

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Classification:</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>Meeting Name:</b>
7.1	Open	14 November 2012	Planning Sub-Committee A
<b>Report title:</b>	<b>Development Management planning application:</b> Application 12/AP/1066 for: Full Planning Permission  <b>Address:</b> 44-50 AND 52-58 LANCASTER STREET, LONDON, SE1 0SJ  <b>Proposal:</b> Demolition of existing commercial buildings (B Class use) and erection of two residential blocks both of up to five storeys comprising a total of 39 flats; with at nos. 44 - 50 (Site B) (7 x one bedroom, 10 x two bedroom and 7 x three bedroom flats); and at nos. 52 - 58 (Site A) (7 x one bedroom, 4 x two bedroom and 4 x three bedroom)		
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>	Cathedrals		
<b>From:</b>	Head of Development Management		
<b>Application Start Date</b> 30 March 2012		<b>Application Expiry Date</b> 29 June 2012	

## RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1 Subject to the applicant first entering into an appropriate legal agreement by no later than the 31 December 2012, planning permission be granted subject to conditions.
- 2 In the event that the requirements of 1 are not met by the 31 December 2012, the Head of Development Control be authorised to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in paragraph 91 below.

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

### Site location and description

- 3 The application proposal comprises of two sites. Both sites are occupied by two storey buildings which were used by Colorama Photographic Centre and are former developing/processing laboratory with offices and an ancillary residential element within Site A.
- 4 Site A is located on the western side of Lancaster Street and on the south east side of Library Street on the junction of Lancaster Street and Library Street. The building is brick built and comprises of a warehouse element and two-storey element with a large chimney which extends approximately 5 metres above the ridge line. This building accommodated the warehouse, caretaker's flat and management offices. There is also a basement. The building fills the entire site at ground floor level with access points to both Lancaster Street and Library Street. The building is described as having a large floor to ceiling height. Roof lights provide light into the building. At the rear there is a first floor element with windows which overlook the parking area on Davidge Street.

- 5 Site B is located on the western side of Lancaster Street, to the north west of Library Street and on the junction of Lancaster Street and Library Street. The building was used as the laboratory as well as offices and the company refectory. The building fills the entire site at ground floor level with access points to both Lancaster Street and Library Street. There are windows overlooking properties on Davidge Street, Library Street and Lancaster Street. To the north of the site is an alleyway providing a pedestrian link between Davidge Street and Lancaster Street. The site is therefore surrounded by three roads and a footpath.
- 6 The immediate neighbourhood is predominantly residential with an adjoining property to Site A on Library Street, being a four-storey public house that has been converted into residential, with windows to the rear, which they state, do not serve habitable areas. The buildings opposite Sites A and B are four storey deck accessed flats. The exception is a training centre on the junction of Lancaster Street and King James Street and a hotel on the junction of Lancaster Street and Borough Road. The buildings in the area are generally three to five storeys high. There is a development site in Library Street where 3 storey town houses and 3/6 storey flats are being constructed. An eight storey building has recently been completed between Webber Street and King James Street.
- 7 The site has a PTAL rating of 6B. Within the Local Development Framework 2012 the sites have the following designations:
- 8 Bankside and Borough Town centre; Central Activities Zone; Air Quality management Area; Bankside, Borough and London Bridge Opportunity Area.

### **Details of proposal**

- 9 It is proposed to completely demolish the existing buildings on site and to redevelop with two residential blocks, on Site A and Site B. These are considered in turn below:
- 10 The proposed building on Site A comprises of four storey building with setback fifth floor attached to the adjoining public house. The building is contemporary in style and is to be constructed in brick, zinc, and with galvanized steel screens, with solar panels to the roof.
- 11 The building will be comprised as follows:

#### **Ground floor -**

communal courtyards, refuse store and cycle store, plant room  
 One bedroom flat - living area -28.8 square metres and bedroom 14.5 square metres overall size 56.9 square metres and with a private terrace  
 One bedroom flat - living area 28.7 square metres and bedroom 12.7 square metres, overall size 52.7 square metres and with a private terrace  
 Three bedroom flat, living area 52.6 square metres, bedrooms 12 square metres, 12 square metres and 12.5 square metres overall flat area 137 square metres with a private terrace

#### **12 First floor -**

(Flat 4) Two bedroom flat with living area of 29.2 square metres, bedrooms of 14.6 and 11.9 square metres, overall size 78.5 square metres with outside balcony)  
 (Flats 5 and 6) 2, one bedroom flats with living area of 26.4 square metres, and bedroom of 13.7 with outside balcony (each of overall size 52.7sqm).  
 (Flat 7) Three bedroom flat with living area of 38.3 square metres and bedrooms of 7.6, 11.9 and 12.7 square metres with outside balcony (overall flat size 90.3 sqm).

- 13 **Second floor -**  
(Flat 8) Two bedroom flat with living room of 27.2 square metres, bedrooms of 14.9 and 14.6 square metres, (overall flat area 78.5 square metres.)  
(Flats 9 and 10) 2, one bedroom flats with living area of 26.4 square metres, bedroom of 13.7 (overall flat area of 52.7 square metres)  
(Flat 11) Two bedroom flat with living area of 36.6 square metres, bedrooms of 12.5 and 13.4 square metres (overall flat size 78.6 square metres).
- 14 **Third floor -**  
(Flat 12) Three bedroom flat with living area 38.6 square metres, bedrooms 13, 11.2, 13 square metres (overall flat area of 100.5 square metres with terrace and balcony)  
(Flat 13) One bedroom flat with living area of 26.4 sqm, (overall flat area of 52.7 sqm), with access to terrace.  
(Flat 14) Two bedroom flat with overall living area of 36.6 square metres, bedrooms 12.5 and 13.4 square metres (overall flat area of 78.6 square metres) with terrace
- 15 **Fourth floor -**  
(Flat 15) Three bedroom flat with living area of 52 square metres, bedrooms 15.6, 14.0 16.4 square metres with terrace of 62 square metres. Communal outdoor amenity area 54.6 square metres. Overall flat size 124.8 sqm.
- 16 Roof - solar panels
- 17 Which can be summarised as follows:  
  
One bedroom - 7 units  
Two bedroom - 4 units  
Three bedroom - 4 units  
  
Total - 15 units
- 18 Giving a density of 973 habitable rooms per hectare.
- 19 The proposed building on Site B comprises of a five storey building with the fourth floor set in from the elevations. It is a contemporary building of brick, zinc with galvanized steel screens and solar panels, the garage doors are timber slats; there will also be solar panels at roof level.
- 20 **Ground floor**  
- three disabled parking spaces, refuse and cycle stores and plant room  
(Flat 1) (Wheelchair unit) One bedroom flat with living area of 28.1 square metres, and bedroom of 17.2 square metres (overall size 71.4 square metres) with an outside terrace.  
(Flat 2) (Wheelchair unit) Three bedroom flat with living area 43.1 sqm, bedrooms of 14.1, 14.5 and 8.7 sqm (overall area 122 sqm), with an outside terrace  
(Flat 3) (Wheelchair unit) Two bedroom flat with living area 34.1 square metres, bedrooms of 12 and 12.3 square metres (overall flat size of 85.5 square metres) with outside terrace.  
(Flat 4) Three bedroom flat with living area of 36.6 square metres and bedrooms of 18.9, 13.75 and 7.8 square metres with an outside terrace; (overall size 102.6 sqm)

