

<b>Item No.</b> 6.1	<b>Classification:</b> OPEN	<b>Date:</b> 7 May 2013	<b>Meeting Name:</b> Planning Committee
<b>Report title:</b>	<p><b>Development Management planning application:</b> Application 12/AP/2737 for: Full Planning Permission</p> <p><b>Address:</b> TOWER BRIDGE BUSINESS COMPLEX, CLEMENTS ROAD, LONDON SE16 4DG</p> <p><b>Proposal:</b> Hybrid planning application comprising:</p> <p>1. Application for <u>full</u> planning permission for the demolition of existing buildings and the erection of a new part 5, part 7 and part 9 storey building (max height 32.125m AOD) fronting Clements Road providing 119 residential units, plus associated highway works, vehicle access, car and cycle parking and landscaping, including all related ancillary facilities (storage, management facilities and plant).</p> <p>2. Application for <u>outline</u> planning permission (with all matters reserved) for the demolition of existing buildings and the development of a mixed use scheme providing a number of buildings ranging from 14.08m (AOD) to 32.45m (AOD) in height (approximately 4 to 9 storeys) providing up to 73,000sqm of residential floorspace (up to 681units) and up to 8,240sqm of new commercial floorspace (Use Classes A1, A2, A3, B1, B8, D1 and D2), plus associated highway and public realm works, landscaping, car and cycle parking, and related infrastructure works.</p> <p>The application is accompanied by an environmental statement.</p>		
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>	Riverside		
<b>From:</b>	Head of Development Management		
<b>Application Start Date</b> 16/10/2012		<b>Application Expiry Date</b> 31/03/2013 PPA Application	

## RECOMMENDATION

- 1
  - a) That planning permission is GRANTED subject to conditions (which are subject to further refinement and discussion with the applicant) and the applicant entering into an appropriate legal agreement by no later than 30 August 2013, and subject to referral to the Mayor of London;
  - b) If it is resolved to grant planning permission, that it is confirmed that the environmental information has been taken into account as required by Regulation 3(4) of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessments) Regulations 2011;
  - c) That it is confirmed that, following issue of the decision, the Head of Development Management should place a statement on the Statutory Register pursuant to Regulation 24 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact

Assessments) Regulations 2011 which contains the information required by Regulation 21 and that for the purposes of Regulation 24(1)(c) the main reasons and considerations on which the Planning Committee's decision was based shall be set out as in this report;

d) In the event that the requirements of (a) are not met by 30 August 2013, the Head of Development Management be authorised to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out under paragraph 184.

## **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

### **Site location and description**

- 2 The site is the Tower Bridge Business Centre, formerly known as the Biscuit Factory. The site is triangular in size and contains 14 factory buildings. It is bound by Clements Road to the north, Drummond Road to the east and a railway viaduct to the west.
- 3 The Peaks Freans factory closed in 1989 and the site currently provides multi-occupier small and medium business accommodation, but also includes other leisure facilities such as an indoor go-karting facility and a climbing wall. There are also a number of vacant units. The estate comprises refurbished late 19th and early 20th century former factory buildings and more recent single storey industrial units.
- 4 The site is situated within a predominantly residential area containing a mix of terraced properties and housing estates. To the north lies predominantly two storey housing and also the Southwark College. To the east lies the Four Squares Estate. Further to the east lies Southwark Park. The remainder of the site is bounded by the railway viaduct, which lies to the south-west. The site is close to The Blue town centre which provides local shops and services. The nearest underground station is Bermondsey, located to the north around 450m away.
- 5 The site is approximately 4.5 hectares in area and is owned by Workspace Group Plc.

### **Details of proposal**

- 6 The application is in a 'hybrid' form, with full permission sought for part of the development and the remaining aspects provided in outline only. The two parts of the application are described below. Plot 1 has details provided in full, with the outline being submitted with all matters reserved.
- 7 The development would replace the redundant warehouse units within the northern part of the site. The buildings at the southern end of the site would be retained and refurbished under the proposals.

#### Plot 1 Full application

- 8 Plot 1 is located in the north western corner of the site, fronting Clements Road to the north and the railway viaduct to the south-west side. It would comprise the erection of a new building ranging between five and nine storeys arranged around car parking at ground floor level and a first floor podium. This plot would provide 119 residential units, 13 of which would be disabled units and 18 car parking spaces.
- 9 Plot 1 would provide the following mix:
  - 39 x 1 bed units
  - 54 x 2 bed units
  - 26 x 3 bed units
  - Total of 119 units

10 26% of the housing would be affordable (measured by habitable room).

#### Outline application

11 Outline planning permission is sought for the remainder of the master plan area with all matters reserved. A total of 5 phases are proposed for development, providing up to 681 residential units. Combined with Plot 1, this would produce a total of 6 phases for redevelopment.

12 The outline planning application is accompanied by a series of parameter plans. These set out the minimum and maximum parameters for the building footprints, building heights, road widths and open space. A design code has been developed by the applicant which describes the vision and objectives for the appearance of the outline phase. It is intended that any reserved matters application for the outline phase would follow the guidance in the design code. However until the reserved matters applications have been submitted, the final appearance of the buildings would not be known.

13 It is proposed that the development would be delivered in 6 defined phases:

- Phase 1 – plot 1 and associated access roads and footpaths
  - Phase 2 – plot 2 and associated access roads and footpaths
  - Phase 3 – plot 3 and associated access roads and footpaths
  - Phase 4 – plot 7 and associated access roads and footpaths
  - Phase 5 – plot 4 and plot 5 and associated access roads and footpaths and part of central square
  - Phase 6 – plot 6 and associated roads and footpaths and rest of central square.
- Each phase would take approximately 24 months to construct.

14 An indicative mix for the outline application is as follows:

- 252 x 1 bed
- 291 x 2 bed
- 116 x 3 bed
- 22 x 4 bed
- Total 681 units (maximum).

