

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Classification:</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>Meeting Name:</b>
7.5	OPEN	23 April 2013	Planning Sub-Committee A
<b>Report title:</b>	<b>Development Management planning application:</b> Application 12/AP/1818 for: Full Planning Permission  <b>Address:</b> 4-7 VINE YARD, LONDON SE1 1QL  <b>Proposal:</b> Construction of a second floor and part third floor extension above existing office building to provide 3no. residential flats (2 x two bedroom and 1 x one bedroom) with terraces.		
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>	Cathedrals		
<b>From:</b>	Head of Development Management		
<b>Application Start Date</b> 20/08/2012		<b>Application Expiry Date</b> 15/10/2012	

## RECOMMENDATION

- 1 Grant planning permission

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

### Site location and description

- 2 The application property comprises a two-storey plus basement former warehouse building which is currently used for commercial purposes as offices. The site is located within Vine Yard, which is accessed via Sanctuary Street, and generally to the rear of Borough Underground station. Vine Yard continues around the subject site and culminates in a small courtyard, with some landscaping, and hardstanding which appears to be used for car parking.
- 3 The site comprises a two attached, two storey brick buildings with a basement level, and has multiple street level entries, and which is currently used as a recording studio and offices. The site abuts a four storey brick building to the west, and 3-4 storey buildings stand opposite the courtyard to the south, which also have primary frontages to Lant Street to the south. The use of land in the area includes residential, office, and retail.
- 4 The surrounding buildings are of varying heights ranging from two to four storeys but having greater than average floor to ceiling heights they appear taller. The building is not located within a conservation area nor is it listed or adjacent to one..

### Details of proposal

- 5 The proposal under consideration seeks planning permission for construction of a second floor and part third floor extension above existing office building to provide 3no. residential flats (2 x two bedroom and 1 x one bedroom) with terraces.
- 6 The proposed flats proposed are as follow;

Unit 1 - 2 bed flat (second floor) - 69.3 sq.m  
Bed 1 (en-suite) - 17 sq.m  
Bed 2 - 7 sq.m  
Living/diner/kitch - 27.7 sq.m  
Bath/wc - 4.3 sq.m  
Store - 1.2 sq.m  
Terrace - 9 sq.m

Unit 2 - 1 bed flat (second floor) - 57.5 sq.m  
Bed 1 - 12.2 sq.m  
Living/Diner/kitch - 34 sq.m  
Bath/wc - 3.6 sq.m  
Store - 1.1 sq.m  
Terrace - 10 sq.m

Unit 3 (Maisonette, 2nd and 3rd floors) 70.6 sq.m  
Bed 1 (en-suite) - 14 sq.m  
Bed 2 14 sq.m  
Living/diner/kitch - 26 sq.m  
Bath/wc - 2.6 sq.m  
Terrace - 15 sq.m

- 7 All the units have been designed with a minimum floor to ceiling height of 2.4 metres with dual aspect design.
- 8 All the units have been designed with private amenity space in the form of terraces with sizes as detailed above in the description of the proposed units.
- 9 The main residential access into the development is off Vine Yard.
- 10 Adequate refuse/recycling storage provision will be located on the ground floor to the eastern side of the building and will be accessed off Vine Yard.

There is very minor difference between the application proposal and the expired permission under reference 04-AP-0324 and that is the introduction of a ground floor door on the east elevation that provides access into the refuse store and additional glazing to the second floor bedroom on the east elevation.

### **Planning history**

- 11 00-AP-0949  
Planning permission granted on 18/08/2000 for replacement of all doors and windows on all elevations plus the installation of two new windows on ground & 1st floor on the east elevation.
- 12 03-AP-0309  
An application for the erection of a 2nd and part 3rd floor extension to existing building to create 3 flats with new ground floor entrance from front was submitted to the Council for consideration on 06/02/2003. The application was subsequently withdrawn on 22/04/2003.
- 13 04-AP-0324  
Planning permission was granted on 08/07/2004 for the construction of a second floor and part third floor extension above existing basement and two storey office building to provide 3 residential flats.