- 21 **First floor**  
(Flat 5) Three bedroom flat with living area 31.5 square metres, and bedrooms of 11, 12.5 and 15.2 square metres (overall 93.7 square metres) with balcony  
(Flats 6 and 8) 2, one bedroom flats with living area of 22.8 square metres and bedroom of 15 square metres, (each overall 51.6 square metres) with balcony  
(Flat 7) One bedroom flat with living area of 22.2 and bedroom of 14.7, (overall 51.6 square metres) with balcony  
(Flat 9) Two bedroom flat with living area 27.9 square metres and bedrooms of 12.4 and 12.1 square metres, (overall area 70.9 square metres) with balcony  
(Flat 10) Two bedroom flat with living area of 27.8 square metres, with bedrooms of 11.8 and 12.2 square metres with balcony; (overall size 72.8 sqm).  
(Flat 11) Three bedroom flat with living area of 30.2 square metres and bedrooms of 11.5, 12.9 and 14.2 square metres (overall size 95.5 square metres)
- 22 **Second floor -**  
(Flat 12) Two bedroom flat with living area of 27.8 square metres and bedrooms of 12.3 and 13.8 square metres, (overall flat area of 75.1 square metres) with large terrace.  
(Flats 13, 14 and 15) 3, one bedroom flats with living area of 23.2 square metres, bedroom of 14.7 square metres, (overall flat size of 51.6 square metres) with balcony.  
(Flat 16) Two bedroom flat with living area of 27 square metres, bedrooms of 12.1 and 12.3 square metres, (overall flat size of 74.9 square metres) with balcony.  
(Flat 17) Three bedroom flat with living area of 36.2 square metres, bedrooms 8.2, 12.1 and 13.3 square metres, (overall flat size 87.1 square metres) with large terrace.
- 23 **Third floor-**  
(Flat 18) Two bedroom flat with living area of 27.8 square metres, bedrooms of 12.3 and 13.8 square metres. (overall flat size of 75.1 square metres) with balcony  
(Flats 19 and 20) 2, two bedroom flats with living room of 25.8 square metres, bedrooms 11 and 16 square metres, (overall flat size of 69 square metres) with terrace  
(Flat 21) Two bedroom flat with living area of 23 square metres and bedrooms 9.2, 12.8 square metres, (overall flat area 64.7 square metres) with terrace  
(Flat 22) Three bedroom flat with living area of 36.2 square metres, bedrooms 8.2, 12.1 and 13.3 square metres with two balconies, (overall flat area 87.1 square metres)
- 24 **Fourth floor -**  
(Flat 23) Two bedroom flat with living area of 33.3 square metres, bedrooms 12, 13 square metres, (overall flat area of 75.2 square metres) with terraces  
(Flat 24) Three bedroom flat with living area of 31.1 square metres, bedrooms 15.1, 12, 13 square metres, (overall flat size 96.7 square metres) with large terrace.  
Roof - communal Terrace of 51 square metres and solar panels
- 25 Which can be summarised as follows:  
  
One bed - 7 units (including one wheelchair)  
Two bed - 10 units (including one wheelchair)  
Three bed - 7 units (including one wheelchair)
- 26 Total in block B - 24
- 27 Giving a resultant density of 1024 habitable rooms per hectare.
- 28 Block B will also include the affordable housing component with the 4 units at ground

floor, including the 3 wheelchair units, being social rented; and 2 one bedroom flats and a three bedroom flat in the building will also be provided for shared ownership. This constitutes 21% of the overall provision with a tenure split, amongst the affordable units, of almost 68% social rented and just over 32% shared ownership.

- 29 It should also be noted that there has been a minor amendment made to the proposal since its submission, including improvements to the cycle storage area in site B and making the disabled parking spaces more secure in site B, together with a more detailed elevation of the flank walls of Sites A and B and a boundary enclosure shown on the frontages to the blocks on Library Street.

### **Planning history**

- 30 Planning permission was granted for the use of the sites as a photographic processing laboratory plus ancillary offices in December 1990 (90-AP-458)

### **Planning history of adjoining sites**

- 31 A recent development has been completed for land adjoining Library Street, Davidge Street, King Street and Milcote Street (08-AP-2427) for the erection of a part three, part four, part five, part six storey block (22.69m AOD) comprising 34 residential flats with private terraces/balconies, communal courtyard and roof garden with pergola and cycle parking; erection of 6 three storey 4 bedroom town houses with private gardens and provision of a community allotment garden.
- 32 Under ref. 99-AP-0778 permission was granted in June 1999 for the change of use and conversion of the Dover Castle Public House, 42 Davidge Street, to a live/work unit at basement and ground floors and 3 two bedroom flats on the upper floors.

## **KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

### **Summary of main issues**

- 33 The main issues in the case are:
- Principle of the proposed use in terms of land use and conformity with strategic issues;
  - Density, tenure and mix;
  - Impact on the amenities of neighbouring residents and occupiers;
  - Impact of the proposal on the amenities of future occupants
  - Traffic and parking issues;
  - Principle of the loss of the existing buildings
  - Design and layout of the proposal (having regard to the merits of the existing buildings)
  - Flood Risk Assessment;
  - Planning obligations

### **Planning policy**

#### Core Strategy 2011

- 34 Strategic Policy 1 – Sustainable development  
Strategic Policy 2 – Sustainable transport  
Strategic Policy 5 – Providing new homes  
Strategic Policy 6 – Homes for people on different incomes  
Strategic Policy 7 – Family homes

Strategic Policy 12 – Design and conservation  
Strategic Policy 13 – High environmental standards

Southwark Plan 2007 (July) - saved policies

- 35 Policy 1.7 Development within town and local centres  
Policy 1.4 – Employment sites outside preferred locations;  
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 3.11 - Efficient use of land  
Policy 4.2 - Quality of residential accommodation;  
Policy 4.3 - Mix of dwellings;  
Policy 4.4 - Affordable housing;  
Policy 4.5 - Wheelchair affordable housing;  
Policy 5.2 - Transport impacts;  
Policy 5.3 - Walking and cycling;  
Policy 5.6 - Car parking

Adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance

- 36 Residential Design Standards (2011)  
Sustainability Assessment (2009)  
Sustainable Design and Construction (2009)  
S.106 Planning Obligations (2007)  
Affordable Housing (2008)

London Plan 2011

- 37 Policy 2.12 - Central Activities Zone – predominantly local activities  
Policy 2.13 - Opportunity areas and intensification areas  
Policy 2.14 - Areas for regeneration  
Policy 2.15 - Town centres  
Policy 3.3 - Increasing housing supply  
Policy 3.4 - Optimising housing potential  
Policy 3.5 - Quality and design of housing developments  
Policy 3.8 - Housing choice  
Policy 3.13 - Negotiating affordable housing  
Policy 5.2 - Minimising carbon emissions  
Policy 5.3 - Sustainable design and construction  
Policy 5.7 - Renewable energy  
Policy 6.9 - Cycling  
Policy 7.3 - Designing out crime  
Policy 7.4 - Local character  
Policy 7.5 - Public realm  
Policy 7.6 - Architecture  
Policy 7.14 - Improving air quality  
Policy 8.2 - Planning obligations.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

38 The NPPF is a material planning consideration. The following sections are relevant to consideration of this application

- 2. Ensuring the vitality of town centres
- 4. Promoting sustainable transport
- 6. Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes
- 7. Requiring good design.
- 12. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

### **Principle of development**

39 As the sites have historically been in commercial use (B Class) and this remains the likely planning use of the sites, Saved Policy 1.4 – Employment sites outside preferred locations’ of the Southwark Plan and Strategic Policy 10 ‘Jobs and businesses of the Core Strategy 2011 which seek to protect existing business space are relevant here. Saved Policy 1.4 provides protection for existing commercial space in the Central Activities Zone, as here, unless the applicant can demonstrate that convincing attempts to dispose of the premises, either for continued B Class use, or for mixed uses involving B Class, including redevelopment, over a period of 24 months, have been unsuccessful. In this respect the applicants have submitted a marketing report that indicates that the property has been marketed for both commercial and mixed use development as well for rent over a 24 month period with very little interest. The properties have also been vacant since July 2006. Accordingly, it is considered that Saved Policy 1.4, and Strategic Policy 10 have been satisfied and other uses should be looked at here.

40 The application property is also situated with the Bankside and Borough Town Centre and therefore saved Policy 1.7 of the Southwark Plan 2007 will apply. This states that within town centres, developments will be permitted providing a range of uses including cultural, tourism, residential and employment uses. The residential use of the sites are considered acceptable, particularly as the sites are on the periphery of the town centre and commercial uses may not be as viable here. Therefore the proposed land use is considered to be acceptable and policy compliant.

### 41 Dwelling mix

The scheme complies with Strategic Policy 7 ‘Family Homes’ as more than 60% of the units are 2 or more bedroom and at least 20 % being three bedroom.

### 42 Density

In terms of density, the proposed density is 973 habitable rooms per hectare on site A and 1024 habitable rooms per hectare on site B. These density ranges accord with the Council's density range for the CAZ of 650 - 1100 hrha. Moreover the broad scale and massing is considered to accord with the surrounding context, as discussed in more detail in the Design section below.

### 43 Tenure mix

The tenure mix of the scheme is discussed below in the S106 section.

### **Environmental impact assessment**

44 A Screening Opinion was not requested prior to the submission of the application as

the scheme is not Schedule 1 development. It does fall within Schedule 2, being an urban development project. Having reference to the Column 2 criteria, the site area does not exceed the initial threshold of 0.5ha. In addition it has been determined that the development is unlikely to have a significant effect upon the environment by virtue of its nature, size or location based upon a review of the Schedule 3 selection criteria for screening Schedule 2 Development. The site is a brownfield site in an inner London location, and is located outside of a sensitive area as per Regulation 2(1) and the development is unlikely to generate any significant environmental effects. Therefore an Environmental Impact Assessment is not required.