15 As with the full element, 26% of the accommodation would be affordable.

16 In combination with the full element, the site would deliver up to 800 units. 25,700sqm of existing Class B floorspace would be retained.

17 In addition, the outline also proposes up to 8,240sqm of new commercial and non residential floorspace (Use Classes A1, A2, A3, B1, B8, D1 and D2).

#### Revised plans

18 In order to respond to a number of issues and concerns raised on the original submission, a series of revisions were made to the scheme. In summary, these changes comprise of the following:

- revisions to the detailed design of Plot 1 including a revised elevational treatment, a revised treatment to the viaduct entrance and addition of front garden areas to the units;
- revisions to the parameters of Plot 04 including an increase in its maximum building height;
- modified arrangements for cycle parking; and
- revisions to the Design Code.

19 The revised plans were consulted upon, and the responses are summarised in the appendix to this report. Any additional responses to the re-consultation will be

included in the addendum report to the committee.

### **Planning history**

- 20 10AP1585: Planning permission granted in September 2010 for a change of use from warehousing (Class B8) to a go-karting centre (sui generis) in Block E, Unit 4.
- 21 10AP1871: Planning permission refused in September 2010 for the change of use from storage to an art gallery at Unit N001.
- 22 11AP2286: Planning permission granted in September 2011 for the retention of the ground floor from a photographic studio to an animal day care and boarding facility, at Unit G01.
- 23 11AP3584: Planning permission granted on 24 February 12 for retention of arts and performance exhibition centre in Block N, Unit 1.
- 24 11/AP/4232: Planning permission granted on 5 April 2012 for the change of use of Unit E01B (1045 sqm) from Storage (Use Class B8) to Indoor Climbing Centre (Use Class D2); installation of a ground floor entrance and a ventilation fan on the roof of the building.
- 25 13/AP/0158: A planning application for the change of use of part of the third floor of Block J from B1 (office) to D1 (non-residential institution) was withdrawn on 10 April 2013.
- 26 A series of other applications have been granted for external alterations to existing buildings, and also for the installation of telecommunications equipment.

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

- 27 None relevant.

## **KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

### **Summary of main issues**

- 28 The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:
  - a) Principle of redevelopment in terms of land use and conformity with site designation
  - b) Environmental Impact Assessment
  - c) Affordable housing
  - d) Housing mix
  - e) Density
  - f) Quality of accommodation
  - g) Impact of the amenities of occupiers of adjoining properties
  - h) Transport issues
  - i) Design issues, including site layout
  - j) Landscaping and trees
  - k) Planning obligations
  - l) Sustainable development obligations.

### **Planning policy**

- 29 The site was de-designated from the strategic industrial location in the Core Strategy. The site lies within the Urban Density Zone and the Air Quality Management Area.

### Core Strategy 2011

- 30 The relevant policies of the Core Strategy are:
- Strategic Targets Policy 1 – Achieving growth
  - Strategic Targets Policy 2 – Improving places
  - Strategic Policy 1 – Sustainable development
  - Strategic Policy 2 – Sustainable transport
  - Strategic Policy 3 – Shopping, leisure and entertainment
  - Strategic Policy 5 – Providing new homes
  - Strategic Policy 6 – Homes for people on different incomes
  - Strategic Policy 7 – Family homes
  - Strategic Policy 10 – Jobs and businesses
  - Strategic Policy 11 – Open spaces and wildlife
  - Strategic Policy 12 – Design and conservation
  - Strategic Policy 13 – High environmental standards
  - Strategic Policy 14 – Implementation and Delivery

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

- 31 The council's cabinet on 19 March 2013, as required by paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), considered the issue of compliance of Southwark Planning Policy with the NPPF. All policies and proposals were reviewed and the Council satisfied itself that the policies and proposals in use were in conformity with the NPPF. The resolution was that with the exception of Policy 1.8 (location of retail outside town centres) in the Southwark Plan all Southwark Plan policies are saved. Therefore due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans in accordance to their degree of consistency with the NPPF.

- 32 The relevant policies include:
- Policy 1.1 Access to Employment Opportunities
  - Policy 1.4 Employment Sites
  - Policy 1.5 Small business units
  - Policy 2.2 Provision of new Community Facilities
  - Policy 2.5 Planning Obligations
  - Policy 3.1 Environmental Effects
  - Policy 3.2 Protection of Amenity
  - Policy 3.3 Sustainability Assessment
  - Policy 3.4 Energy Efficiency
  - Policy 3.6 Air Quality
  - Policy 3.7 Waste Reduction
  - Policy 3.9 Water
  - Policy 3.11 Efficient Use of Land
  - Policy 3.12 Quality in Design
  - Policy 3.13 Urban Design
  - Policy 3.14 Designing Out Crime
  - Policy 3.19 Archaeology
  - Policy 3.28 Biodiversity
  - Policy 3.31 Flood Defences
  - Policy 4.1 Density of Residential Development
  - Policy 4.2 Quality of Residential Development
  - Policy 4.3 Mix of Dwellings
  - Policy 4.4 Affordable Housing
  - Policy 4.5 Wheelchair Affordable Housing
  - Policy 5.1 Locating Developments
  - Policy 5.2 Transport Impacts
  - Policy 5.3 Walking and Cycling
  - Policy 5.6 Car Parking
  - Policy 5.7 Parking Standards for Disabled People and the Mobility Impaired