- 14 05-AP-0487  
Planning permission was refused on 10/05/2005 for change of use from commercial to residential on first floor, comprising one no. 1 bed flat and one no.2 bed flat. Works also to include insertion of new window on SE elevation;

The reasons for refusal were:

*The development, by means of the loss of existing office space, would be detrimental to the supply of office space and potentially reduce employment generating activity in the Borough. As such, the development would be contrary to Policy B.1.2 'Protection Outside of Employment Areas and Sites' of the Southwark Unitary Development Plan 1995 [UDP] and Policy 1.4 'Preferred Office Locations' of The Southwark Plan [Revised Deposit Unitary Development Plan] February 2005.*

*The development, by means of the substandard habitable room window sizes, would represent a poor standard of residential development to the detriment of future occupants. As such, the development would be contrary to Policy H.1.8 'Standards for New Housing' of the Southwark Unitary Development Plan 1995 [UDP] and Policies 3.2 'Protection of Amenity' and 4.2 'Residential Design Standards' of The Southwark Plan [Revised Deposit Unitary Development Plan] February 2005.*

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

- 15 5 - 7 Marshalsea Road  
03-AP-1208  
Planning permission granted 06/04/2004 for the erection of extensions at 1st, 2nd and 3rd floor levels, erection of additional floors at 4th and 5th floor level, installation of air conditioning units & plant equipment behind an acoustic screen on the roof and alterations to the external facade.
- 16 05-AP-0969  
Planning permission granted 13/09/2005 for the change of use of the ground floor from offices (Class B1) to a restaurant (Class A3)
- 17 8 Vine Yard and 59 Lant Street  
02-AP-0253  
Planning permission refused on 16/01/2003 for construction of additional floor to 8 Vine Yard to provide new 3 bed flat; balustrading above proposed flat to provide terrace for 2nd floor flat at 59 Lant Street with the insertion of an obscure glazed window to north-facing gable end at 2nd floor flat, 59 Lant Street.
- The Council's reason for refusal was;
- The proposed structure, by virtue of its height and proximity to adjoining premises would give rise to an unacceptable loss of natural light, and thereby loss of amenity to residential premises at 6, Vine Yard.*
- Permission was subsequently granted on appeal on 04/09/2003.
- 18 02-AP-0541  
Planning permission was granted on 02/09/2002 for change of use of second floor to provide 3 bedroom flat.

## **KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

### **Summary of main issues**

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

- a] the principle of the development in terms of land use and conformity with strategic policies.
- b] impact of proposed development on amenity of adjoining occupiers and surrounding area;
- c] standard of living accommodation;
- d] impact of proposed development on character and appearance of the building and surrounding area;
- e] transport considerations;
- f] the design of the proposal.

### **Planning policy**

#### Core Strategy 2011

Strategic Policy 1 - Sustainable Development  
Strategic Policy 2 - Sustainable Transport  
Strategic Policy 5 - Providing New Homes  
Strategic Policy 12 - Design and Conservation  
Strategic Policy 13 - High Environmental Standards

#### Southwark Plan 2007 (July) - saved policies

Policy 3.2 - Protection of Amenity  
Policy 3.12 - Quality in Design  
Policy 3.7 Waste reduction  
Policy 3.11 - Efficient use of land  
Policy 3.13 - Urban Design  
Policy 4.2 - Quality of Residential Accommodation  
Policy 5.2 - Transport Impacts  
Policy 5.3 - Walking and Cycling  
Policy 5.6 - Car Parking

Residential Design Standards (SPD) 2011

#### London Plan 2011

Policy 3.3 Increasing housing supply  
Policy 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments  
Policy 3.9 Mixed and balanced communities  
Policy 3.11 Efficient use of land  
Policy 5.3 Sustainable design and construction  
Policy 5.12 Flood risk management  
Policy 5.18 Construction, excavation and demolition waste  
Policy 6.3 Assessing effects of development on transport capacity  
Policy 6.9 Cycling  
Policy 6.13 Parking  
Policy 7.4 Local character

### National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

The NPPF came into effect on 27 March 2012 and is a material planning consideration. In terms of consideration of the NPPF and the status of the Core Strategy and the saved Southwark Plan policies these will be set out in an addendum report. In respect to the NPPF the most relevant parts of the NPPF are:-

- 1) Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes
- 7) Requiring good design

