

43 The most prominent heritage asset in immediate vicinity of the site is the Grade II Listed Metropolitan Tabernacle. The listing description defines the significance of this asset as being the prominent eastern porticoed facade facing onto the Elephant & castle. The proposed development is not located within the curtilage of the listed building, it is well set back from the Elephant & castle frontage and will not affect the viewer's ability to recognise and appreciate this historic building in views from the northern roundabout.

44 In its materiality and its massing the north western pool enclosure echoes the predominant brick facing materials and scale of the proposed Elliots Row Conservation Area and this will compliment this historic setting appropriately.
Landscaping and Public Realm

The proposals include landscaping around the building that will help to assimilate the building into its surroundings. A row of new trees are proposed along the Brook Drive frontage which will soften the impact of this elevation and contribute towards a green link between Brook Drive and Elephant and Castle. Further planting will be incorporated within the shared surface area and adjoining plaza area located between the leisure centre and the adjacent St Mary's development. Whilst Transport for London have raised concern that the inclusion of four disabled parking spaces within the shared surface will discourage its use by pedestrians, this concern is considered to be outweighed by the benefits of locating disabled parking spaces in close proximity to the leisure centre entrance. In principle, the proposed landscaping details are considered appropriate and further details of all hard and soft landscaping will be required by condition.

Designing out Crime

The proposed design has included as much natural surveillance as possible on all four elevations creating active frontages which will reduce the risk of crime and anti-social behaviour around the building and will represent in considerable enhancement in relation to the existing building. The introduction of lighting, CCTV will also be of benefit in designing out crime. Cycle storage is located at the front of the building in a location which is overlooked by the reception and cafe area.

Design Review Panel

The proposal was presented to the Design Review Panel (DRP) prior to the submission of the application and the comments of the DRP are summarised in the Appendix 2 (Consultation Replies) of this report. The applicant has responded to these comments in the following ways:

- All four sides have been redesigned with elevations composed to present active frontages on all its elevations.
- The design for the public space has been developed in unison with the St Mary's Residential to include useful and engaging spaces that can accommodate all of the Leisure Centre's diverse users. The detailed landscape design for the whole scheme including the number, size and species of planting, fixtures and finishes of the landscape as well as its maintenance arrangements should be reserved by condition.
- The prominence of the entrance has been incorporated into the architectural design with the cantilevered sports hall designed to announce the leisure Centre to those approaching from the north.
- The south elevation has been completely re-designed to express each separate part more strongly and to give this sensitive facade a coherent rationale
- The architectural concept of the 'sliding' architectural forms has been expressed more confidently especially in the sports hall and the main entrance as well as the studios to the west. These subtle but significant changes have embedded this expressive concept into the architecture of the design.
- The design of the roof has been improved with the four forms expressed separately and large areas of the roof taken up by brown roof and photo-voltaic
arrays (PVs). All the plant is enclosed and capped with a louvered roof. This will ensure that the outlook for future occupiers of the tower will be preserved and will not be dominated by services and utilitarian finishes.

Conclusion on Design Issues

48 The design of the proposed leisure centre has successfully responded to its prominent location fronting onto public spaces and access routes on all four sides. The building uses a mix of materials and treatments, and represents a well articulated, accessible and engaging public facility that both reflects its context whilst providing the range of facilities required within it. The landscaping and public realm around the building will provide an appropriate setting for the building and help to create attractive access routes on the routes around the building. It is considered to be high quality design which accords with the relevant Core Strategy and saved Southwark Plan policies.

Impact of proposed development on the living conditions of adjoining occupiers and surrounding area

49 Saved Southwark Plan policy 3.2 (Protection of Amenity) seeks to prevent a loss of amenity, including disturbance and noise, to existing and future occupiers in the vicinity of the development.

Day/Sun Light and Visual Intrusion

50 The nearest existing residential properties to the site are those on Brook Drive and Church Yard row to the west and north west of the site, the closest of which are within 20 metres of the proposed development. Properties on Brook Drive will face the north facing wall of the proposed development, in particular nos. 191 and 193, the nearest windows of which are a minimum of 15.3 metres from the building. The building has been designed so that its lowest part comprising the learner pool is adjacent to these buildings with a height of 12.9m and it only extends so far to be in line with no.193 Brook Drive which is next door but one to the end of the terrace. Whilst this part of the proposed building will be prominent when viewed from the residential properties opposite, the separation distance is considered to be sufficient to prevent the building from appearing as unduly overbearing or resulting in a significant loss of day/light and sun light. This conclusion is confirmed by the applicant’s daylight and sunlight assessment (based on Building Research Establishment guidelines) which concludes that the impacts on these properties would be negligible.

51 The end of terrace residential property at 2 Churchyard row has its flank elevation facing the west elevation of the proposed leisure centre with a separation distance of approximately 18 metres. This property has two flank windows facing the leisure centre but these serve non-habitable rooms and no significant impact on amenity is considered to result. In addition the rear windows would not be detrimentally affected taking account of both the separation distance and juxtaposition of the west elevation of the leisure centre with the rear elevation of this adjacent dwelling.