- 33 London Plan 2011
- Policy 2.5 Sub-regions
  - Policy 2.9 Inner London
  - Policy 3.3 Increasing housing supply
  - Policy 3.4 Optimising housing potential
  - Policy 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments
  - Policy 3.6 Children and young people's play and informal recreation facilities
  - Policy 3.8 Housing choice
  - Policy 3.10 Mixed and balanced communities
  - Policy 3.11 Definition of affordable housing
  - Policy 3.12 Affordable housing targets
  - Policy 3.13 Negotiating affordable housing on individual private residential and mixed use schemes
  - Policy 3.14 Affordable housing thresholds
  - Policy 4.1 Developing London's economy
  - Policy 4.12 Improving opportunities for all
  - Policy 5.1 Climate change mitigation
  - Policy 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
  - Policy 5.3 Sustainable design and construction
  - Policy 5.5 Decentralised energy networks
  - Policy 5.6 Decentralised energy in development proposals
  - Policy 5.7 Renewable energy
  - Policy 5.9 Overheating and cooling
  - Policy 5.10 Urban greening
  - Policy 5.11 Green roofs and development site environs
  - Policy 5.12 Flood risk management
  - Policy 5.13 Sustainable drainage
  - Policy 5.21 Contaminated land
  - Policy 6.1 Strategic approach (Transport)
  - Policy 6.2 Providing public transport capacity and safeguarding land for transport
  - Policy 6.3 Assessing transport capacity
  - Policy 6.9 Cycling
  - Policy 6.10 Walking
  - Policy 6.11 Smoothing traffic flow and tackling congestion
  - Policy 6.12 Road network capacity
  - Policy 6.13 Parking
  - Policy 7.1 Building London's neighbourhoods and communities
  - Policy 7.2 An inclusive environment
  - Policy 7.3 Secured by design
  - Policy 7.4 Local character
  - Policy 7.5 Public realm
  - Policy 7.6 Architecture
  - Policy 7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology
  - Policy 7.14 Improving air quality
  - Policy 7.15 Reducing noise and enhancing soundscapes
  - Policy 7.18 Protecting local natural space and addressing local deficiency
  - Policy 7.19 Biodiversity and access to nature
  - Policy 7.21 Trees and woodlands
  - Policy 8.2 Planning obligations
  - Policy 8.3 Community infrastructure levy

- 34 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
- The relevant sections are:
- Section 1 Building a strong, competitive economy
  - Section 4 Promoting sustainable transport
  - Section 7 Requiring good design
  - Section 8 Promoting healthy communities

### Relevant SPDs/SPGs

- 35 Design and Access Statements SPD 2007
- Planning Obligations SPD 2007
- Affordable housing SPD 2008
- Sustainability assessment SPD 2009
- Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2009
- Sustainable Transport SPD 2010
- Residential Design Standards SPD 2011
- Draft Affordable Housing SPD 2011

### **Principle of development**

- 36 The NPPF was published on 27 March 2012. At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The framework sets out a number of key principles, including a focus on driving and supporting sustainable economic development to deliver homes, business, industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places. It also promotes mixed use developments.
- 37 The proposal involves the retention, enhancement and consolidation of the commercial space within the southern part of the site, and the mixed use redevelopment of the warehouse sheds within the northern sections of the site. The proposals for the site involve removing 32,800sqm of existing warehouse and commercial space and its replacement with housing plus approximately 8,240sqm of flexible employment space close to the core of the existing business centre. This is a reduction from the 24,560sqm of existing floorspace. The storage sheds are of low quality, are under utilised, and currently support relatively low levels of employment.

### Site designations

- 38 Under the Southwark Plan 2007, the site was designated as part of a strategic Preferred Industrial Location. PILs are defined as significant clusters of industrial and warehousing activities of importance to Southwark's economy and which provide an important source of local employment opportunities.
- 39 The council's Employment Land Review (2010) however, recognised that the business centre includes low grade warehousing space (as well as the higher quality workshop and studio units) which was largely vacant and suffered from insufficient and declining demand. It identified a significant decline in Class B2 industrial uses within the borough and a decline in B8 warehousing floorspace. The review noted that the site includes low grade warehousing space as well as higher end workshop and studio space. The warehouse space is described as largely vacant with agents suggesting lack of demand for this type of space in this location and the presence of residential uses to the north and east meaning that some industrial activities are unsuitable.
- 40 On this basis, the ELR recommended that the site should be released from its PIL designation. This would enable a mixed use redevelopment to provide residential accommodation and compatible B1 uses. The ELR also recognised the benefits of releasing the site from the PIL cluster in terms of its role as a driver and catalyst in the regeneration of The Blue and the wider surrounding area.
- 41 The ELR's recommendation for de-designation of the site to enable its mixed use regeneration has been upheld in the Core Strategy 2011. Therefore, there are no longer any site or policy designations at the site. The site would not be protected under Southwark Plan Saved policy 1.4 'Employment sites outside the Preferred Office Locations and Preferred Industrial Locations' since it does not lie within any of the areas specifically protected under that policy. In line with national, London and

local policies, the need for housing should be accorded significant weight where suitable sites come forward for development.