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

- 45 In compliance with saved policy 3.2 'Protection of amenity' of the Southwark Plan 2007 the proposal has been designed to be a neighbourly development with scale and massing being kept to broadly similar heights of the surrounding flats. The proposed blocks are also stepped back on their upper floors so as to reduce their visual impact on neighbouring blocks, and to afford acceptable levels of outlook and sunlight and daylight to neighbouring buildings. Whilst the proposed blocks will have windows facing neighbouring buildings on a number of elevations, these are across existing streets in the main and the distances are sufficient to avoid undue overlooking.
- 46 There are a number of windows in the back of 7 - 13 King James Street which face north west, some directly over the site. The BRE assessment says that only one serves a habitable room, a bedroom, but there are also two bedrooms directly above this bedroom. However, the BRE assessment finds that the ground floor rear facing bedroom also has a flank window looking south west - which is away from the development - and therefore light into this room is considered to be acceptable. It seems reasonable to assume that the same layout exists on the upper floors where flank windows are also evident and therefore the impact on these rooms above should also be acceptable. The windows nearest the development on the rear of this block are to bathrooms and stair cases and therefore there will be no loss of privacy for these residents.
- 47 In terms of sunlight and daylight impacts, the applicant's agent has undertaken a daylight, sunlight and overshadowing report which considered the impact of the proposal on Markstone House and Lingfield House in Lancaster Street (to the north west and north east respectively), 7-13 King James Street (to the south), the adjoining block at 42 Davidge Street (to the west of Site A and the south of Site B) and Bazeley House (to the west).

#### Daylight and Sunlight Issues

##### Markstone House

##### Daylight Issues

- 48 This building is to the north of site B, which fronts Lancaster Street. The flank elevation with a view of the site contains a vertical line of very small windows serving non habitable spaces which are excluded from daylighting criteria in the BRE guidelines.

##### Lingfield House

##### Daylight Issues



- 49 Fifty two windows serving 50 rooms were analysed across the ground and first floor levels of Lingfield House. Thirty rooms have levels above the required Vertical Sky Component of 27% with the development in place, a further seven are close to meeting this benchmark and would do if measured to one decimal place instead of 2. The remaining 6 rooms relate to bedrooms where daylight may not be seen as being as important, compared to living rooms. The rooms affected are on the ground and first floors and when the daylight distribution is considered four out of the six rooms meet the recommended BRE values.

#### Sunlight Issues

- 50 The report concluded that two living rooms in Lingfield House would be adversely affected but that this needed to be considered in the context of the length of Lingfield House as a whole, which has a long range of windows that face both Site A and B, and also that these properties are served by a large number of balconies that reduce daylight availability in any event.
- 51 In relation to sunlight issues the report concluded that with respect to Lingfield House it confirmed that the great majority of rooms will satisfy the sunlight availability. Again the encumbrance to sunlight from the overhanging balconies needs to be taken into account. One living room window at ground floor would not fully meet the BRE standard, although the difference should not be readily perceptible.

#### 7-13 King James Street

#### Daylight Issues

- 52 The report confirms that only bedroom windows are affected and although the ground floor window will be affected the Vertical Sky Component would remain in excess of 30% and therefore good daylight will remain. The upper floor bedroom windows would also achieve acceptable values.

#### Sunlight Issues

- 53 The window with a direct view of the development is north east facing and there would be no change in sunlight availability. The windows in the alternate elevation would continue to receive unaltered levels of sunlight and there would be no adverse effect.

#### 42 Davidge Street -

#### Daylight Issues

- 54 There are three windows which face Site A , they serve non habitable spaces and there require no assessment. There are rooms that front onto Davidge Street and face Site B. The report confirms that with the development in place that all these windows would meet the Vertical Sky Component and satisfy the BRE criteria and in the case of Daylight Distribution it would remain at 95%, ensuring good daylight in terms of the lower windows and therefore upper windows in the building will have higher values.

#### Sunlight issues

- 55 All rooms with a view of the proposed development are north facing and serve a hallway and bathroom for which there is no sunlight criteria.

#### Bazeley House -

## Daylight Issues

- 56 As with Bazeley House this block is linear with a large number of windows that look directly onto Site B. Existing daylight is affected by the protrusion of the walkways from the face of the development and sited above windows. The windows not serving habitable rooms were not considered and the windows were analysed with and without the balconies in position. BRE guidelines confirm that 'if the proposed VSC with the balcony was under 0.8 times the existing value with the balcony, but the same ratio for the values without the balcony was well over 0.8, this would show that the presence of the balcony, rather than the size of the obstruction, was the main factor in the relative loss of light'. A similar situation arises with daylight distribution.
- 57 Out of 14 rooms that were analysed across the ground and first floors, four fall short of the proposed value of 0.8 with the walkway . With the removal of the walkways only one room at ground floor will be affected, a bedroom window. No living rooms will be affected.

## Sunlight Issues

- 58 In respect of sunlight all the relevant windows are north east facing and there are no numerical values to satisfy.

## Overshadowing Issues

- 59 There would be no material increase in permanent overshadowing. All those amenity spaces that presently benefit from at least two hours of sunlight on 21 March, will continue to receive the benefit. There would be no adverse affect.

## **Impact on the future occupiers of the development**

- 60 The proposal provides residential units that exceed the minimum size standards as set out in Policy 3.5 of the London Plan 2011 and the Council's Residential Design Standards SPD 2011. Both buildings have a communal outside space of over 50 square metres with all units having a terrace or balcony. The three bedroom units in addition have direct access to at outdoor area of at least ten square metres. Cycle and refuse/recycling areas are to be provided.
- 61 In terms of daylight, the BRE assessment states that both buildings A and B, would be well served by the amenity of daylight. There are only four locations where the numerical values fell short of the BRE recommendations and in these situations the kitchens in question form part of open plan areas with the living areas, and these total spaces satisfy the criteria for living rooms.
- 62 The Environmental Protection Team have identified that this site is within the Local Air Quality Management Area and therefore it is essential that the building structure protect the residents from poor external air quality particularly with regard to NO<sub>2</sub> (Nitrogen Dioxide) and PM<sub>10</sub> (Breathable Particulates). The team have identified some shortfalls, however on balance, it is considered that the development will provide a reasonable standard of amenity for future occupiers.
- 63 The development sites fall in an area which are not impacted by noisy roads or near to a railway line and therefore in terms of noise the main concern is within the blocks and this is covered by the Building Regulations. However, concern has been expressed in relation to a unit in the east block having a bedroom of a 3 bed flat backing onto living/dining/kitchen room of the 2 bed flat on the Lancaster St frontage.

A condition recommending additional sound proofing, will ameliorate potential noise issues in respect to this.

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

- 64 The majority of the surrounding properties are in residential use and therefore the adjoining uses are considered to be complementary to, and can comfortably co-exist with, the proposed scheme.

### **Traffic issues**

Pedestrian, vehicular and disabled access

- 65 The principal pedestrian access will be via Library Street for both proposed blocks. Vehicular access will be via Davidge Street. The proposed cross over is 12m in width which is considered acceptable but the Highways department would request that the cross over is constructed to a higher amenity standard, (ie better materials, additional measures to safeguard the safety of pedestrians), than the specified cross overs in the Highways Department design brief. This will be included in the informatives, along with the applicant being made aware that all shrubbery should not exceed 0.6m in height so it does not impede the driver's visibility

Sightlines

- 66 The applicant was requested to provide details of visibility splays and sightlines, but due to the need to provide secure car parking for the wheelchair units it was agreed that this would not be required given that there are only three spaces proposed and the street is relatively quiet.

Cycle storage

- 67 The cycle store in Site A has been revised so that vertical stands are not used. However, more detailed drawings will be required of this provision to ensure that it is practical.

Car Parking.

- 68 The site is located in an area that benefits from a high PTAL (6) and excellent transport links, is located within a Controlled Parking Zone and within the Central Activities Zone, therefore, a car free development would be expected, with the exception of disabled parking. The applicants have proposed to provide a car free development which officers support.

Car Club

- 69 The site is located in close proximity to one on street car club bay. As it stands officers do not request that the applicant provides a further on street car club bay as there is no viable mechanism to provide this. Officers do require the applicant to provide a minimum of three years free street car membership for all residents of the proposed development.

- 70 The reasoning behind a three year membership request from a developer is explained by a number of factors. The point behind any car club incentive is to get

people out of private vehicles and into shared cars, the more enticing this incentive is the more likely a resident is going to take this up in the first place. A three year membership period ensures some real longevity, it makes it more likely that residents will continue to use a car club after the initial 3 years instead of looking at private vehicle options. If just one or two years membership is supplied it makes it more likely that a resident will see a car club as a short-term fix rather than a long-term solution. Finally, in developments where no or very little parking is being offered it is crucial that the impact the development may have on surrounding traffic and parking pressures is minimised, offering a three year membership helps ensure a car club has the most succinct impact possible without over-burdening the developer.