### **Principle of development**

- 19 The property is situated within the Borough and Bankside Opportunity Area where mixed use developments are welcomed. There will be only a minor loss of commercial floorspace within the proposal, where a new entrance and staircase are constructed. There are other residential developments within the area and permission had been allowed on appeal at appeal on 8 Vine Yard and 59 Lant Street for the construction of additional floor to 8 Vine Yard to provide a new 3 bed flat; balustrading above proposed flat to provide terrace for 2nd floor flat at 59 Lant Street. It is considered that the provision of three residential units above the commercial element is acceptable in principle.
- 20 Furthermore regard must be had for planning permission granted 08/07/2004 under application reference 04-AP-0324 for a very similar scheme, in so far as the building footprint, bulk and mass is concerned, which is a material consideration that established the principle of residential use at that location. Although there are minor elevational variations in the proposed development when compared to the expired permission, these are not considered to be significant, as the changes involve the introduction of a new door to the refuse storage area on the ground floor on the east elevation and the introduction of additional window to the second floor bedroom, also on the east elevation.

### **Environmental impact assessment**

- 21 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**

- 22 The applicants have submitted a sunlight/daylight report in support of the application. The report gives an assessment of the impact of the development on the light receivable by the neighbouring properties at 8 Vine Yard (2nd floor) and 59 Lant Street/6 Vine Yard which are in residential use, based on information supplied by the valuation office as the two properties registered for Council Tax and therefore in

residential occupation.

- 23 The study carried out is based on various numerical tests laid down in the British Research Establishment (BRE) guide 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight'.
- 24 The BRE guide sets out three methods for assessing daylight impacts on neighbouring properties where internal arrangements are not known.
- 25 The first of these methods is the 25 degree angle test. This test is to strike a line at an angle of 25 degrees from the centre of the lowest existing windows and if the profile of the development sits beneath the 25 degree angle line, then the development is unlikely to have a substantial effect on the daylight enjoyed by the existing building. However, the report states that this test has not been used for the assessment of the proposal as it does not always reflect the differing heights and layouts of the buildings in the local area.
- 26 If the proposed development protrudes past the 25 degree angle line then the second test, the Vertical Sky Component (VSC) needs to be considered. In so far as the assessment of the proposed development goes, this test has not been applied as it does not always reflect the differing heights and layouts of the buildings in the local area.
- 27 The second method calculates the Vertical Sky Component (VSC) at the centre point of each affected window on the outside face of the wall. The VSC is an external daylighting calculation that measures the amount of direct daylight to a specific window point on the outside of the property. The calculations fundamentally assess the amount of blue sky that will be seen converting results into a percentage. A window looking into an empty field will achieve a maximum value of 40%. However the BRE suggests that 27% VSC achieves a good level of daylight.
- 28 The third method involves calculating the VSC at the window of the existing situation, i.e before redevelopment. If the reduction of VSC is less than 0.8 times its former value then the occupants of the adjoining building are likely to notice the reduction in daylight. In conjunction with the VSC tests, the BRE guidelines suggests that the distribution of daylight is assessed using the No Sky Line (NSL) test. This test separates those e areas of the working plane that can receive direct skylight and those that cannot.
- 29 The sunlight/daylight report also states that a further daylighting method which is used for the internal daylighting levels of all new residential construction is the Average Daylight Factor (ADF) calculation. This calculation takes into account the size and shape of the room and window, the reflectance of the room's surfaces and the diffuse transmittance of the glazing as well as the amount of blue sky calculated in the VSC calculation.
- 30 With regards to sunlight, the BRE guide also sets out three methods of assessing the potential effect of sunlight on existing windows.
- 31 The first test is the application of the 25 degree angle test. This test is to strike a line at an angle of 25 degrees from the centre of the lowest existing windows and if the profile of the development sits beneath the 25 degree angle line, then the development is unlikely to have a substantial effect on the daylight enjoyed by the existing building.
- 32 The second test used for calculating sunlight is the Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH) at the centre of each window on the outside face of the window wall.. The BRE guide suggests that 'if this window point can receive more than one quarter of the

APSH, including at least 5% of APSH in the winter months between 21 September and 21 March, then the room should still receive enough sunlight.