### Jobs and businesses

- 42 The site as a whole contains around 130 small and medium sized businesses which provide 653 jobs. The majority of businesses (120) are located within buildings in the southern section of the site which would be retained under the proposals. Existing employment on site now falls within the following categories:
- 59% creative industries (SMEs)
  - 31% other business/office/charities (SMEs)
  - 7% storage
  - 3% industrial.
- 43 It is apparent that the tenancy of the units for storage/warehouse/industrial is in the minority on the site. The estimated gross job generation of the proposed development amounts to 1,034 jobs. The net new number of jobs would be around 384 full time jobs. This represents a net increase in employment levels at the site once the development has been completed. The development would also create jobs during the construction phase, and this would also benefit the local economy.
- 44 In the absence of any policy to protect the existing employment floorspace on the site, the net loss of the storage/warehouse business floorspace on the site is accepted. The proposal to consolidate and improve the industrial floorspace provision in the southern section of the site, and add other types of uses to the overall mix and increase the number of jobs, is welcomed. The new space would be of high specification and would be efficiently laid out and well designed to fit modern day business practices. It is acknowledged that Workspace Group manage a number of similar premises around London, and are well established in offering premises which are attractive to small and start-up businesses. The development would comprise a genuinely mixed and balanced community with a mix of residents and business occupants.
- 45 The majority of existing workshop and small business uses will be retained on the site after the development, and this is supported. There would however be some businesses that would relocate to other premises. The applicant will be working with these businesses to find alternative premises, either by relocating them to premises elsewhere within their portfolio, or helping them to search for a new location within the borough. The applicant will also seek to help the retained businesses to continue to operate with minimal disturbance during the construction works.
- 46 The proposals would include measures to enhance the quality of the retained buildings, in terms of replacement windows and provision of more ground level active glazing. This is welcomed and supported.
- 47 The site's redevelopment therefore provides an opportunity to retain, consolidate and enhance the better performing, higher quality accommodation at the site whilst replacing the lower grade, inefficient buildings with a more intensive form of mixed use development that would also contribute to meeting housing needs. Overall, nine of the 14 buildings on the site would be retained in the development and only the low rise warehouses would be replaced. The new employment generating floorspace would be provided within the ground floor of plot 7 and the ground floor of the new building on Drummond Road (plot 5) and through the introduction of an extension to buildings I/J (plot 5).
- 48 The proposed mixed use development of the site would accord with the Core Strategy. There is no longer any policy designation restricting the site's mixed use

redevelopment. In principle therefore, the mixed use redevelopment is accepted, subject to an assessment of other considerations set out later in this report.

#### Acceptability of new A1/A2/A3/B1/B8/D1/D2 uses

- 49 In the outline phase, new commercial and other non residential floorspace is proposed, to a maximum of 8,240sqm. As discussed above, there are no policy concerns with the new B1 and B8 floorspace since they would replace the existing. In relation to the retail provision however (Class A1, A2 and A3), saved policy 1.8 of the Southwark Plan states that exceptions criteria need to be applied as the site does not lie within any town or local centre.
- 50 The development would create a new community of up to 800 new residential units together with the retained and new commercial floorspace. Accordingly, the provision of a range of local services is supported. In order to ensure that the retail floorspace does not compromise the vitality and viability of nearby shopping centres including The Blue, it is recommended that a limit be placed on the amount of retail floorspace. The applicant has suggested that 750sqm would be appropriate. This quantum would allow the residential population to have easy access to retail facilities, whilst not undermining the future of The Blue. The increased population would expand the potential catchment for The Blue.
- 51 In addition, some Class D1 Non Residential Institutions and D2 Assembly and Leisure uses are also proposed. This provision would help to mitigate some of the existing leisure facilities such as the go-karting track and climbing centre, and increase the diversity of uses on the site and accordingly are supported.

#### Provision of housing

- 52 Strategic Policy 5 of the Core Strategy seeks high quality new homes in attractive environments. It states that development will provide as much housing as possible whilst also making sure that there is enough land for other types of development. The policy sets a target of 24,450 net new homes between 2011 and 2026.
- 53 The provision of up to 800 new homes would make a significant contribution towards meeting the borough's housing target, which is welcomed.

#### Link to The Blue local centre

- 54 The vision for The Blue local centre is set out in Strategic Targets Policy 2 – 'Improving Places' of the Core Strategy. The Blue contains a range of shops, services and employment opportunities. The policy includes the aim of encouraging local people to use The Blue and improving links into and around the area. It is proposed that a direct connection for pedestrians and cyclists be formed beneath the railway viaduct towards Bombay Street, leading to the Blue. The link would require the removal of some brick sheds which are owned by Network Rail.
- 55 The link from the site through the railway arches would increase permeability around the area, and encourage more people to use the shops in The Blue which should, in time, help to improve the retail performance of the centre. Therefore this element of the scheme is welcomed. The archway would be lit, resurfaced and decorated to provide an attractive and safe route. The land required to deliver it is under the ownership of Network Rail, and accordingly the applicant would need to demonstrate that they have access rights to deliver and complete the route and so further clarifications on this point will be required. It would also be secured under the s.106 legal agreement.

## Summary on land use

- 56 Overall, it is considered that the land uses proposed are acceptable and in compliance with relevant policies. Following de-designation of the site from its former PIL status, the principle of a mixed use development is acceptable. The retained and new employment floorspace would contribute to the growth and diversification of the local economy and the provision of residential accommodation would help to meet the borough's housing needs. The provision of retail floorspace is welcomed, subject to a cap being added to ensure there is no detrimental impact to The Blue shopping centre. The proposals also improve the permeability in the area, through the provision of a new link to enable connection to The Blue shopping centre, and also the wider connection to Southwark Park. The new linear park is a further benefit, this is discussed further below at paragraph 153.

## **Environmental Impact Assessment**

- 57 Applications where an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is required will either be mandatory or discretionary, depending on whether they are found in Schedule 1 (mandatory) or Schedule 2 (discretionary) of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999 (the 'EIA Regulations').
- 58 In this case, the proposal falls within Section 10(b) of Schedule 2 of the Regulations. The threshold for 'urban development projects' is a site area exceeding 0.5ha. The site is 4.5ha and the development is likely to generate significant environmental effects by virtue of its size, based on a review of the Schedule 3 selection criteria for screening Schedule 2 Development.
- 59 Prior to the submission of the planning application, the applicant requested a 'Scoping Opinion' under Regulation 10 of the EIA Regulations (then 1999) to ascertain what information the Local Planning Authority considered an Environmental Statement (ES) should include (ref 11/AP/3749).
- 60 Regulation 3 of the EIA Regulations 2011 precludes the granting of planning permission unless the council has first taken the 'environmental information' into consideration. The 'environmental information' means the ES, including any further information, any representations made by consultation bodies, and any other person, about the environmental effects of the development.
- 61 In accordance with the EIA Regulations, an Environmental Statement (ES) comprising a Non-Technical Summary, Environmental Statement (Volumes 1 and 2) and Technical Appendices (Part 4) accompanies the application. An addendum to the Environmental Statement was also received during the course of the application in relation to the revisions as described in paragraph 18. The assessment of the ES and the conclusions reached regarding the environmental effects of the proposed development are set out in Appendix 3.
- 62 Following mitigation measures, there are likely to be some adverse impacts in relation to the development with regards to air quality, traffic and transportation, noise and vibration, daylight and sunlight. However, the impacts are not significant enough to warrant refusal of the application. Information on the specific impacts is included, where relevant, in the various sections of this report.