52 In terms of the potential impact of the new leisure centre on the proposed development to the south west (former London Park Hotel site), the nearest part of the leisure centre will be approximately 26m from the proposed residential development. Such a separation distance will safeguard the reasonable living conditions of the
future occupiers of this adjacent development.

53 The taller east elevation of the new leisure centre will have some impact on the lower facing apartments of the proposed St Mary’s development. However, the proposed apartments are dual aspect and the separation distance of around 18 metres will be satisfactory to prevent any significant impacts in this regard.

Noise, Disturbance and Air Quality

54 Given the close proximity to residential properties (both existing and proposed as outlined above) careful design is required to ensure that there will be no adverse implications for noise, disturbance and air quality. The site is within an air quality management area where there is an existing concern about poor existing air quality levels, particularly nitrogen dioxide. Further details of ventilation and extraction, proposed on the roof of the building, will need to be provided via conditions to ensure no adverse impacts would result upon the surrounding area.

55 The applicants air quality assessment includes an addendum relating to the air quality impacts associated with emissions from the proposed gas Combined Heat and Power (CHP) plant which will be emitted via a flue exiting from the roof the building. Given the proximity to the proposed tower building on the adjacent site with residential units proposed above the level of the extract flue, it proposes the use of a catalytic reduction system which would significantly reduce the potential for nitrogen dioxide emissions. The Council’s Environmental Protection Team support the use the catalytic reduction system which will prevent significant air quality impacts, though have suggested that the flue is located as far from the proposed St Mary’s tower as possible to minimise any impact. A condition will require further details of the flue and catalytic reduction system.

56 Construction Impacts

A Construction Management Plan (CMP) has been provided with the application and will need to be implemented via a condition. This will control the impacts of construction works on surrounding amenities including for residents living in the vicinity of the site. Appropriate management and mitigation is particularly important given the potential for overlap between the times of construction of both this development and those developments proposed on adjacent sites (St Mary’s and potentially the London Park Hotel). Working hours will be restricted to 08:00 – 18:00 hours Monday to Friday and 8:00 to 13:00 hours on Saturday with no work on Sundays or public holidays. Mitigation measures including dust management, dampening down of loose materials, positioning of stockpiles, acoustic covers and a continued register and appraisal of any complaints from residents are included in the CMP and continued liaison will take place with the Council’s Environmental Protection Team. The proposed route for construction traffic is along Oswin Street which will also require close supervision and management to control the impacts of this. Further consideration of this is set out in the Transportation section of this report. Whilst some disturbance will inevitably result from construction works, it is considered that the management and mitigation measures proposed will ensure that disturbance will be kept to a minimum.
Impact of adjoining and nearby uses on occupiers and users of proposed development

There are no adverse impacts likely to result from adjacent land uses and buildings upon the proposed development.

Transportation Issues

Saved policy 5.1 of the Southwark Plan seeks to ensure that development is located near transport nodes, or where they are not it must be demonstrated that sustainable transport options are available to site users, and sustainable transport is promoted. In addition, saved policy 5.6 of the Southwark Plan requires development to minimise the number of car parking spaces provided and include justification for the amount of car parking sought taking into account the site PTAL, the impact on overspill car parking, and the demand for parking within the Controlled Parking Zones. The site is located in close proximity to public transport nodes (bus, train and tube) and achieves a PTAL rating of 6b.

No private parking is proposed within the scheme, this being appropriate given the site's sustainable location with excellent access to public transport provision. Four disabled parking spaces are located within the shared surface in close proximity to the pedestrian entrance of the building. The shared surface will also serve as a dropping off and picking up point of users of the facility, including provision for a mini bus allowing children to alight and board in a safe location adjacent to the entrance. Coaches will also be able to use the shared surface area for dropping off and boarding though it is not anticipated that this will be a common occurrence given the availability of public transport.

Twenty six cycle parking spaces are proposed within the public realm area close to the leisure centre entrance. This exceeds the amount required by the London Plan standard (19) for a leisure facility of this size and is appropriate given the location of the site next to the Cycle Superhighway and the council’s encouragement for cycling. The use of cycle parking will be reviewed when the centre is operation and more cycle parking will be able to be provided if required. Five secure and covered cycle spaces are also provided for staff within the building. The facility will also be very accessible to a large number of users who will walk to the building included the proposed pedestrian plaza area forming part of the adjacent St Mary’s application providing safe pedestrian access from Elephant and Castle.