- 33 The third test involves calculating the APSH at the window in the existing situation, i.e. before the redevelopment. If the reduction of APSH between the existing and proposed situation is less than 0.8 times its former value for either the total APSH or in the winter months, and greater than 4% for the total APSH, then the occupants of the adjoining building are likely to notice the reduction in sunlight.
- 34 The report concludes that the daylight analysis undertaken shows that all windows tested at 8 Vine Yard (2nd floor) meet the BRE guidelines criteria achieving either a VSC of 27% and above in the proposed situation or a ratio reduction of at least 0.8 times its former value. The report conclusion also states that no sky line tests have been undertaken. The no sky line test shows no reduction in daylight distribution between the existing and proposed. It also states that as all windows face within 90 degrees of due north no sunlight analysis was required.
- 35 With regards to 59 Lant Street/6 Vine Yard, the report concludes that all windows tested meet the BRE guidelines criteria achieving either a VSC of 27% and above in the proposed situation or a ratio reduction of at least 0.8 times its former value. The report conclusion also states that no sky line tests have been undertaken. The no sky line test shows no reduction in daylight distribution between the existing and proposed. It also states that all windows tested meet the BRE guidelines for sunlight criteria achieving either an APSH of 25%, with 5% being in the winter months or a ratio reduction of at least 0.8 times its former value.
- 36 The submitted report therefore demonstrates that the proposed development will not cause undue harm that will be detrimental to the amenity currently enjoyed by nearby residents having regard to sunlight/daylight. However, more information will be available at the meeting in respect to the objection raised in respect to the impact on amenity space.
- 37 With regards to outlook and privacy, it is unlikely that the proposed development will cause undue harm to the amenity currently enjoyed by nearby residents, given the juxtaposition of the proposed development in relation to existing surrounding buildings. Furthermore there are no windows in the proposed development that directly faces onto existing windows within close proximity as there is reasonable separating distance between windows in the proposed development and nearby surrounding windows and in the circumstances unlikely to cause harm to amenity.

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

- 38 The character of the area is comprise a mix of commercial and residential uses. As such the proposal is not considered to be more sensitive to these uses than other surrounding residential uses and as such the proposed development involving the construction of a second floor and part third floor extension above existing office building to provide 3no. residential flats (2 x two bedroom and 1 x one bedroom) with terraces will not suffer any loss of amenity from noise or general disturbance as the proposed use is considered to be compatible with the surrounding area.

#### **Traffic issues**

- 39 The proposal is unlikely to give rise to any significant issues in so far as traffic generation or highway safety is concerned given the site's location being in very close proximity of very good public transport services. The proposal makes no off street car parking provision due to the constrained nature of the site. The Council's Traffic Group

raise no objections to this having regard to the location in an area with a very high Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating of 6, reflecting the area's high level of access to all forms of public transport. However they comment that refuse and cycle storage provision should be addressed. This will be secured by condition.

- 40 In addition the Traffic Group requests that CPZ exemption to exclude future occupiers of the development from obtaining parking permits should be secured by way of a condition.

### **Design issues**

- 41 Saved Policy 3.13 'Urban Design' of the Southwark Plan advised that principles of good urban design must be taken into account in all developments. Urban design is the relationship between different buildings and streets.
- 42 In designing new developments, consideration must be given to:  
i. Height, scale and massing of buildings – Designing a building that is appropriate to the local context and which does not dominate its surroundings inappropriately
- 43 The scale of the new development has been designed to make efficient use of the site whilst minimising the impact to neighbouring dwellings and businesses. There are no alterations proposed to the existing building at ground and first floors other than the main entrance to the flats where the window will be replaced with a door and the refuse storage area.
- 44 As with the previously approved scheme, the proposed development involves the creation of a number of 'boxes' on the roof with the extension to the north at both part second and third floors within the existing north elevation. In keeping with the existing building the second and part third floor accommodation will have a variety of regular window openings and the windows would be kept in the same arrangement and orientation to avoid potential overlooking and loss of privacy problems.
- 45 The external walls would be cladded and it is proposed that a material contrasting with the brickwork is used. It is also proposed that a solid grade laminate, such as Eternite, as a rainscreen cladding is used in contrast with the existing and adjoining building. The proposed roof will be waterproofed with a grey coloured single ply membrane, such as Trocal, and in part will be covered with sedum planting together with terrace areas of timber decking.
- 46 Whilst the choice of materials may be acceptable in principle, Officers consider that this should be dealt with as reserved matters, the details which will be secured by condition.
- 47 Officers also considered that the height, scale and bulk of the proposed development would be acceptable in this location and would not look out character with the surrounding properties nor would it result in dominance. The development would sit well within the context of the site and contribute positively to the neighbouring properties.