## **Affordable housing**

- 63 The NPPF states that local planning authorities should identify the type, tenure and range of housing that is required, and also set policies for meeting the need on site. In

terms of tenure, it recognises that social rented, intermediate and affordable rent housing can be provided to households whose needs are not met by the market.

- 64 In addition to the NPPF, the policy context relating to the delivery of affordable housing is also contained within London Plan Policy 3.13 'Negotiating affordable housing in individual and private residential and mixed use schemes', Saved Policy 4.4 of the Southwark Plan, and Strategic Policy 6 – 'Homes for people on different incomes' of the Core Strategy. Further advice is contained within the council's adopted Affordable Housing SPD 2008 and the draft Affordable Housing SPD 2011.
- 65 London Plan (2011) Policy 3.13 'Negotiating affordable housing in individual and private residential and mixed use schemes' states that affordable housing provision is normally required on-site. In this case, on site provision is proposed.
- 66 Saved Policy 4.4 of the Southwark Plan and Strategic Policy 6 of the Core Strategy set the targets in relation to the provision of affordable housing. The minimum policy requirement here is for the provision of 35% affordable housing with a 70:30 ratio of social rented to intermediate housing. If, however, an applicant maintains that they cannot afford the minimum affordable housing provision, the adopted Affordable Housing SPD 2008 and the draft Affordable Housing SPD 2011 allows for justification to be provided by way of a financial appraisal that is used to assess the viability of the scheme.
- 67 In this case, the applicant has set out that achieving 35% affordable housing would render the scheme unviable. Accordingly, a financial appraisal was submitted to allow an assessment of the maximum level of affordable housing that could be secured.
- 68 After a series of lengthy negotiations involving the District Valuer (DV) on behalf of the Local Planning Authority, the proposal has identified the level of affordable housing at 26% with a tenure split of 60% social rent, 30% shared ownership and 10% affordable rent. The affordable rent units would be limited to the one and two bed units and are proposed at 60% of market rent. The larger 3 bed plus units would be social rented.
- 69 Affordable rent units are proposed which is a relatively new form of affordable housing with rented housing which can be offered at up to 80% of the local market rent. However, the provision of this form of housing would represent an exception to the council's policy on affordable housing which, as set out in paragraph 66 above, requires the provision of social rent housing and intermediate housing. This issue is discussed further below.
- 70 At 26% the level of affordable housing proposed is below the level set by Saved Southwark Plan policy 4.4, which requires 35% provision. The financial appraisal has demonstrated that a scheme providing 35% affordable housing would be unviable. The viability assessment has been scrutinised by the District Valuer (DV). Having considered the extensive range of data that is required to provide a detailed assessment, the advice received is that the applicant's financial appraisal presents a reasonable account of the viability of the scheme. The DV accepts the applicant's appraisal and agrees that the scheme cannot support the policy requirement of 35% affordable housing and has advised that 26% affordable housing, with the inclusion of some affordable rent, would represent a reasonable offer.
- 71 In terms of the detailed element of the proposal (Plot 1), the following affordable housing mix would be delivered.

Table: Plot 1 affordable housing mix

<b>Phase 1</b>	<b>1 bed</b>	<b>2 bed</b>	<b>3 bed</b>	<b>Total</b>
Social Rent		4	10	60%
Affordable Rent	5			10%
Intermediate	10	2		30%
<b>Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100%</b>

- 72 This sets out that the clear majority of units would be delivered as social rent, with the remainder as affordable rent and intermediate. The outline mix has yet to be determined since these specific details would be determined on a plot by plot basis under the reserved matters applications. It would follow the general principles set out by Plot 1 in terms of the 60% social rent, 10% affordable rent and 30% intermediate split, but could also include the provision of some two bed units at affordable rent levels (at maximum of 60% of market rents). This level of rent is well within the maximum 80% set by the NPPF. This will ensure that the proposed housing would help to meet the underlying housing need. Taking a one-bed affordable rent unit as an example, this would produce an approximate weekly rent of £152.11, measured against an average market rent of £253.56. The inclusion of affordable rent units would also enable the scheme to increase the total number of affordable units it can support. Therefore, on the basis of these specific circumstances, the provision of affordable rent units would be acceptable as an exception to the normal policy position.
- 73 Overall, the quantum of affordable housing, at 26%, is considered a reasonable offer, and one that the DV has advised should be accepted. The accommodation would be provided across all three types of tenure (social rent, intermediate and affordable rent), and would contribute to the delivery of much needed affordable accommodation in the borough. The affordable housing would be delivered across all of the future phases, to ensure the delivery of a mixed and balanced community. Importantly, the larger family sized units would be provided at social rent levels.
- 74 The legal agreement would secure review mechanisms prior to the reserved matters applications coming forward, to determine whether the viability of the scheme has improved. Should the review indicate that the development could support a higher quantum of affordable housing, the legal agreement would set out the details of how to secure this in the subsequent phases. A review mechanism would also be secured if the development does not commence within two years of the permission being issued, again to review whether the viability has changed. However, it should be stressed that the overall quantum of 26% would remain as the minimum level of provision. The review mechanisms would capture any increase should the development be able to support it.
- 75 Accordingly, it is considered that the level of affordable housing should be accepted, after taking into account a review of the development's viability. The inclusion of review mechanisms would also ensure that the viability of the development is assessed during the later phases, in order to determine whether the amount of affordable housing could be increased.