The Transport Assessment (TA) submitted with the application does not anticipate that there will be a high number of vehicle movements in connection with the leisure centre. During the peak hour of 18:30 to 19:30 the TA predicts there will be 12 arrivals and 9 departments by private car with less at other times of the day. Bearing in mind that this is a replacement for the existing leisure centre, the number of car journeys resulting from this development is not considered to result in significant impacts upon local highway conditions or the amenities of local residents. Furthermore, given the low number of private parking spaces proposed in association with the proposed residential developments at the adjacent London Park Hotel and St Mary’s sites (46 and 30 respectively including disabled parking) it is not considered that the potential
combined impacts on the highway and local amenities would be significant.

For the shared surface to work in the best possible manner, with vehicles not dominating pedestrians, a shared surface management plan will be required by condition which will need to include monitoring of the shared surface and any management or mitigation measures that might be required to enhance its operation. A Travel Plan will also need to be provided via a condition which will include measures to discourage car use and promote more sustainable methods of transport.

The proposed servicing area for the development is located adjacent to the west elevation of the building via Churchyard Row. The vehicular service requirements of the building are not high with refuse collection occurring three times a week and chemical deliveries (in connection with the swimming pool) every two weeks. Post and general deliveries to the café will take place on a daily basis but will normally only necessitate a small van. A servicing management plan will need to submitted via a condition to include measures demonstrating that servicing of the development will not result in adverse impacts for local highway conditions including for the Cycle Super Highway running along Churchyard Row and amenities of neighbouring residents.

The proposed construction management plan includes measures to mitigate the road safety and environmental impacts from construction vehicles. It is proposed that construction traffic will access and egress the site using Oswin Street, though upon the commencement of the adjacent St Mary’s development there will be potential to access from Elephant and Castle/Newington Butts with egress along Oswin Street. This will inevitably result in some impacts on residents of Oswin Street, particularly given that construction will also be likely to be taking place on the St Mary’s development. Consequently, strict management of construction traffic will be required to be in place to control times of use, speeds and safety of pedestrians and cyclists, along with continued liaison with local residents throughout the works. Drivers of construction vehicles are to be required to undertake a course in Safer Urban Driving to Drivers’ Certificate of Professional Competence standard, and that hauliers are to be members of TfL’s Freight Operator Recognition Scheme and working toward a higher level of membership.

Interim Management

An interim management plan has been submitted with the application setting out the methodology and logistical arrangements for the period of time that is likely to occur when the new leisure centre is open to the public and the adjacent St Mary’s development is still being constructed. Based upon the estimated programme for each development it is expected that there will be a period of 18 months (Spring 2014 to winter 2015) when the leisure centre will be open whilst St Mary’s is still under construction. Temporary pedestrian access will be provided adjacent to the south edge of the St Mary’s construction site and adjacent to the eastern elevation of the leisure centre. Four disabled parking spaces will be provided on Brook Drive until the shared surface is completed and temporary cycle stands will be provided adjacent to the leisure centre entrance. An interim visitor drop-off space is proposed within a section of the service area accessed from Churchyard Road. Such measures are considered to be appropriate to provide the necessary access provision until the final
access arrangements can be completed along with the St Mary’s development. In the event that the St Mary’s development is not completed as expected, there will be opportunity for further arrangements to be put in place including any further planning permissions that may be required.

**Impact on trees**

66 There are no existing trees within the site of significant amenity value though a condition will be necessary requiring an arboricultural method statement with suitable protection measures to safeguard the existing London plane tree located adjacent to the south east corner of the site, some of the routes of which cross into the site itself.

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

67 The provision of a leisure centre providing an important facility for the surrounding area does not trigger the s106 Tool Kit contributions. Conditions are recommended however including for the following:

- Provision of local employment for both the construction phase and the operation of the leisure centre.
- Landscaping including the planting of new trees on the frontage with Brook Drive
- Travel Plan
- Construction Management Plan
- Servicing and Delivery Management Plan
- Management of shared space between the leisure centre and St Marys
- Highway works
- Interim arrangements (including access and servicing) during construction of the St Mary’s residential development
- Sustainable energy requirements including the provision for future link to the Heygate Energy Centre

The proposed development is liable to the Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy.

**Sustainable development implications**

68 The energy statement demonstrates how the proposal will achieve a 44% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions below the 2006 buildings regulations following the energy hierarchy as set out in the London Plan. This also meets the target set out in Strategic Policy 13 of the core strategy.

69 The energy statement also proposes that the development will be designed to accommodate future connection to the future Heygate decentralised energy network which is a sustainable energy aspiration set out in the Elephant and Castle SPD/OAF Policy19. The development provides both the space and infrastructure required for this within the building including the required external pipe work from the building to the site boundary.

70 Additional information has been submitted by the applicant considering the feasibility of a shared gas Combined Heat Power system with the proposed St Mary’s
development on the adjacent site. This finds that providing a plant room large enough to provide a CHP system to serve the two developments is not feasible within the proposed development. Operational difficulties have also been highlighted as accommodating the shared CHP system within the leisure centre would place an obligation on the Council to provide energy to St Mary’s in perpetuity with potential implications for the future operation of the leisure centre site and there is a significant risk that acceptable commercial and legal obligations may not be reached. Furthermore, as the leisure centre is expected to be completed well ahead of St Mary’s there is a risk that a procured energy provider may vary their technical requirements resulting in implications for the internal layout. The option of providing the CHP facility within the St Mary’s development has also been considered, though as the Leisure Centre is expected to be constructed in advance of St Mary’s a temporary energy plant would be required with significant practical and cost implications.