#### Disabled parking

- 71 The applicant has proposed three off street disabled bays to serve the three wheelchair units within Site B. These are very well situated close to the units and are safe and secure for the users.
- 72 Vehicles are normally required to enter and exit a development in a forward gear. However this is not the case here, but given the constraints of the site and Davidge Street not being particularly busy, on balance this is acceptable.

#### Servicing of the development

- 73 Servicing for new developments including refuse collection is usually required to take place off street. However, given the size of this development and site constraints, this is not possible. It is therefore requested that an informative be added to the decision notice, making the applicant aware that any servicing which takes place on street, is subject to local restrictions.
- 74 Given that the proposed development has been proposed as car free it is envisaged that the vehicle trips associated with the site will be low. The Transport Group do not believe that the pedestrian trips will have an impact on the highway.
- 75 The interim travel plan submitted with the application is sufficient at this stage. A full travel plan must be submitted and approved by the Local Authority, incorporating the contents specified within the interim travel plan. The full travel plan must be submitted and approved prior to occupation, to ensure that measures are in place to ensure sustainable travel behaviour from the outset of the developments occupation. This will be secured by the Section 106 Agreement and include the commitment to be in conformity with Transport for London's *Travel planning for new development in London (2011)* document as well as the ATTrBuTE tool; and to surveying residents at 1, 3, and 5 years; commitment to update the travel plan following each of the the surveys; and commitment to measures identified within the travel plan.

#### Design issues

- 76 The two sites are currently occupied by 2-storey warehouse/workshop buildings at 44-50 and 52-58 Lancaster Street. The exact dates of the buildings are not known, although representations have been received which suggest that one or both of the buildings may date, or have elements from, the late Victorian period. What is clear is that both buildings have been substantially altered with the footprint of the larger building on Site B (44 - 50 Lancaster Street) having been extended and containing many 20th Century interventions. The building on Site A at 52 - 58 has been less altered and has older elements which are more readily evident. It is accepted that though these buildings do have a certain scale, character and identity which they contribute to the surrounding townscape, their heritage value is not considered to be significant (in terms of architectural quality and historical relevance) and their loss is

considered to be acceptable (indeed the buildings enjoy no protection at present from demolition in that they are not listed or within a Conservation Area).

- 77 While previous policy guidance has suggested that they may be suitable for 'local-listing', a re-appraisal has found them to be lacking in the required level of significance. The surrounding context is a variety of four and five-storey housing blocks of varying architectural quality, with the Hunter House group being of particular interest; there are however no direct impacts on heritage assets or their settings arising from the re-development of this site.
- 78 Saved Policy 3.13 Urban design, requires that the height, scale and massing of buildings should be appropriate to the local context and should not dominate its surroundings inappropriately, with regard to their local context and character of the area's townscape. The general scale of the proposal, at two/three/four-storey with a set-back fifth is acceptable in principle, and responsive to the scale of its townscape context. In terms of bulk and massing the blocks provide interest with set-backs, terraces and recessed balconies; the feature/foil-walls which frame some of the terraces but are clearly also two-dimensional with large openings, are also adding character and interest. The physical nature of the two blocks also responds well to the nature of the larger apartment blocks that predominate within the Lancaster Street-scape, as well as stepping-down to 2-storey on Davidge Street to respect its more open nature and scale.
- 79 The layout of the two sites, while generally rational and conforming to streetscape frontages are not dissimilar to the existing building footprint. The proposal has been revised to solve issues regarding loss of privacy for future occupiers by providing high level and obscure glazed windows on the Library Street frontage on Block A. Entrances have been revised so that there are no recesses in order to ensure that they are safe and comply with Secure by Design principles.
- 80 Elsewhere defensible space and garden areas are provided, and landscaping of these areas are subject to a condition. The two communal entrance points are via open landscaped courtyards, which should be pleasant spaces (subject to the landscaping and detailing), and are welcomed.
- 81 The submitted elevations indicate a variety of form and massing, openings and fenestration that, with good materials and execution, will achieve a high quality of design. Revised drawings have been submitted showing more detailing of the flank walls which have ensured that the proposal has evolved into an interesting development. Saved Policy 3.12 Quality in design, requires that developments should achieve a high quality of both architectural and urban design; new buildings should embody a creative and high quality appropriate design solution, specific to their site and context, and these proposals are considered to comply with this policy.
- 82 In terms of materials, the predominant facing treatment is brickwork (in a variety of types to express different elements/blocks) which is acceptable and should help the proposal respond to its context. The chosen bricks should also have a variety and interest in their colour-range and texture-finish, to avoid an aesthetic 'flatness' across the facades; the choice of pointing profile and mortar colour will also be key elements for the material/detailing success. Windows will be composite with an outer aluminium facing in a dark grey finish. The set-back upper levels will be lighter in appearance and use glass to give a less solid/heavy capping to the development. Landscaping will be an important component of this development, both in the street-frontage gardens/defensible spaces and in the entry courtyards/gardens. The former must also carefully consider how the boundary treatment can contribute to the streetscape and still provide privacy/security to the residential units. All areas of flat roof not utilised for amenity space should be used to implement either living roofs,

renewable or a combination of both, this is subject to a condition.

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

- 83 The property is not in a conservation area and not within the setting of any listed buildings.

### **Impact on trees**

- 84 There are no trees on the site and there are no proposals for works to adjoining trees.

### **Affordable Housing**

- 85 Paragraph 50 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires local planning authorities to set policies for affordable housing needs on site. Policies in relation to affordable housing are set out in London Policy Plan 3.13 'negotiating affordable housing in individual and private residential and mixed use schemes', this was adopted in 2011. The Council's policies are contained within Strategic Policy 6 'Homes for people on different incomes' of the Core Strategy 2011 and saved Policy 4.4 of the Southwark Plan 2011 and further advice is available within the Council's adopted Affordable Housing SPD (2008). This requires 35% of affordable housing to be provided with a tenure split of 70% social rented to 30% intermediate housing.
- 86 In respect to this application the applicant has submitted a viability report outlining why the 35% affordable component can not be provided or the tenure split met. This is in compliance with the Affordable Housing SPD (2008) and Draft 2011 which allows for the possible reduction of affordable housing by providing a financial appraisal that is used to assess the viability of the scheme. In this case the applicant's report was assessed by the District Valuer.
- 87 The District Valuer concluded in their report that the proposed offer of 21 % affordable housing "exceeds the level that is technically viable". Therefore, it is considered that the shortfall in the level of affordable housing has been justified along with the tenure of the units being 19 habitable rooms of social rented housing (67.85%) and 9 habitable rooms of shared ownership (32.14%) which is just under the 70/30 ratio required.

### **Section 106 Head of Terms**

- 88 The Heads of Terms comply with the Section 106 Toolkit and comprise of:-

Education £67,992  
Employment during construction £28,035  
Employment during construction management fee £2,273  
Public open space £12,150  
children's play equipment £5,100  
sports development £29,650  
Transport Strategic £19,385  
Transport site specific £19,500  
Public Realm £29,250  
Health £42,662  
Community facilities £6,277  
Admin charge £5,246  
Total £267,522

Other Section 106 Issues

- 89 Car Club membership/exemption of parking permits - The Section 106 will also include excluding future occupiers from obtaining parking permits, and three year membership of a car club for all units. The Transport Group wanted a sum to be made payable to provide another car club bay in the future if the current bay is not sufficient. However, it is considered unreasonable to provide funding for an item that may/or not be needed in the future.
- 90 In accordance with the recommendation, should an acceptable Section 106 Agreement not be signed within the specified time, the following reason for refusal would apply:
- 91 "In the absence of a signed Section 106 Agreement, there is no mechanism in place to avoid or mitigate the impact of the proposed development on the public realm, public open space, the transport network, health and education facilities, employment training and affordable housing and the proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy 2.5 of the Southwark Plan 2007 and Policy 6A.5 of the London Plan 2011."

#### **Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy CIL**

- 92 The Mayor's CIL came into effect in April 2012 which is not discretionary. The cost is based on a levy of £35 per square metres and for this development the fee will be £123,032.

#### **Sustainable development implications**

- 93 The applicant's agent have confirmed that the proposal will meet the required Sustainable Homes Standard Code 4.

#### **Flood Risk Assessment**

- 94 The applicant has submitted a flood risk assessment and the Environment Agency have no objection subject to a condition which is included in the recommendation.