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

- 48 None envisaged. The application property is not adjoined to or within close proximity of listed buildings neither is it in a conservation area or adjacent to one.

### **Impact on trees**

- 49 There are no trees affected by the proposal.



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

50 The proposal raises no S106 issues.

## **Sustainable development implications**

51 The design of the development has been given careful consideration to ensure that natural lighting and ventilation potential of the new accommodation is maximised with good levels of thermal comfort will be achieved by high levels of thermal insulation and good airtightness to minimise uncontrollable draughts.

52 The building will be insulated in line with Building Regulations and therefore will be a very thermally efficient building. Less heat will be required as heat loss through the building's envelope will be kept to a minimum. This will also reduce carbon dioxide emissions for the whole development.

53 A condition is recommended requiring the applicant to submit details as to how the development would achieve level 4 of the 'Code for Sustainable Homes. This is in accordance with Strategic Policy 13 of the Core Strategy 'High Environmental Standards'.

## **Other matters**

### **54 Flood Risk**

The site in question is partly within Flood Zone and flood zones are drawn ignoring the presence of flood defences including the Thames Barrier. The most flood risk sensitive part of the proposal is the development of the space in a basement. The Flood Risk Assessment accompanying the proposal is regarded as acceptable to the Environment Agency.

55 The site is within a Flood zone 3 and the Applicant has submitted a Flood Risk Assessment. The Environment Agency has no objections to the scheme as the River Thames flood defences in this area defend the site to a 1 in 1000 year annual probability of river flooding in any year (<0.1%). Areas of residual flood risk can occur due to failure of the flood defences or a design flood event greater than that mentioned above. However according to the best information available the site lies outside the area of residual risk of flooding.

### **56 CIL**

Section 143 of the Localism Act 2011 states the any financial sum that an authority has received, will, or could receive in the payment of CIL as a material "local financial consideration" in planning decisions. The requirement for Mayoral CIL is a material consideration. However, the weight to be attached to a local finance consideration remains a matter for the decision-maker. Mayoral CIL is to be used for strategic transport improvements in London, primarily Crossrail. CIL is payable on this application as under the current guidance a calculation is made for any new floor space created by the provision of a new residential building.

57 As the application proposal involves the redevelopment of the site, the proposed development is liable for 100% CIL contribution. This involves the creation of 198 sq.m of new residential floorspace. The payment required equates to 198 x £35 for the new residential floorspace which equates to a total of £6,930.00.

## **Conclusion on planning issues**

58 The proposed construction of a second floor and part third floor extension above

existing office building to provide 3no. residential flats (2 x two bedroom and 1 x one bedroom) with terraces is considered acceptable in principle as the proposal raises no fundamental policy issues. Although the proposal makes no provision for off street car parking provision, this has to be judged against the merits of the proposed scheme and the site constraints which on balance is considered acceptable, Furthermore the location of the site within very close proximity of good public transport services makes a car free development acceptable on balance. It is recommended therefore that planning permission.

### **Community impact statement**

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

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

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

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

### **60 Consultations**

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

### **Consultation replies**

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

### **63 Summary of consultation responses**

9 letters of objection received on the grounds of loss of light, overshadowing, loss of privacy, noise and disturbance, affect on wildlife in courtyard garden, inaccuracy of sunlight/daylight report.

### **Human rights implications**

64 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.

65 This application has the legitimate aim of erection of a second floor and part third floor extension above existing office building to provide 3no. residential flats (2 x two bedroom and 1 x one bedroom) with terraces. 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/1495-222 Application file: 12/AP/1818 Southwark Local Development Framework and Development Plan Documents	Chief Executive's Department 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH	Planning enquiries telephone: 020 7525 5403 Planning enquiries email: <a href="mailto:planning.enquiries@southwark.gov.uk">planning.enquiries@southwark.gov.uk</a> Case officer telephone: 020 7525 5428 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>	Donald Hanciles, Senior Planning Officer	
<b>Version</b>	Final	
<b>Dated</b>	3 April 2013	
<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 of Finance & 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>	12 April 2013	