71 Whilst recognising the feasibility issues outline above, the inability to utilise a shared CHP plant is disappointing. However, the key long term energy requirement is for the leisure to connect into the future Heygate energy network, provision for which has been made within the proposal. Before this is enabled, the energy of the Leisure Centre will be provided by a standalone CHP facility which will still provide for the carbon dioxide reductions as required by Policy.

72 Strategic Policy 13 of the Core Strategy seeks a reduction in carbon dioxide of 20% from using on-site or local low and zero carbon sources of energy. A feasibility study of all the potential renewable technologies has been submitted with the application and it is proposed that photovoltaic’s are included in the development to achieve a 2.6% reduction in CO2 emissions. Further work has been undertaken to increase the contribution by renewable technologies as a result of which it is now also proposed to add photovoltaics to the brown roof section of the building increasing the reduction in CO2 emissions to approximately 5.4%.

73 The scheme will also incorporate a grey water recovery system, a sustainable urban drainage system (SUDs), recycling facilities, exclude private parking (other than disabled parking), and will use responsible sourced construction materials.

74 In conclusion on energy matters, in the short term the proposal will be able to meet the required reductions in Carbon Dioxide emissions through a gas CHP plant within the building and provision is included in the design of the proposal to enable a future connection to the Heygate energy network, this being the key long term energy requirement. The development has also been designed to achieve a BREAM rating of Very Good. Whilst the scheme is unable to provide a shared CHP plant with St Mary’s and provides less than 20% on-site renewable sources of energy, the justification for these shortfalls is accepted on feasibility grounds. It is concluded that the key energy requirements of Core Strategy Policy 13 have been satisfied by the proposals.

Other matters

Ecological Implications

75 A site ecological assessment has been submitted with the application concluding that the existing site is not of any ecological value and this conclusion has been agreed by
the Council’s Ecological Officer. A section of brown roof is proposed on the building, further details of which will need to be submitted via a condition. The scheme therefore accords with saved Policy 3.28 of the Southwark Plan.

**Flood Risk**

The site is located in Flood Zone 3a which is deemed to be ‘high risk’ though is within an area benefiting from the River Thames tidal flood defences. The proposed development is classified as ‘less vulnerable’ by the Technical Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework (Table 2) and accordingly, it falls into a flood risk vulnerability category which is appropriate to the Flood Zone according to the Technical Guidance to the NPPF (Tables 1 and 3). No objections are raised to the planning application on flood risk ground subject to conditions relating to contamination and piling/foundation designs.

**Archaeology**

An archaeological desk base assessment has been submitted with the application and an archaeological evaluation has been undertaken in land to the south of the leisure centre and within and around the present leisure centre building. The evaluation demonstrated that remains of archaeological interest is within or around the present buildings occupying the site, except for the area of the former St Mary’s Churchyard. This occupies a defined strip of land south of the present leisure centre and within the footprint of the proposal. This part of the site is present under archaeological excavation to record remains of burials within the churchyard and structures consisting of the remains of burial vaults and the church of St Gabriel. The applicants have submitted a written scheme of investigation for the excavation and recording of archaeological remains within the area of the former churchyard and the work is being undertaken in accordance with this document. Two trenches remain to be undertaken of the archaeological evaluation. These are to the rear of the present building and are detailed in a second written scheme of investigation (phase 2) and shall be undertaken once the land becomes available. Should remains be present in these trenches they shall be extended and any remains recorded. The proposal is concluded to accord with saved Southwark Plan policy 3.19 (Archaeology) and shall be secured by a suitable condition.

**Contamination**

A ground investigation report has been submitted with the application and identified contaminants within the ground although further investigation is required once the existing buildings have been demolished. The Environmental Protection Team and Environment Agency are satisfied that the development can proceed without adverse impacts resulting from any existing contamination subject to conditions requiring that the developer follows the recommendations made in the submitted Site Remediation and Verification Strategy to ensure that previously unidentified contamination be appropriately remediated with during construction works.

**Conclusion on planning issues**

The proposed development provides a much needed new leisure facility replacing former facility at this site and meeting one of the policy objectives of the Elephant
and Castle SPD/OAF. The development will also play a key role in the on-going regeneration of the wider Elephant and Castle area.

80  The replacement facility provides a range of facilities including swimming pool, learner pool, gymnasium and studio spaces. The overall mix of facilities is considered to represent an improvement in relation to the former facility on the site, has responded to public consultation previously carried out and provides an appropriate facility to replace the previous leisure centre.