#### **Other matters**

- 95 Construction works and impact on adjoining foundations have been identified as an issue by an adjoining occupier, but this is covered by Building Regulations and is not a material planning consideration.
- 96 A condition restricting the hours of construction work is being proposed to protect the amenities of local residents. However, issues regarding impact to foundations are not a material planning consideration.
- 97 An objector has stated that planning permission is required for the demolition of the buildings, this is not correct. Prior Approval is required for demolition which is not considered as part of a redevelopment proposal as part of a planning application, the latter being the case here. Moreover, where demolition is to be carried out unconnected to a redevelopment proposal, and therefore is subject to the Prior Approval process, the process only considers the environmental aspects of the demolition of the building(s) and not consideration of whether there is merit in their retention.

## **Conclusion on planning issues**

- 98 Consideration was given to the loss of Class B1 floorspace and to employment opportunities within the area in accordance with Saved Policy 1.4 of the Southwark Plan 2007. The applicant has provided acceptable evidence that retention of Class B1 floorspace or the development of the site for mixed use purposes would not be viable due to the marketing of the properties for over 24 months, with little interest. The proposal would also bring back into use vacant properties which will provide much needed family and affordable housing on site.
- 99 In terms of amenity issues, it is considered that there will be no significant impact on adjoining properties and the proposed scheme will provide a good standard of accommodation for future occupiers. The proposal is in compliance with Saved Policy 3.2 'Protection of Amenity'.
- 100 Particular consideration was given to the merit of the buildings in terms of their appearance, character and historical interest. While there is no conclusive evidence in respect to the age of the building, both buildings have been substantially altered since they were constructed. It is accepted that these buildings do have a certain scale, character and identity which they contribute to the surrounding townscape. However, their heritage value is not considered to be significant (in terms of architectural quality and historical relevance) and their loss is considered to be acceptable taking into account the merits of the replacement scheme. It is considered that the replacement buildings are of a high quality and subject to the imposition of conditions in respect to elevational treatment are considered to improve the appearance of the streetscape. The proposal therefore satisfies the policy requirements for high quality design, including the NPPF expectation that new development has the highest standard of design and protection of amenity for adjoining occupiers.

## **Community impact statement**

- 101 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**

- 102 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.

- 103 Summary of consultation responses

- Loss of heritage assets that contribute to the historical appearance and character of the area
- The provision of modern, identikit flats which will be unattractive and whose residents are unlikely to contribute to the local community
- Loss of daylight and sunlight and impact on amenities of local residents
- Proposal will result in additional parking in an already congested area.
- Impact of construction works in terms of noise and disturbance and closure of Davidge Street



- Contrary to Council policies and the NPPF

### Human rights implications

- 104 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.
- 105 This application has the legitimate aim of providing new housing. 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/1394-44 Application file: 12/AP/1066 Southward 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: <a href="mailto:planning.enquiries@southwark.gov.uk">planning.enquiries@southwark.gov.uk</a> Case officer telephone: 020 7525 5453 Council website: <a href="http://www.southwark.gov.uk">www.southwark.gov.uk</a>

### APPENDICES

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

## AUDIT TRAIL

<b>Lead Officer</b>	Gary Rice, Head of Development Management	
<b>Report Author</b>	Michèle Sterry, Team Leader (Planning)	
<b>Version</b>	Final	
<b>Dated</b>	4 October 2012	
<b>Key Decision</b>	No	
<b>CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER</b>		
<b>Officer Title</b>	<b>Comments Sought</b>	<b>Comments included</b>
Strategic Director, Finance and Corporate Services	No	No
Strategic Director, Environment and Leisure	No	No
Strategic Director, Housing and Community Services	No	No
Director of Regeneration	No	No
<b>Date final report sent to Constitutional Team</b>	1 November 2012	

**Consultation undertaken**

**Site notice date:** 30/04/2012

**Press notice date:** 19/4/2012

**Case officer site visit date:** 30/4/2012

**Neighbour consultation letters sent:** 30/4/2012

**Internal services consulted:**

Environmental Protection Team  
Waste Management  
Transport Planning  
Policy Team

**Statutory and non-statutory organisations consulted:**

Metropolitan Police  
Environment Agency

**Neighbours and local groups consulted:**

FLATS A-M 33 BOROUGH ROAD LONDON SE1 0AJ  
MILCOTE HOUSE MILCOTE STREET LONDON SE1 0RX  
FLATS 1- 32 BAZELEY HOUSE LIBRARY STREET LONDON SE1 0RN  
FLAT B 31 BOROUGH ROAD LONDON SE1 0AJ  
FLAT A- K 31 BOROUGH ROAD LONDON SE1 0AJ  
FLAT 1-32 MATHIESON COURT KING JAMES STREET LONDON SE1 0SA  
FLATS A-Q 34 BOROUGH ROAD LONDON SE1 0AJ  
FLATS 1-14 CLANDON BUILDINGS BOYFIELD STREET LONDON SE1 0SD  
FLATS 1-15 GIBBINGS HOUSE LANCASTER ESTATE KING JAMES STREET  
LONDON SE1 0DL  
FLAT 16 STOPHER HOUSE 90 WEBBER STREET LONDON SE1 0SE  
FLATS 1-36 ALBURY BUILDINGS BOYFIELD STREET LONDON SE1 0SB  
FLATS 1-30 HUNTER HOUSE BOROUGH ROAD LONDON SE1 0AG  
FLAT B 42 DAVIDGE STREET LONDON SE1 0RR  
FLAT C 42 DAVIDGE STREET LONDON SE1 0RR  
ERLANG HOUSE 128 BLACKFRIARS ROAD LONDON SE1 8EQ  
44-50 LANCASTER STREET LONDON SE1 0SJ  
FLAT A 42 DAVIDGE STREET LONDON SE1 0RR  
FLAT D 42 DAVIDGE STREET LONDON SE1 0RR  
PART THIRD FLOOR SOUTH 1-2 SILEX STREET LONDON SE1 0DP  
PART THIRD FLOOR NORTH 1-2 SILEX STREET LONDON SE1 0DP  
67 LANCASTER STREET LONDON SE1 0RZ  
NEIGHBOURHOOD HOUSING OFFICE LIBRARY STREET LONDON SE1 0RN  
HILL HOUSE 133-150 BLACKFRIARS ROAD LONDON SE1 8DB  
34 BOROUGH ROAD LONDON SE1 0AJ  
GROUND FLOOR 32 BOROUGH ROAD LONDON SE1 0AJ  
32 BOROUGH ROAD LONDON SE1 0AJ  
GATEWAY TRAINING CENTRE 66 LANCASTER STREET LONDON SE1 0RZ  
30 BOROUGH ROAD LONDON SE1 0AJ

FLAT 6 7-13 KING JAMES STREET LONDON SE1 0RU  
7-12 BOROUGH ROAD LONDON SE1 0AN  
60 LANCASTER STREET LONDON SE1 0RS  
FLAT 5 7-13 KING JAMES STREET LONDON SE1 0RU  
FLAT 2 7-13 KING JAMES STREET LONDON SE1 0RU  
FLAT 1 7-13 KING JAMES STREET LONDON SE1 0RU  
FLAT 4 7-13 KING JAMES STREET LONDON SE1 0RU  
FLAT 3 7-13 KING JAMES STREET LONDON SE1 0RU  
ROOM 1 to 114 32 BOROUGH ROAD LONDON SE1 0AJ  
FLATS 1-34 MURO COURT MILCOTE STREET LONDON SE1 0FH  
FLAT 13 7-13 KING JAMES STREET LONDON SE1 0RU  
FLAT 12 7-13 KING JAMES STREET LONDON SE1 0RU  
FLAT 9 7-13 KING JAMES STREET LONDON SE1 0RU  
FLAT 8 7-13 KING JAMES STREET LONDON SE1 0RU  
FLAT 11 7-13 KING JAMES STREET LONDON SE1 0RU  
FLAT 10 7-13 KING JAMES STREET LONDON SE1 0RU  
WORKSHOP STOPHER HOUSE 90 WEBBER STREET LONDON SE1 0RE  
FIRST FLOOR 52-58 LANCASTER STREET LONDON SE1 0RY  
LIVING ACCOMMODATION 30 BOROUGH ROAD LONDON SE1 0AJ  
BASEMENT AND GROUND FLOOR 52-58 LANCASTER STREET LONDON SE1 0RY  
GROUND FLOOR FIRST FLOOR AND SECOND FLOOR 1-2 SILEX STREET  
LONDON SE1 0DP  
FLATS 1- 24 BROOKWOOD HOUSE LANCASTER ESTATE WEBBER STREET  
LONDON SE1 0RJ  
FLATS 1-20 MURPHY HOUSE BOROUGH ROAD ESTATE BOROUGH ROAD  
LONDON SE1 0AH  
29 BOROUGH ROAD LONDON SE1 0AJ  
15 LIBRARY STREET LONDON SE1 0FJ  
13 LIBRARY STREET LONDON SE1 0FJ  
17 LIBRARY STREET LONDON SE1 0FJ  
11 LIBRARY STREET LONDON SE1 0FJ  
9 LIBRARY STREET LONDON SE1 0FJ  
7 LIBRARY STREET LONDON SE1 0FJ  
1-4 GARDINER HOUSE BOROUGH ROAD ESTATE BOROUGH ROAD LONDON  
SE1 0AQ

**Re-consultation:**

N/A

### Consultation responses received

#### Internal services

##### Environmental Protection Team

This site is within the LAQMA, and seeks to introduce many new residents to an area of poor air quality. Therefore it is essential that the building structure protect the residents from poor external air quality particularly with regard to NO<sub>2</sub> (Nitrogen Dioxide) and PM<sub>10</sub> (Breathable Particulates).