**Consultation undertaken**

**Site notice date:** 05/07/2012

**Press notice date:** Not required

**Case officer site visit date:** 05/07/2012

**Neighbour consultation letters sent:** 03/07/2013

**Internal services consulted:**

Transport Group  
Design and Conservation  
Environmental Protection Team

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

Environment Agency

**Neighbours and local groups consulted**

---

03/07/2012 FLAT 6 6 VINE YARD LONDON SE1 1QL  
03/07/2012 FLAT 7 6 VINE YARD LONDON SE1 1QL  
03/07/2012 FLAT 4 6 VINE YARD LONDON SE1 1QL  
03/07/2012 FLAT 5 6 VINE YARD LONDON SE1 1QL  
03/07/2012 226 BOROUGH HIGH STREET LONDON SE1 1JX  
03/07/2012 FOURTH FLOOR 210 BOROUGH HIGH STREET LONDON SE1 1JX  
03/07/2012 FLAT 2 6 VINE YARD LONDON SE1 1QL  
03/07/2012 FLAT 3 6 VINE YARD LONDON SE1 1QL  
03/07/2012 5 VINE YARD LONDON SE1 1QL  
03/07/2012 FLAT 1 6 VINE YARD LONDON SE1 1QL  
03/07/2012 FLAT 11 VINE YARD LONDON SE1 1QL  
03/07/2012 FIRST FLOOR FRONT 210-212 BOROUGH HIGH STREET LONDON SE1 1JX  
03/07/2012 FIRST FLOOR REAR 210-212 BOROUGH HIGH STREET LONDON SE1 1JX  
03/07/2012 BASEMENT AND GROUND FLOOR FRONT 210-212 BOROUGH HIGH STREET LONDON SE1 1JX  
03/07/2012 GROUND FLOOR REAR 210-212 BOROUGH HIGH STREET LONDON SE1 1JX  
03/07/2012 FIRST FLOOR 8 VINE YARD LONDON SE1 1QL  
03/07/2012 SECOND FLOOR 8 VINE YARD LONDON SE1 1QL  
03/07/2012 FOURTH FLOOR FRONT 210-212 BOROUGH HIGH STREET LONDON SE1 1JX  
03/07/2012 FOURTH FLOOR REAR 210-212 BOROUGH HIGH STREET LONDON SE1 1JX  
03/07/2012 FIRST FLOOR FLAT 57A LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1QN  
03/07/2012 FLAT 1 214-216 BOROUGH HIGH STREET LONDON SE1 1JX  
03/07/2012 LANGDALE HOUSE 11 MARSHALSEA ROAD LONDON SE1 1EN  
03/07/2012 FLAT 2 8 VINE YARD LONDON SE1 1QL  
03/07/2012 FLAT 4 214-216 BOROUGH HIGH STREET LONDON SE1 1JX  
03/07/2012 FLAT 5 214-216 BOROUGH HIGH STREET LONDON SE1 1JX  
03/07/2012 FLAT 2 214-216 BOROUGH HIGH STREET LONDON SE1 1JX  
03/07/2012 FLAT 3 214-216 BOROUGH HIGH STREET LONDON SE1 1JX  
03/07/2012 UNIT 39 LANGDALE HOUSE 11 MARSHALSEA ROAD LONDON SE1 1EP  
03/07/2012 UNIT 32 LANGDALE HOUSE 11 MARSHALSEA ROAD LONDON SE1 1EP  
03/07/2012 2 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1ED  
03/07/2012 6 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1ED  
03/07/2012 FIRST TO SECOND FLOOR 9 MARSHALSEA ROAD LONDON SE1 1HL  
03/07/2012 FIRST FLOOR FLAT FRONT 226A BOROUGH HIGH STREET LONDON SE1 1JX  
03/07/2012 UNIT 22 LANGDALE HOUSE 11 MARSHALSEA ROAD LONDON SE1 1EP  
03/07/2012 UNIT 21 LANGDALE HOUSE 11 MARSHALSEA ROAD LONDON SE1 1EP  
03/07/2012 SECOND FLOOR AND THIRD FLOOR FLAT 57A LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1QN  
03/07/2012 BASEMENT 9 MARSHALSEA ROAD LONDON SE1 1HL  
03/07/2012 BASEMENT AND GROUND FLOOR 222-224 BOROUGH HIGH STREET LONDON SE1 1JX  
03/07/2012 SECOND FLOOR 222-224 BOROUGH HIGH STREET LONDON SE1 1JX  
03/07/2012 THIRD FLOOR 9 MARSHALSEA ROAD LONDON SE1 1HL  
03/07/2012 FOURTH FLOOR 9 MARSHALSEA ROAD LONDON SE1 1HL  
03/07/2012 GROUND FLOOR 9 MARSHALSEA ROAD LONDON SE1 1HL  
03/07/2012 BASEMENT AND GROUND FLOOR 214-216 BOROUGH HIGH STREET LONDON SE1 1JX