81  The proposed design of the building has evolved in response to the particular constraints of the site including the need for the building address each of its four public frontages. The resulting design, including further amendments proposed following the submission of the application, will provide an interesting and well articulated building using a mixture of different materials and providing an active frontage to each elevation. The building will represent a significant enhancement of the townscape in this location and, coupled with the adjacent St Mary's development, will provide high quality areas of landscaping and public realm improving the pedestrian access ways in and around the site.

82  The design of building, with its lower massing adjacent to the western edge of the site ensures, along with measures to control noise and pollution, will ensure that no significantly adverse impacts will result upon the living conditions of neighbouring residents. The design will also ensure that the amenities of future adjacent schemes are able to adequately safeguarded.

83  Whilst it has not proved possible to provide a shared CHP system with the proposed St Mary’s development on the adjacent site, the scheme makes provision for a future connection to the Heygate district hearing network, provides its own gas CHP system and has been demonstrated to be capable of achieving BREAM Very Good. It is concluded to be in general accordance with the Council’s energy and sustainability policies.

84  With excellent public transport accessibility and no private car parking (other than disabled provision) the scheme will promote sustainable transport modes and it has been satisfactorily demonstrated that no significant impacts would result upon local highway conditions. The impacts of construction works and traffic will need to be tightly controlled through the implementation of the Construction Management Plan.

85  Taking all matters into consideration, the development will provide a high quality development providing a replacement public leisure facility for the Elephant and Castle. The application has been demonstrated that it can be accommodated on the site without significant impacts upon the environment and amenities of the surrounding area.

Community impact statement

86  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.

Consultation

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

Consultation replies

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

Human rights implications

88 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.

89 This application has the legitimate aim of providing a replacement leisure centre. 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.
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APPENDIX 1

Consultation Undertaken

Site notice date: 29 August 2012

Press notice date: 30 August 2012

Case officer site visit date: 29 August 2012

Neighbour consultation letters sent: 24th August 2012

Internal services consulted:

- Planning Policy
- Transportation Team
- Environmental Protection Team
- Ecological Officer
- Parks and Open Spaces
- Highways (Public Realm)
- Property Division

Statutory and non-statutory organisations consulted:

- Transport for London
- Greater London Authority
- Environment Agency
- Sport England
- Metropolitan Police
- Thames Water
- London Fire and Emergency Planning
- Health and Safety Executive
- Southwark Cyclists
- London Wildlife Trust
- London Borough of Lambeth

Neighbours and local groups consulted:

Refer to appendix 3

Re-consultation:

N/a
APPENDIX 2

Consultation Responses Received

Internal services

Planning Policy

Energy comments:

• In line with Core Strategy policy 13 the development should achieve BREEAM ‘Very Good’. The sustainability statement sets out the scheme BREEAM pre-assessment indicates a level of ‘Very Good’ will be achieved. This is supported and should be secured by condition.

• The energy statement demonstrates how the proposal will achieve a 44% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions below the 2006 Buildings Regulations following the energy hierarchy as set out in the London Plan. This meets the target set out in Strategic Policy 13 of the core strategy.

• It is set out in the energy statement that the system will be designed to accommodate future connection to the proposed Heygate decentralised energy network. London Plan policy 5.6(a), Core Strategy Policy 13, and the guidance set out in the Elephant and Castle SPD (SPD19) state that developments should evaluate the feasibility of connecting to existing heating and cooling networks and CHP systems. We support the approach to allow for future connection to the proposed Heygate decentralised energy network and recommend that a requirement to connect if and when the district system is available is secured by planning obligation.

• It is also set out in the energy statement that “possible synergies with the adjacent St. Mary’s residential development will be considered as the design develops.” London Plan policy 5.6(a), Core Strategy Policy 13, and the guidance set out in the Elephant and Castle SPD (SPD19) state that where a new CHP system is appropriate, proposals should also assess the feasibility of extending the system beyond the site boundary to adjacent sites. We strongly support a connection between this proposal and the adjacent St Mary’s residential development.

• Given the significant opportunity afforded to the fact that the leisure centre provides a suitable anchor heat load for a district heat network, we recommend that further work is undertaken to assess the feasibility of a joint approach across both development sites. This would negate the need for CHP plant to be installed in both developments. The energy strategy should also evaluate the feasibility of extending the system beyond the boundary of the Leisure Centre and St Mary’s residential development sites. A feasibility study identifying possible connections to other adjacent sites should be included in the energy strategy.

• Strategic Policy 13 of the Core Strategy requires a reduction in carbon dioxide of 20% from using on-site or local low and zero carbon sources of energy. A feasibility
study of all the potential renewable technologies has been submitted with the application. It is proposed that photovoltaic’s are included in the development to achieve a 2.6% reduction in CO2 emissions. We are disappointed that the proposal would only achieve a 2.6% CO2 reduction from the use of on-site renewable technologies. We recommend that further work is undertaken to investigate whether a higher amount could be achieved on site, for example, through the incorporation of PV’s on the brown roof.