The ACCON uk Air Quality Assessment report dated 12.03.12 has not used the most recent figures from local air quality monitoring to feed into the prediction model, therefore the results are a significant underestimate of the current position. The methodology is efficacious and acceptable, however the assumptions are incorrect. It is the opinion of the EP team that some mechanism for the protection of internal air quality will be required at this site. It is recommended that the report is updated to reflect the most recent pollutant levels measured by local air quality monitoring before conditions regarding this issue are recommended.

The acoustic report by Sound Acoustics Ltd dated 15<sup>th</sup> March 2012 has assessed the area using PPG24 methodology, this standard has been recently withdrawn, however, its use is helpful in identifying that this site would have been mainly in category NEC B, it is clear from the measurements undertaken that the internal environment of any residences on this site will require protection by planning condition. The report does not give the developers a clear steer as to which glazing system to use and the report gives the client (developer) options, therefore, it is appropriate to recommend conditions to ensure that works to protect the internal acoustic environment are undertaken.

The internal arrangement of rooms seems good in the west block, however, the east block has the bedroom of a 3 bed flat backing onto living/dining/kitchen room of the 2 bed flat on the Lancaster St frontage. It would be helpful if this internal arrangement could be improved to reduce the clash of room uses backing onto each other. The alternative is that where party walls have differing uses to either side that the party wall is beefed up to Building Control Standard E plus 5dB(A) to mitigate the impact of the varying uses.

Balconies – the BS 8233 standard of 55dB(A) Leq<sub>t</sub> is unlikely to be met on the Lancaster Street frontage but will be met on other frontages. The developer may wish to remove balconies and amenity space from this frontage or, should it be required with regard to good design and the visual impact of the development, suggest extra protection measures for the affected amenity areas, particularly on the lower floors e.g. , entire, higher balustrades/fences/barriers.

Conditions have been recommended.

#### Traffic issues

Pedestrian, vehicular and disabled access

Pedestrian access will be via Library Street for both proposed blocks. Vehicular access will be via Davidge Street.

From the plans provided the proposed cross over is 12m in width, which is acceptable to the highways department but request that the cross over is constructed to a higher amenity standard than the specified cross overs in the highways Department design brief. It is requested that the applicant contacts the highways department - Geoffrey Ellwood 020 7525 3313 or Ian Law 020 7525 2170-07881500249.

The applicant should be made aware that all shrubbery should not exceed 0.6m in height so it does not impede the driver's visibility

#### Cycle storage

Revised plans have been submitted which have taken out the vertical storage system and have been verbally agreed, subject to a condition requiring more detailed plans.

#### Car Parking.

The site is located in an area that benefits from a high PTAL (6) and excellent transport links, is located within a CPZ and within the CAZ a car free development would be expected, with the exception of disabled parking. The applicants have proposed to provide a car free development which the Transport Group welcomes and support.

#### Car Club

The site is located in close proximity to one on street car club bay.

As it stands the Transport Group do not request that the applicant provides an on street car club bay. However, the Transport Group would request that the applicant makes a contribution towards the implementation of a further car club bay in the future should the existing bay becomes well used.

The Transport Group will require the applicant to provide a minimum of three years free street car membership for all residents of the proposed development.

#### Disabled parking.

The applicant has proposed three off street disabled bays.

Vehicles are required to enter and exit a development in a forward gear. However this is not the case here, but it has been agreed that there are only three spaces and Davidge Street is not a busy road and therefore, this provision is acceptable.

#### Servicing and refuse vehicle access

Servicing for new developments including refuse collection is usually required to take place off street. However, given the size of this development and site constraints, this is not possible. It is therefore requested that an informative be added to the decision notice, making the Applicant aware that any servicing which takes place on street, is subject to local restrictions.

#### Trip generation

Given that the proposed development has been proposed as car free it is envisaged that the vehicle trips associated with the site will be low. The Transport Group do not believe that the pedestrian trips will have an impact on the highway.

#### Travel Plan

The interim travel plan submitted with the application is sufficient at this stage. A full travel plan must be submitted and approved by the Local Authority, incorporating the

contents specified within the interim travel plan as well as comments within this advice. The full travel plan must be submitted and approved prior to occupation, to ensure that measures are in place to ensure sustainable travel behaviour from the outset of the development's occupation.

The travel plan must conform to Transport for London's *Travel planning for new development in London (2011)* document as well as the ATTrBuTE tool.

Should planning permission be granted it is recommended that a full travel plan is secured by Section 106 agreement and through this; commitment to surveying residents at 1, 3 and 5 years, commitment to updating the travel plan following each of the surveys, and commitment to measures identified within the travel plan, should be sought.

### Section 106 Issues

In order that the Traffic Order can be changed, a sum of £2,750 must be secured from the applicant for the costs associated with amending the TO, either through a S106 agreement or unilateral undertaking.

### Construction Management Plan

The applicant will be required to provide a construction management plan. However, this can be left to condition.

In order to improve the safety of cyclists in the borough we require that all drivers of HGVs related to construction projects have completed an accredited Cyclist Awareness course in advance of (but no more than two years before) the start of works. This includes drivers employed by sub-contractors, and drivers engaged in any HGV activity serving the site, including waste collection. Records of drivers accessing the site will be held as a matter of course. This should be supplemented by records of each driver's training in this respect, and such records should be provided to the Council ([transport@southwark.gov.uk](mailto:transport@southwark.gov.uk)) within one month of the start on site and made available to view on request thereafter.

For further information on suitable courses, please contact:

[Gareth.Tuffery@southwark.gov.uk](mailto:Gareth.Tuffery@southwark.gov.uk), Principal Road Safety Officer, 020 7525 5566

## **Statutory and non-statutory organisations**

The Victorian Society

Thank you for consulting the Victorian Society on this application. We object to a damaging and backward proposal which would see the destruction of a part of Southwark's late-Victorian architectural heritage.

The buildings in question form an interesting group and are some of the best remaining in an immediate vicinity divorced of much of its worthy architecture. They are brick-built, two-storey structures; plain but attractive, and the sort of building that at one time defined the local architectural landscape. Such buildings have become sadly isolated.

That they are proposed for demolition is regrettable. It suggests the applicants are not aware of the importance of the site they are dealing with. In some ways this is not surprising given the misleading information with which they have been provided.

## Pre-application

documents are enclosed with the application, including correspondence between the applicant and Council as to the suitability of the site for redevelopment. Unfortunately, this correspondence (Appendix 2 of the application Planning Statement) outlines the Council's apparent lack of opposition to the demolition of the warehouses, stating – in a letter from Head of Development, Mr Gary Rice, dated 26 January – “their loss is not seen as problematic”.

In light of the Council's own recommendation that these buildings be considered for local listing, this is extremely surprising. The recommendation (pages 5-6 & 9: *South of Union Street and North of Borough Road Character Area Appraisal, 2007*) continues by suggesting that 44 to 62 Lancaster Street be preserved and furthermore that they “contribute to the character and appearance of the Lancaster Street precinct”. The Council's stated views on the heritage value of these buildings are completely at odds with the advice laid out in its correspondence with the applicant. It is highly improbable that the application would ever have been submitted had the Council provided more accurate advice that accords with its own published documentation.

The pre-application correspondence from the Council also describes the buildings in question as warehouses from the early-1950s. Indeed they have undergone alteration and expansion over the years, but historic maps illustrate that the greater part of the warehouse complex was in place by 1896 at the latest and thus the Council's advice was factually flawed.

These buildings should be seen in the same light as those on Valentine Place, recently saved from demolition and offered a degree of protection by the designation of a new Conservation Area.