### **Housing mix**

- 76 Saved Policy 4.3 of the Southwark Plan requires a mix of dwellings sizes and types to be provided within major new developments in order to cater for a range of housing needs. There is a particular need for family units in the borough and therefore policy requires that the majority of units should have two or more bedrooms and at least 20% three or more bedrooms with direct access to private outdoor amenity space. At least 10% of the units should be suitable for wheelchair users.

- 77 Strategic Policy 7 of the Core Strategy increases the proportion of two bed plus accommodation to be provided and expects 60% of developments to have more than two bedrooms, and at least 20% 3, 4, or 5 bedrooms. The mix of units provided is shown in the table below for Plot 1. An indicative mix is shown for the outline element.

Unit size	Plot 1 (Full)		Outline Indicative Mix	
	No. of units	% units	No. of units	% units
1 bed/2 person	39	33%	252	37%
2 bed/4 person	54	45%	291	43%
3 bed/5 person	26	22%	116	17%
4 bed/6 person	0	0%	22	3%
TOTAL	119	100%	681	100%

**Overall housing mix (Plot 1 and outline combined)**

Unit size	No. of units	% units
1 bed/2 person	291	36%
2 bed/4 person	345	43%
3 bed/5 person	142	18%
4 bed/6 person	22	3%
TOTAL	800	100%

- 79 The proposal meets policy requirements for housing mix both individually when assessing Plot 1 and the outline alone but also cumulatively. 64% of the units would have two or more bedrooms, exceeding the minimum 60% target. 21% of the accommodation overall would be provided as three bed plus units, exceeding the 20% target. The proposal satisfies policies in relation to housing mix and accordingly is acceptable. In addition, the proposal includes the provision of townhouses which would increase housing choice. It is indicated that a total of 22 4-bed townhouses would be provided in the outline phases.

- 80 10% of the units would be provided as wheelchair accommodation, in a range of unit sizes and tenures.

**Density**

- 81 Policy 3.4 Optimising Housing Potential of the London Plan states that development should optimise housing output for different types of location within the relevant density range shown in Table 3.2 of the Plan. It also requires local context, the design principles and public transport capacity to be taken into account. Strategic Policy 5 – Providing new homes of the Core Strategy sets out the density ranges that residential and mixed use developments would be expected to meet. As the site is located within the Urban Density Zone, a density range of 200 to 700 habitable rooms per hectare (hrh) would be sought. It should be noted that 700hrh is the maximum upper limit. In order for a higher density to be acceptable, the development would need to meet the criteria for exceptional design as set out in section 2.2 of the Residential Design Standards SPD.

- 82 The development as a whole would have a density 729hrh. Since the maximum upper limit of 700hrh would be exceeded, the development would need to demonstrate that it would be excellent in relation to housing quality. If it can be demonstrated that an excellent standard of accommodation would be provided (which is addressed below), then it is considered that the high density would not raise any issues to warrant withholding permission.

## Quality of accommodation

- 83 Saved Policy 4.2 of the Southwark Plan advises that planning permission will be granted provided the proposal achieves good quality living conditions. The adopted standards in relation to internal layout are set out in the adopted Residential Design Standards SPD 2011.
- 84 The following table sets out the minimum flat size requirements as set out in the adopted SPD 2008 and the Update to the Residential Design Standards 2011, and also the flat sizes that would be achieved.

Unit type	SPD (sqm)	Size range proposed
1 bed (flat)	50	50–53.6
2 bed (flat)	70	70-105
3 bed (flat)	86	87-119
4 bed (house)	106	115 to 140

- 85 The flat sizes comfortably meet the minimum sizes as set out in the SPD, and in many cases exceed the minimum, especially for two and three bedroom units and also the 4 bed townhouses. 62% of the units in Plot 1 would be dual aspect. The exact percentage of dual aspect for the outline phases has yet to be determined. Space has been allocated for storage on the plans. Overall, it is therefore considered that the flat sizes are acceptable, and would provide for a good standard of internal amenity.

## Noise and vibration

- 86 To the south-west of the site lies the railway viaduct. The railway arches are occupied by a variety of different uses and are protected by the South-East Bermondsey Preferred Industrial Location. Sufficient mitigation has been incorporated into the design of the residential units to protect against any noise pollution that would arise from the use of the railway arches. The detailed design of the external balcony and amenity spaces would also have to give consideration to preventing noise as far as is possible, through the use of planting and also screening to shield against the railway noise.
- 87 Mitigation would be required to ensure that the residential units are not affected by vibration. These details will be required by condition.

## Air quality

- 88 The site lies within an Air Quality Management Area. The main sources of pollution would be from residential use, transport and commercial activities. The development would consist of new road layouts and green spaces which should allow for better distribution/dilution of air pollutants. The proposal to connect to the SELCHP plant would be positive with regards to further minimising the pollution burden.
- 89 Dust and other environmental impacts created during the demolition and development stages will be controlled by measures included in the Environmental Management Plan, details of which will need to be submitted and approved.
- 90 Overall, the design and other mitigating features will minimise the impact to existing air quality. Accordingly, this aspect of the scheme is considered acceptable.

## Internal daylight

- 91 The internal daylight results show that the majority of the rooms (80%) would meet the

BRE guidelines ADF measure for internal daylight to new build accommodation based on their room use. Accordingly, a clear majority meet the standard. It is the units at the lower levels and also those in the corners that do not meet the minimum guidelines. This is disappointing, however since the scheme has been submitted as part outline, there is scope to improve the daylighting during the reserved matters applications. Accordingly, refusal on grounds of poor daylighting to 20% of the units is not considered reasonable. Some of the units are dual aspect which helps to mitigate the substandard level of daylighting.