Transportation Team

- The transport assessment is of good quality, and therefore the conclusions can generally be relied upon.

- Given the close proximity to the Cycle Superhighway and consequent likelihood of a high level of cycle use, the method of arriving at the quantum of visitor cycle parking was discussed and agreed with the consultant in advance, and so is supported. Using this method 26 spaces are proposed, compared to the London Plan standard of 19 (based on estimated peak period visitors). The commitment to review the use of cycle parking and to provide more if necessary is welcomed, but should be secured through condition.

- A place for set-down and pick-up of parties by minibus has been identified in the “shared space” between the leisure centre and St Mary’s residential development. This is suitable for parking a minibus if necessary, though the TA assumes (paragraph 5.8.2) that the minibus will be moved to the service yard off Dante Road. While either option is generally acceptable, it is recommended that a method of coordinating such parking, particularly in order to ensure space for deliveries, is included in a Servicing Management Plan which should be secured by condition.

- There is no consideration of arrivals by coach. While it is acknowledged that Camberwell Leisure Centre (one of the comparator sites) receives school parties by coach, it would be unreasonably onerous to require a specific coach facility as part of this development due to the constrained nature of the site. Given the very high level of accessibility by public transport coupled with the fact that this is free for school children, arrivals by coach are less likely here. However, vehicle swept path analysis of the “shared space” indicates that it is likely to be suitable for turning coaches, and so this space can be used for set-down and pick-up. Naturally the parking of coaches in this area would be detrimental to the operation of that space and so should not be permitted. Parties for sports competitions are unlikely to be large, since none of the facilities are large enough for large tournaments and provide little spectator seating.

- Paragraph 5.8.3 indicates that the visitor cycle parking stands will be available for motorcycle parking. This is not acceptable, both because it would reduce space for cyclists and because it would lead to a higher use of the “shared space” by private motorised vehicles. Enforcement against motorcycle parking should be included in the Shared Space (or Public Realm) Management Plan secured between this
development and the St Mary’s residential development.

- As for cycle parking, the method of estimating likely demand for disabled parking was discussed and agreed in advance, and so is supported. Four spaces are provided within the “shared space” and it is proposed that a further space is designated on Brooke Drive. This would conflict with the two car club parking bays proposed to support the low-car nature of the St Mary’s residential development, and further reduce on-street visitor parking (existing bays in this location are for Pay & Display parking). The highly-accessible nature of the locality to mobility-impaired people, including by public transport, means that it is possible that demand for disabled parking is lower than estimated. It is recommended that the demand for disabled parking is monitored (to be secured by condition) and this fifth parking bay designated if necessary. During this period disabled blue-badge holders will be able to park without charge in other visitor parking places or where single- or double-yellow-line restrictions apply without additional loading restrictions.

- The number of car trips attracted by the proposed leisure centre has been estimated by reference to three Central/Inner London leisure centres where parking spaces are provided. In this location, where no parking is provided, it is likely that car trips will be lower. Some of the remaining car trips will be by disabled people. The remainder will be able to park locally in visitor parking places. However, there is concern that the level of set-down and pick-up of users of the leisure centre could be high during periods of poor weather, and it has not been possible for the consultant to quantify this potential effect. The behaviour of drivers at such times, specifically queuing in the “shared space”, would be detrimental to the operation of that space. It is recommended that the management plan for this space includes provision to monitor the use of the space and take appropriate action, perhaps including the application of a restriction or prohibition.

- The impact of all trips arising from the leisure centre is relatively small, albeit applied to a network which is already very busy. Some of those trips will be “pass-by” trips, i.e. users will already be passing the site by various modes of transport and will break their existing journey to visit the leisure centre, thus reducing the impact. Overall the impact of additional trips is acceptable.

- The servicing yard is not ideally placed given its proximity to the Cycle Superhighway. However, the constraints of the site and building layout and the undesirability of this operation in other locations are acknowledged. The yard has been demonstrated to be of sufficient size for the demands placed upon it, subject to my comment above about minibus parking and the need to secure a servicing management plan by condition.

- A draft construction management plan has been provided. It is not of sufficient quality, but a revised CMP and adherence to it can and should be secured by condition. In particular, the revised CMP should include measures to mitigate the road safety and environmental impact that construction traffic will have. This can in part be achieved by requiring drivers to undertake a course in Safer Urban (or
London) Driving to Drivers’ Certificate of Professional Competence standard, and that hauliers are members of TfL’s Freight Operator Recognition Scheme and working toward a higher level of membership. Additionally, details of arrangements for access to the site should be confirmed in conjunction with those of the St Mary’s residential development, including how the completed leisure centre will be accessed by the public while the latter development is still under construction. Construction access from Newington Butts and egress via Oswin Street are strongly preferred.