These buildings are undoubted heritage assets and were justifiably identified as such by the Council in 2007. Their architectural quality, their links with Southwark's industrial and commercial history and the relative rarity of this building type in the local area bestow a very particular significance that demand that this application be refused consent.

Metropolitan Police - Require a condition seeking Secure By Design certification.

Environment Agency - No objection subject to condition.

## **Neighbours and local groups**

Seven objections and an on-line petition have been submitted, objecting to this proposal on the following grounds:-

Objection, name and address withheld, objecting on the following grounds:-

Recognises there is a need for more housing but considers that the building under consideration in this application should be preserved, at least externally.

These buildings were regarded by council officials as worthy inclusion in the Council's South of Union Street and North of Borough road Character Area Appraisal Report 2007, extracts enclosed. I agree with the assessment these buildings are given in the report - these buildings not only add character to the current built environment but also reflect its history. It states that the application properties should be listed individually. Oppose the demolition of the buildings in Lancaster Street, which they believe could be maintained even for residential use, with a bit of imaginative design.

- Occupier Flat 3 Winchester Stables SE1 objects to demolition of the buildings:-



Because of the age of the structures they are by definition irreplaceable. They are crucial to the notion of the area as a neighbourhood that has come from somewhere. To replace them with identikit blocks of flats is not to care that this is Southwark, not to be proud of this area as a specific place rather than 'anywhere' where you can find modern blocks of flats made to exactly the same design. To turn it into this will rob it of the reason why people want to move here. Any owner or developer that could see the bigger picture would realise the value of these structures, but as they clearly can't it is up to the Councils to defend the area from being turned into a stretch of rabbit hutch apartments that you can find in any city.

- The Walworth Society, objects to the proposal on the following grounds:-

Character of the wider area is animated by older buildings which also tell the story of our industrial phase. The application buildings represent this part of the local historical story and are much valued by the local community. In addition the historic and evidential values contained within these buildings, there is also an aesthetic value which they contribute to the character of the surrounding area through their distinct small scale and attractive industrial architecture.

Their demolition is unwarranted and not sustainable and while there is a need for housing this should be created in an appropriate context. Indeed, for such an extreme action as demolition of a heritage asset to be justified, a clear and convincing argument must be made as to why these unique buildings are not capable of refurbishment and sensitive reuse.

Proposal should be refused as it contravenes a number of the core principles of sustainable development as set out in Section 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework

- it fails to 'take into account the different roles and character of different areas' in terms of the industrial past of this area and the buildings which remain and are intrinsic to it
- It fails to 'encourage the reuse of existing resources, including conversion of existing buildings'
- It fails to 'conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the quality of life of this and future generations'. We understand that under the policies set out in the new NPPF, these buildings qualify as being undesignated heritage assets through having being positively identified as such by the local authority, for example through the Senior Design and Conservation Officer's recent submission to the planning committee. This is a revision of the situation under PPS5 which suggested such undesignated assets had to be formally catalogued in local registers.

Beyond these core principles, policy 135 of NPPF requires appropriate regard to be given to applications that affect undesignated assets. Clearly, demolition of these buildings would constitute 'substantial harm' of the undesignated heritage assets.

The Walworth Society requests that the current planning application is rejected for the reasons set out above. We encourage the local authority to seek a sympathetic renewal of these unique buildings in a way which can sustain the special character of the area.

- Objector, name and address withheld, has forwarded a copy of a report which they say has previously been prepared for these buildings by Southwark, please find attached Character Area Appraisal 2007 (This is a publically accessible document on the Southward website.)

In Southwark Council's, 'South of Union Street and North of Borough Road Character Area Appraisal 2007' page 5- 9, is that these group of buildings ( 44-50 and 52-58 Lancaster Street) be considered and recommended for inclusion in Southwark Councils List of buildings of local historic or architectural interest.

In the pre application letter (written to the developers) by the planning dept (12-AP-1066), it states that these buildings have been around since the 1950's. In actual fact 52-58 is a Victorian factory, dating back before 1896 and the other buildings also date from around this time, yet was extended later on and still seems to have the original Victorian facade. There is no mention of these facts in the pre application letter, nor the Character appraisal undertaken in 2007. It is also written by the planning dept, that their loss ( 44-50 and 52-58 Lancaster Street) is not seen as 'problematic' - I was wondering on whose loss you are referring to? The developers?.

Another query aside, in the Planning Statement, states that the property has been marketed, yet is that for Class B ( warehouses) only? Or has it been marketed also as either a potential community facility or as a residential conversion?

Also, it would seem that the developers have chosen to neglect these buildings and allowed them to continue to have water damage over a period three years (as noted in the marketing suite of documents listed on the planning app. online) so, it seems they have not taken action to keep them in good ready shape for converting, selling or letting out. It seems they are actively letting them deteriorate, which could have been off putting to those seeking to rent it. If these buildings were listed by EH, surely the developer would need to be held to account on this and seek remedy action?

Lastly, I note that the Core Strategy has deleted the Borough and Bankside Action Plan. Is there a replacement document of this nature of which you could refer me, or is it still in development? ( Also is this a document which would be consulted on with the general public and if so, how?)

As a member of the community I would like to request these buildings are locally listed. I am also able to provide substantial evidence and indication that both local residents and the wider community would also like these locally listing. Please let me know what the process is from your end for this to take place and when the most suitable Members Committee meeting for this would be.

- Objection from the occupiers of 42a Davidge Street, SE1 0RR.

1) The colorama building is a building of historical value and adds significant character to the local area. The current plan proposes to demolish the building which would be a significant loss to the local community.

2) We are concerned that the proposed development could impact our 'right to light' - it is unclear from the documents we have seen as part of the proposal. We have been told informally by the developers that their proposed development shouldn't impact our light, however, we would ask the council to require the developers to conduct and submit a light study confirming this as part of the planning committee's consideration.

3) The proposed plan situates a communal entrance right next to our flat, specifically next to our main bedroom. We are concerned that this plan will result in substantial increase in noise. While we realise that this consideration may not be sufficient for the planning committee to deny permission, we would ask the committee mandate the developers to put in place appropriate noise mitigation steps to minimise the impact - e.g., silent hinges, muted entry phone and appropriate levels of sound proofing between

the connecting wall (for the entire length of the connection, as the current level of sound proofing between our flat and the colorama building is very limited).

4) The building work and the proposed removal of the current foundations could have significant impact on the foundations of our flat. We ask the committee to require the developers to guarantee the structural integrity of our foundations and to use an independent contractor of our choosing to survey the state of the foundations before building and after building, with the developers to fix and remediate and damage caused during development, as well as provide a guarantee to fix and damage which occurs in the 10 years after development as a result of the development.

5) The building work will cause significant disruption - both in terms of noise and dust. We would ask the planning committee to ensure that work is limited to 8-5pm during the week and no work at weekends. We would also ask the committee to require the developers to fix and damage caused during the building work, including removal of dust from our building.

6) We understand the developers mean to close of Davidge Street during their work. We would ask the committee not to allow this, as it would cause significant disruption to the local community, in particular to the school runs to Friars and Charles Dickens schools. In addition, our understanding of their plans would remove temporary parking spaces outside our building which would make managing toddlers and shopping more challenging.

- Objection from occupier of 11 Lingfield House, Lancaster Street objects on the following grounds

Affect the quality of life of neighbours to the proposal, currently buildings are low rise, characteristic building that looks good and allows light and air to reach the windows. How high will the building be, what does it look like. Concerned proposal will create noise and additional traffic. It will change the entire look of the street and obstruct daylight.

Against demolition of old style building in order to build cheap tall buildings, usually bad looking, made with poor materials and only good for property speculation.

The area does not have enough green and does not need more concrete. A communal garden has been lost , in front of the former neighbourhood office and it would only be bad to see the erection of more buildings in the street. Why don't they convert the existing flats instead? That would be an acceptable and sustainable choice.

- Occupier of 20 Stopher House 90 Webber Street objects on the following grounds:-

No adequate parking for the number of dwellings to be built, on street parking in Lancaster Street and adjoining streets is under considerable strain, with no scope for further parking.

- Objection from a friend of a local objector who objects on the following grounds:-

The history and community of the local area is rich and diverse, and is rapidly loosing its character with the influx of newly built properties that can only be afforded by rich professionals with little time to enjoy or contribute to the community. Don't let this be another loss in the area - the loss of the local pub which gave history and social place to the community is still a very sore wound, with the building work still giving off noise and

air pollution right now. The generic flats popping up all around this neighbourhood are unsightly and lack function for the community which is so needed, as well as looking directly ugly against all the historical architecture.