03/07/2012 FIRST FLOOR 4-7 VINE YARD LONDON SE1 7QL  
03/07/2012 BASEMENT FRONT 4-7 VINE YARD LONDON SE1 1QL  
03/07/2012 BASEMENT REAR 4-7 VINE YARD LONDON SE1 1QL  
03/07/2012 57A LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1QN  
03/07/2012 FIRST FLOOR TO FIFTH FLOOR 5-7 MARSHALSEA ROAD LONDON SE1 1EP  
03/07/2012 CAR PARKING SPACES 5-7 MARSHALSEA ROAD LONDON SE1 1EP  
03/07/2012 SECOND FLOOR AND THIRD FLOOR FLAT 226A BOROUGH HIGH STREET LONDON SE1 1JX  
03/07/2012 FIRST FLOOR 222-224 BOROUGH HIGH STREET LONDON SE1 1JX  
03/07/2012 GROUND FLOOR 4-7 VINE YARD LONDON SE1 1QL  
03/07/2012 BASEMENT AND GROUND FLOOR 5-7 MARSHALSEA ROAD LONDON SE1 1EP  
03/07/2012 THIRD FLOOR 222-224 BOROUGH HIGH STREET LONDON SE1 1JX  
20/06/1837 6 VINE YARD LONDON SE1 1QL  
20/06/1837 27 SVENSKABY ORTON WISTOW PETERBOROUGH PE2 6YZ  
20/06/1837 8 VINE YARD LONDON SE1 1QL  
20/06/1837 by email

**Neighbours and local groups consulted:**

**Re-consultation:**

10/10/2012

### Consultation responses received

#### Internal services

Design and Conservation - comments incorporated into body of report

Transport Group -

Environmental Protection Team - comment that as the development is not exposed to traffic pollution and given the relatively small scale of the proposal it would be unreasonable to insist that a Noise Assessment or Air Quality Assessment is submitted.

#### Statutory and non-statutory organisations

Environment Agency - no objections, but comment that imposing a condition regarding a flood evacuation plan should be considered.

#### Neighbours and local groups

Flat 2, 6 Vine Yard - object on grounds that the proposed development will result in loss of light, loss of privacy, noise and inconvenience, traffic and access, issues with construction traffic, noise and dust, and would alter the character and feel of the area.

Flat 6, 6 Vine Yard - object on grounds of loss of light and the accuracy of the sunlight/daylight report submitted.

6 Vine Yard - object on grounds of loss of natural light, overlooking, the external appearance of the proposed development not in keeping with the surrounding area, reduction in natural light to rear garden thereby impeding growth of plants

5-7 Marshalsea Road - object on grounds of poor design and appearance of the proposed development is not appropriate, loss of sunlight and overshadowing, overlooking and loss of privacy.

Flat 4, 6 Vine Yard - object on grounds of loss of light, noise and disturbance, the development being out of character with the area, parking and servicing problems, the development will not be in keeping with the community spirit that exists.

Flat 7, 6 Vine Yard - objects on grounds of noise, overlooking and loss of privacy, loss of visual amenity, resources and facilities already stretched, impact of effective running of business due to noise and disturbance, technical errors with the sunlight/daylight report originally submitted.

Flat 3, 6 Vine Yard - object on grounds that the development will impact negatively on the garden, loss of light to the garden and negative impact on wild life in the garden.

1st floor, 8 Vine Yard - object on grounds of loss of natural daylight, overlooking and loss of confidentiality, loss of communal garden space, design not in keeping with the existing buildings

Flat 3, 6 Vine Yard - no objections to the proposed development but raised serious concerns about rubbish storage and removals. Request a condition on refuse management should be imposed on any permission granted.