Ecological Officer

- The Ecology Walkover report is fine and meets best practice. Agree that the ecological value of the site is low. The ecology report makes no recommendations for ecological enhancement of the site. The brown roof is welcome and the developer should consider installing another under the PV panels on the northwest roof. The brown roof will optimise the performance of the PV tiles. Condition recommended requiring details of green/brown roofs for biodiversity.

Environmental Protection Team

- Site is in a Local Air Quality Management Area where there is poor air quality due to the road network.
- Recommend against the installation of a CHP plant due to concerns concerning emissions. Further information has been submitted regarding the fitting of a catalytic reduction system which will improve the situation but will not negate the need for modelling. It is recommended that the stack is moved as far away from the residential tower as possible and a condition is recommended requiring further details.
- Condition recommended regarding ventilation and extraction details.
- Conditions recommended controlling hours of deliveries and plant noise.
- Contamination has been identified on site. Condition recommended to ensure the works proceed in accordance with submitted details to prevent risk from contamination.
- Further details are required within the Construction Management Plan
- Condition on external lighting is recommended.

Director of Regeneration

- Believe that the proposed scheme meets and exceeds all the original project objectives and wider strategic regeneration objectives for the scheme.
- The existing leisure centre that was closed in June 2012 had been dilapidated for well over 15 years with the swimming pool building unable to be used due to a collapsed roof. The closed building also suffered from poor disabled access and was viewed as blight on the central area of the Elephant and Castle.
- Submitted planning application will significantly address the problems experienced with the previous facility.
- Proposed leisure centre will provide a vastly improved leisure centre and community facility at the heart of the Elephant and Castle regeneration area that will meet the needs of both the existing and future population. The leisure and community offer will greatly improve those which are currently being demolished in the closed and
dilapidated building.

- Proposals are compatible with the adopted Elephant and Castle SPD/OAPF.
- 4Futures have undertaken extensive public consultation and liaison and the final proposed design has responded to feedback received during this process in that public accessibility throughout the site has been improved, connectivity between the leisure centre and St Mary’s Churchyard has been improved and the cafe has been designed so that it is accessible for non-leisure users.
- Layout of the building is designed so that the main entrance is orientated towards and easily visible from the southern roundabout offering significant prominence onto the Southern Junction and strong relationship with the adjacent St Mary's Churchyard.
- New leisure centre will be car free, except for disabled parking and a mini bus drop off area. Given the site’s proximity to the major transport interchange and the Cycle Super Highway 7, the vehicle trip generation and impact on existing local residential roads will be minimal.
- The two to four storey stepped massing of the proposed building is respectful to its relationship with existing residential properties and minimises the sunlight/daylight impacts.
- The external facade treatment is compatible to both the traditional brick built buildings within the local conservation area and supports and enhances the proposed St Mary’s residential tower.
- Proposal is being designed to comply with sustainability requirements and to achieve BREEAM rating ‘Excellent’. The facility will have the capacity to connect to a district wide system.
- In conclusion, the leisure centre scheme has the capacity to deliver substantial regeneration benefits, transform the quality of public realm and provide a modern community facility at the heart of the Elephant and Castle helping to transform the perception of the area. The transformation of the current Elephant and Castle leisure centre will be a visible sign of momentum and progress towards the regeneration of the area.

Statutory and non-statutory organisations

Transport for London

- The site is adjacent to the A3 Elephant and Castle which forms part of the Transport for London Road Network.
- The proposal is supported in principle as it will be highly accessible by public transport, has no car parking (bar disabled provision) and cycle parking is in excess of London Plan standards. As the facility replaces the existing leisure centre, it is unlikely that there will be significant adverse impacts on public transport capacity.
- Noted that the servicing is proposed off Churchyard Row which forms part of Cycle Superhighway 7 (CS7) and is heavily used by cyclists in peak periods. Servicing requirements appear to result in a small number of vehicle movements that could be managed effectively and have limited safety impacts. Travel Plan should be formalised and submitted to the local planning authority, in consultation with TfL, via a condition. It is questioned how on-site servicing can take place with a minibus/bus parked in the service area – there may be at times a potential impact on CS7. A tracking plot should be provided to demonstrate that on-site servicing is still feasible with minibuses parked there and/or alternative arrangements for minibus parking should be made.
• Construction management plan should be formalised through a condition in consultation with TfL. TfL strongly supports the preferred construction vehicle routing option of Oswin Street as this will minimise adverse impacts on CS7 as well as the Transport for London Network.

• Expected there will be a demand for coach travel, for example from schools. It should be clarified how coaches are to be accommodated.

• Provision of car parking in the shared surface detracts from the aim of the space to form an attractive, pedestrian friendly environment at the entrance plaza to both developments. Whilst acknowledging that disabled parking needs to be provided, better use of the leisure centre frontage to Brook Drive could be made. Proposals for how parking and the other uses of the shared space will be controlled will need to form part of a Shared Surface Management Plan, in consultation with TfL. If the space does not function as intended there is a risk that drop off/pick up will occur on Elephant and Castle with subsequent potential adverse impacts on traffic congestion and road safety.