A local resident, name and address withheld objects on the following grounds:-

Background information

- Character Area Appraisal 2007 (This is a publically accessible document on the Southwark website, please see attached document.) [http://www.southwark.gov.uk/download/4119/south\\_of\\_union\\_street\\_and\\_north\\_of\\_borough\\_road\\_character\\_area](http://www.southwark.gov.uk/download/4119/south_of_union_street_and_north_of_borough_road_character_area)
- In Southwark Council's, 'South of Union Street and North of Borough Road Character Area Appraisal 2007' page 5- 9, is that these group of buildings ( 44-50 and 52-58 Lancaster Street) be **considered** and **recommended** for inclusion in Southwark Councils List of buildings of local historic or architectural interest.

52-58 is a Victorian factory, dating back before 1896 and retains the original foot print. 44-50 also date from around this time, yet was later extended; changing the building footprint, but still seems to have the original Victorian façade.

Previous occupiers of these buildings

- 1882  
44-46 Millar Robert (engineer)  
48 Sharp, Samuel, file cutter  
50 Cowling George, beer retailer  
  
1896  
44-46 Millar Robert (engineer)  
50 Fairburn Joseph, Chandler Shop  
52,54,56 and 58 Wix Charles &Son, Sauces and pickles  
  
1900  
44-46 Millar Robert (engineer)  
50 Fox John Chandlers shop  
  
1910  
44-48 Millar Robert (engineer)  
50 - Pauling Joseph, haberdasher  
52-58 Marshalls and Hyatt Ltd, sewing machine manufacturers  
  
1914  
50 Reitzo Domenico Chandlers Shop  
  
1923  
44-50 Premier Press Ltd  
  
1931  
44-50 premier Press Ltd

Revel E and Son, postal tube manufacturers

1940

44-50 Newnes George Ltd (publishers)

#### Planning Dept queries

- Email queries sent to the planning dept in March 2012 as to why this local listing hasn't taken place, has still not been answered, despite their 15 day response for email correspondence and repeated requests. This is key information for assessing this planning application and of which information should be accountable and accessible to the public, alongside the original report which made the recommendation in the first instance.
- The planning dept also advised via email that planning permission is not required to demolish buildings and that therefore local listing wouldn't be able to preserve the buildings. However planning permission is now required for demolition of buildings over 50 sq m and that local listing would therefore be a consideration in a planning application. (See recent Court of Appeal judgment of *SAVE Britain's Heritage v The Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government* it was found that certain parts of the UK Town and Country Planning Demolitions regulations were unlawful and they have therefore been quashed.)

#### Comments on the pre application letter

- Misleading information written by Planning officers.
  - 1) It was stated that the buildings date back from the 1950's
  - 2) No direct impacts on heritage assets or their settings.
  - 3) Their loss is not seen as problematic.

There seems a complete lack of awareness on the part of the planning officers on their own Character Appraisal which they undertook in 2007 and seem not to have undertaken any research on the buildings history. In communication with the planning dept on this matter, it was suggested that 1) they were not aware a report had been written, 2) that perhaps the recommendation for local listing was withdrawn, yet they were unable to provide information as to what had changed, or what report had reassessed this, or on what basis. The buildings remain the same group of Victorian buildings.

The planning department need to become much more accountable in this aspect as current information is not satisfactory. It is key information in making a decision on this planning application.

#### Comments on the Design

Following on from the recommendation in the Character Appraisal, these buildings

should be preserved. Especially the facades and the chimney and sustainable design solutions should start here.

The proposed buildings are too tall and buildings on either side of them are 3 stories high. South west light would be lost for existing properties on Lancaster St.

Existing trees in the car park area – where is the tree survey for these in the planning application? Would these trees be retained?

Metropolitan Police Service concerned about the recesses – as a resident I am very concerned as it will make the area unsafe. I would feel very uncomfortable walking home. The existing façade should be retained – This way the area's history and SAFETY is retained.

The design seems to copycat Muro Court, the recent development on Library Street. It doesn't add anything to the area, it hasn't already got. There could have been much more of a play on Hunter House building design references.

The proposals strip back the area of its character and the urban fabric which many people come and live here to enjoy. The proposals remove these valuable aspects of our neighbourhood.

#### Comments on developer's process

Had the developers assessed and marketed options to retain the building for residential and/or community facilities?

Why did they neglect the building and allow water damage for three years? Kalmar's the letting agency said it put off buyers and leaseholders.

Why didn't the developers maintain the buildings to a minimum standard condition for renting out?

The developers seemed to have actively and deliberately neglecting and letting the buildings deteriorate.

It seems ethically wrong and it doesn't look as though sustainable or re-use options have been considered. The proposals seem to have been driven by economics of scale and use alone.

It seems that the developers have sought only to find problems with these buildings and not solutions.

#### Comments on policy as referred to in Pre application letter, written by the Planning Dept

**6.3 (paragraph 186 NPPF)** Policy seeks to look for solutions rather than problems –

Consider approval for sustainable development which includes refurbishing and converting.

**6.5 ( Para 51 of the NPPF)** Policy seeks to boost the supply of housing.

Consider that this specific area hasn't been identified as an area for housing in the Proposals Plan 2012 and there are other suitable sites for this purpose.

**6.6 (Paragraph 51 of the NPPF** states that LPAs should normally approve planning applications for change to residential use...from commercial buildings where there is an identified need for additional housing.

Consider that there is not an identified need for housing in this specific area. The application sites are not allocated for a particular use on the council's Proposals Map 2012

#### *Local planning strategy*

The application sites are not allocated for a particular use on the council's Proposals Map 2012. Surely, if policy makers had wanted this area to become Housing they would have labeled it as such, like they did with the adjacent housing site on Library St ( Proposals site 9P). Here the housing, Use Class C3, was identified as the only permitted use, from what was a one story high housing office, with little architectural merit. ( NB- It was not a Victorian group of buildings dating back before 1896)

*7.2 – The applicant can demonstrate that convincing attempts to dispose of the premises for continued commercial use, over a period of 24 months have been unsuccessful.*

My query, as noted earlier, is whether the developers have had any other marketing strategies, for other uses of the existing buildings, such as community facilities or housing?

*7.3 – The redevelopment of the land to the west of the proposal site for housing (Proposed site 9P) increases the already residential nature of the immediate area.*

More housing of this scale and massing is objected to, especially when it has been noted by other residents in the petition that they would benefit from community facilities within the area. More housing in this immediate area would not benefit the existing community, yet community facilities would.

Proposals should also be designed with regard to their local context, making a positive contribution to the character of the areas townscape and providing active frontages. These proposals are detrimental to the local character as they remove the local historic character.

Saved policy 3.12 New buildings and alterations to existing buildings should embody a creative and high quality design solution, specific to their sites shape, size, location and development opportunities and where applicable preserving or enhancing the historic environment. These proposals are detrimental to the local character as they remove the local historic character.

#### Borough and Bankside Area Action Plan

Another significant matter is that there used to be a Borough and Bankside Area Action Plan which was recently deleted. However in the introduction of the Core Strategy, there is reference to renewing these plans. My objection is why the planning dept feel able to decide on major planning applications without these documents being in place. (It seems the community has also been denied the opportunity of being consulted on their areas in this manner, before decisions are being made.)

### Policy 3.15 Conservation of the historic Environment

*'Development should preserve or enhance the special interest or historic character or appearance of buildings or areas of historical or architectural significance. Planning proposals that have an adverse effect on the environment will not be permitted.'* (in this policy, it states this 'includes' conservation areas, yet it doesn't state it is 'limited' to conservation areas) Reasons: *'The council recognises the importance of Southwark's built heritage as a community asset and will seek the adequate safeguards of this asset....these historical features define the local environment, providing a sense of place and enriching the townscape*

### Conclusion

There is great value to preserving Victorian character buildings as they reflect the past, which gives the area its identity - otherwise it will become an area unidentifiable from anywhere else.

These buildings on Lancaster St could be converted into residential buildings or community facilities - yet it seems the potential for this to happen has actively been neglected by the developers, where they have allowed them to fall into disrepair. Yet has this been costed and assessed in more detail? How much would a sustainable solution cost?

The council's objective of increasing housing needs in this area is one thing, but bear in mind, this location isn't a site which they have actively identified as a housing opportunity site and has been one where they too have actively promoted as being preserved.

The fact that over 295 people have signed the petition to retain these buildings only confirms this further.

It is too easy to bulldoze the past and replace with copycat housing. More creative solutions are required, which embrace both the present and the future.

Community petition with 96 signatures was also supplied with this letter, objecting to the loss of these buildings. The e-mail address to view the petition is <http://www.ipetitions.com/petition/demolition-threat-to-colorama-victorian/>