Amenity space

92 All new residential development must provide an adequate amount of useable outdoor amenity space. The Residential Design Standards SPD sets out the required amenity space standards which can take the form of private gardens and balconies, shared terraces and roof gardens. Policy 3.6 of the London Plan requires new developments to make provision for play areas based on the expected child population of the development. Children's play areas should be provided at a rate of 10sqm per child bed space (covering a range of age groups).

93 In terms of the overall amount of amenity space required, the following would need to be provided:

- For houses, a garden of 50sqm as required by the SPD;
- For units containing 3 or more bedrooms, 10sqm of private amenity space as required by the SPD;
- For units containing 2 bedrooms or less, ideally 10sqm of private amenity space, with the balance added to the communal space;
- 50sqm communal amenity space per block as required by the SPD; and
- 10sqm of children's play space for every child space in the development as required by the London Plan

94 Table showing private amenity space provision

<b>Unit size</b>	<b>Private amenity space</b>
one bed	5-12.8sqm
two bed	6-34sqm
three bed	9.8-99.4sqm
four bed	25.5sqm

95 A positive aspect of the scheme is that the one and two bed units are provided with their own private amenity space. A small proportion of the three bed units do not meet the minimum 10sqm required, however, the shortfall is very minor at only 0.2sqm and accordingly does not raise any concern. Further, many of the one, two and three bed units are provided with amenity space well in excess of 10sqm.

96 The four bed townhouses would also have access to private amenity space in the form of a garden. The level of provision, at 25.5sqm, is some way short of the 50sqm target, but the units would also contain a front garden of approximately 15.6sqm and also a roof terrace of 10sqm. The townhouses would also have direct access onto the shared amenity space at the back of their garden. The level of provision is therefore acceptable.

97 Many of the plots contain raised podiums to provide communal amenity space for residents. The sizes of the podiums are very large (e.g. 62m by 42m), and accordingly more than meet the 50sqm per block requirement of the SPG. In addition, a linear park is also proposed, measuring approx. 80m by 20m. Space has been designated specifically for children's play to accord with the Mayor's SPG. Overall, the level of amenity space provision is a positive benefit of the scheme.

- 98 The proposed development provides accommodation that is considered to be of a good standard. The sizes and types of the units and the amount and quality of amenity space are all considered to be positive aspects of the scheme. Some of the units would not meet the minimum standards for internal daylighting, however this would be mitigated in part by the percentage of dual aspect units provided (62%). The details submitted as part of the reserved matters applications could also allow the quality of internal daylighting to be improved. Noise and air quality issues have also been suitably taken into account. Accordingly, it is considered that the standard of accommodation provided is on balance sufficient to justify the high level of density on the site.

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

#### Daylight

- 99 A daylight and sunlight report has been submitted with the application. The report assesses the scheme based on the Building Research Establishments (BRE) guidelines on daylight and sunlight.
- 100 The BRE sets out three detailed daylight tests. The first is the Vertical Sky Component test (VSC), which is the most readily adopted. This test considers the potential for daylight by calculating the angle of vertical sky at the centre of each of the windows serving the residential buildings which look towards the site. The target figure for VSC recommended by the BRE is 27% which is considered to be a good level of daylight and the level recommended for habitable rooms with windows on principal elevations. The BRE have determined that the daylight can be reduced by about 20% of their original value before the loss is noticeable.
- 101 The second method is the No Sky Line (NSL) or Daylight Distribution (DD) method which assesses the proportion of the room where the sky is visible, and plots the change in the No Sky Line between the existing and proposed situation. It advises that if there is a reduction of 20% in the area of sky visibility, daylight may be affected.
- 102 Another method of calculation is the Average Daylight Factor (ADF) which is a more detailed assessment and considers the amount of sky visibility on the vertical face of a window, but also the window size, room size and room use. The recommendations for ADF in dwellings are 2% for kitchens, 1.5% for living rooms and 1% for bedrooms.
- 103 The submitted daylight information has tested Plot 1 and the outline elements separately. An analysis of the results is found below.

#### 14-15 Storks Road 'Salisbury Court'

- 104 These properties are located to the north of the site, and face onto Clements Road. These properties currently look out onto a largely open area of the site and accordingly receive high levels of daylight with target VSC and ADF levels being exceeded.
- 105 The ground floor windows to 14 and 15 Storks Road currently receive VSC levels of 34.1% and 34.5%. It is not clear whether these rooms are living rooms or kitchens but they are likely to be single aspect rooms. As proposed, these values would reduce by more than 20% to 18.8% and 19.8%. In percentage terms, this equates to a reduction of 44.8% and 42.7%. Similar losses are experienced at first floor level. In relation to ADF, the existing ADF values of the ground floor windows are 3% and 2.3%. This would reduce to 1.8% and 1.5%. However, using the DD analysis, the proposal

complies and satisfies the BRE tests. The losses range from 3.4% on the first floor to 8.9% on the ground. The losses are within the 20% recommended by the BRE and accordingly the daylight impacts to these properties are considered acceptable.

- 106 Flats 9-12 Salisbury Court do not have any windows in their south elevation so do not need to be tested in the report.

#### 92 Storks Road

- 107 This is a two storey residential building located to the north of the site on the corner with Clements Road. It has no windows on the flank elevation that directly face the site but there are two windows on the set back section that do face the site. The report advises that these windows serve circulation space.

- 108 The VSC analysis shows that these spaces would experience losses below 20%. The existing VSC values are 21.1% and 29.1%. These would reduce to 18.7% and 26.7% which in percentage terms is a loss of 11.2% and 8.5%. The ADF results also show full BRE compliance.