• No mention is made of taxis in the transport assessment. Not allowed to wait on red routes. A pick up/drop off facility for the shared surface should be actively promoted for taxis.

Sport England

• Sport England registered an initial objection to this application, however subsequent to this further information has been provided by the Applicant.

• The key aspects of the proposed development from Sport England’s perspective involve the redevelopment to provide a new public leisure centre, comprising a six lane 25 metre swimming pool, learner pool, four court sports hall, 140 station gym, indoor cycling room, two studios, crèche and café. The development would result in the loss of the existing Elephant and Castle Leisure Centre which includes a six court sports hall, a 50 station gym and formerly provided a swimming pool.

• Furthermore, Sport England welcomes the proposed replacement leisure centre and the provision of a new six lane 25 metre swimming pool and learner pool, larger 140 station gym and the addition of an indoor cycling room and two studios.

• Subsequent to Sport England’s initial objection, there has been dialogue between Sport England, the applicant and the Sports and Leisure Services Manager at Southwark Council regarding the proposed replacement of the existing sports hall. As a result of these discussions, in order to mitigate for the reduction in sports hall size by two courts, it has been agreed that a community use strategy specifying a method to increase community access to existing sports hall provision at secondary schools and further education institutions within the borough will be produced.

• On the basis of the replacement and additional sports facilities proposed and the agreement to produce a community use strategy, Sport England therefore considers that the proposed development meets Planning Policy Objective 2 of Sport England’s Spatial Planning for Sport and Active Recreation: Development Control Guidance Note 2 (2009) Appendix 2 (www.sportengland.org/facilities__planning/developing_policies_for_sport.aspx). Planning Policy Objective 2 aims to prevent the loss of existing sports facilities. Sport
England opposes the redevelopment of such facilities, unless equivalent or better replacement facilities are provided. The only exception to this policy is where it can be proved that the facility is genuinely redundant and there is no demand for a replacement based on a thorough local assessment. Sport England’s policy is consistent with that of the Government’s set out in the NPPF.

- This being the case, Sport England withdraws its objection to this application, subject to the following condition:

  No development shall commence until a community use strategy prepared in consultation with Sport England has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The strategy shall specify a method to increase community access to existing sports hall provision at secondary schools and further education institutions within the borough, including any steps which the local planning authority in consultation with Sport England considers necessary to secure the effective community use of existing sports hall provision at secondary schools and further education institutions within the borough. The development shall not be occupied until the strategy has been implemented in accordance with the approved details.

  Reason: To secure adequate compensation for the reduction of sports hall provision on site by bringing into community use facilities which are not currently available for community use and to accord with The Southwark Development Plan Policy 2.1 and Planning Policy Objective 2 of Sport England’s Spatial Planning for Sport and Active Recreation: Development Control Guidance Note (2009) Appendix 2.

**Environment Agency**

The site is located in Flood Zone 3a which is deemed to be ‘high risk’ and is within an area benefiting from the River Thames tidal flood defences. Further note that the proposed development is classified as ‘less vulnerable’ by the Technical Guidance to the National Planning Policy Framework (Table 2). Accordingly, it falls into a flood risk vulnerability category which is appropriate to the Flood Zone according to the Technical Guidance to the NPPF (Tables 1 and 3).

No objection to the planning application subject to conditions relating to contamination and piling/foundation designs.

**Thames Water**

With regard to water infrastructure no objection raised to the planning application.

**Metropolitan Police Design Out Crime Officer**

Have met with the architects on two occasions regarding this project and confirmed they will be working to Secured by Design principles and looking for the appropriate SBD Certification.

**Design Review Panel**

The scheme was reviewed by the DRP in June 2012. The Panel raised the follow
issues:

• the arrangement of fenestration and the choice of facing materials which should address all four public faces of the development - essentially that the building does not have a 'front' and a 'back';
• the importance of the landscaping to the public space between the this site an the St Mary's Residential scheme;
• the prominence and legibility of the entrance from all approaches especially Brook Drive;
• the relationship of the scheme with the park which needed further refinement;
• the architectural expression was confused; and
• the design of the roof which they considered to be the fifth elevation.

Neighbours and local groups

Letter received from the occupier of 130 Draper House:

• In principle delighted that the leisure centre is finally being redeveloped.
• During consultation process residents have grown more and more dissatisfied with the proposal as needs not being taken into consideration. Existing facilities had a six court sports hall which was well used.
• Council has argued that there is no space for replacement six court sports hall as the site is not big enough and height restrictions made it impossible for this to be provided.
• Proposed sports hall has no light so wrong to argue that the site is not big enough as there is no reason it can not be built below ground level.
• Sport England policy objective is to prevent the loss of existing sports facilities unless better or equivalent facilities are provided.
• Demand will also sore in future years with increased number of local residents.
• Should scheme be revised to include six court sports hall, would withdraw objection.