#### 13-31 Clements Road

- 109 These are a terrace of 10 two storey houses at the north of the site. These properties would experience reductions in daylight but the losses are well within the tolerances of the BRE. The VSC losses range from 1.7% to 12.8%, and so well within the 20% limit.

#### 33 Clements Road and 96 Webster Road

- 110 This is a three storey residential building that fronts onto Clements Road and Webster Road. Some of the basement, ground and first floor windows on this building experience VSC reductions of more than 20%. The losses range from 6.9% to 30.4%. There are also failures in relation to ADF and DD. However, the basement windows are high level slot windows unlikely to provide habitable space. In addition, the ground floor windows have frosted/obscure glazing which limits the amount of light that could pass through the window. Accordingly, the non compliance is considered acceptable by virtue of this analysis.

#### Marden Square and Layard Square (part of the 4 Squares Estate)

- 111 Marden Square and Layard Square are two 7 storey blocks of flats belonging to the 'Four Squares Estate'.

- 112 The rooms on the west and south facades that face onto the site are of ancillary residential use, serving an entry corridor and small kitchen and bathroom, all of which would be classed as non habitable space. The main habitable rooms are therefore unaffected as they face away from the site. Accordingly, there would be no harm to the living conditions of these blocks, on account of the internal flat arrangements.

- 113 A number of other properties on the other side of the railway viaduct (e.g. at Blue Anchor Lane, Bombay Street) have been tested in the daylight report. However, owing to the presence of the railway line, would not be impacted by the proposals.

#### Sunlight

- 114 In relation to sunlight, the test is to calculate the annual probable sunlight hours (APSH) taking into account the amount of sun available in both the summer and winter for each given window which faces within 90 degrees of due south. The assessment

requires that a window should receive a quarter of annual probable sunlight hours in the summer and at least 5% of sunlight hours during the winter months.

#### 14-15 Storks Road 'Salisbury Court'

- 115 The sunlight analysis shows that all of the windows in these properties that face onto the site would experience reductions in their sunlight. The affected windows are all south facing. The windows would retain adequate sunlight levels for most of the year, with 27-40% received which exceeds the 25% target by the BRE. However, it is the winter sunlight that is more problematic as the reductions are very significant with 80-100% losses. The results show that with the development in place, the winter sunlight to all but one of the windows would fall below 5%. This is an unfortunate aspect of the scheme, but overall is not considered to warrant any refusal of the application in light of the wider benefits of the scheme.

#### 92 Storks Road

- 116 This building also has windows that face south and would also experience some reductions in their sunlight. However, the results show that three of the four windows would still achieve sunlight in accordance with the BRE guidelines. The remaining window would experience a reduction in winter sunlight from 8% to 4% therefore falling below the 5% target. However, this minor reduction is considered acceptable in this instance.

#### 13-31 Clements Road

- 117 Again, these buildings have windows that face to the site but largely would still retain close to the target BRE levels. No's 25, 29 and 31 would see an improvement in their levels of sunlight.

#### 33 Clements Road and 96 Webster Road

- 118 This building would also experience losses by virtue of having windows in the south elevation that face the site. However, most of the windows at ground and upper levels (first and second) would still achieve compliance with the BRE. The most affected windows would be a window at ground, one window at first floor level and two at basement level. These windows already receive limited levels of light as they are small horizontal slit windows at high levels and also contain frosted/obscure glazing and accordingly, any sunlight losses should not be so noticeable.

#### Marden Square and Layard Square

- 119 As with daylight, the levels of sunlight received by these windows is limited, because of the small size of openings on the facing elevations. These small openings light non-habitable spaces only, and accordingly would not affect the internal living conditions of any main habitable rooms.
- 120 A number of other properties on the other side of the railway viaduct have been tested for sunlight, but these would not be impacted by the proposals.

#### Overlooking/outlook

- 121 In order to prevent against harmful overlooking, the Residential Design Standards SPD 2011 requires developments to achieve a distance of 12m at the front of the building and any elevation that fronts a highway and a minimum of 21m at the rear.
- 122 These distances would be met. To the north on Clements Road, there would be a distance of 14m. There would be at least 18m to the east across Drummond Road.

To the south, there is a distance of 40m. To the south-west there is the railway viaduct so no overlooking issues that need consideration. In conclusion, the development would protect the privacy of neighbouring residential properties by virtue of the minimum overlooking distances being exceeded.

## **Traffic issues**

### Access

- 123 The site is currently accessed from Clements Road to the north and Drummond Road to the east. The site is reasonably well located for public transport and is 450m away from Bermondsey tube station (Jubilee Line). Various bus routes operate in close proximity to the site, the nearest being Southwark Park Road and Jamaica Road. The site benefits from a public transport accessibility level of 4 indicating a good level of accessibility.

### Car parking

- 124 Parking for the residential element is proposed at an overall ratio of 20%, which represents 160-170 spaces, with half of the spaces suitable for occupants of the wheelchair accessible homes which constitute 10% of the overall number of units. The parking would be provided at grade level below a podium within the courtyards of the buildings, and also on the street. The level of provision when taken on its own is low, however when combined with a package of mitigation would encourage users to use more sustainable modes of transport and reduce the need for car ownership.
- 125 With respect to car clubs, four car club spaces have been proposed. The level of provision is acceptable and would provide an alternative to those that do not have the use of a car. Car club membership can suitably mitigate the possibility of overspill parking and the need for car ownership. The applicant has offered to provide 20 year membership for all first occupiers of the site. This is a benefit of the scheme and accordingly welcomed.
- 126 At least 20% of the parking spaces would be provided with active electric vehicle charging points and 20% with passive electric vehicle charging capability. This form of provision is welcomed and should be secured by condition.
- 127 A condition will be attached to the permission preventing occupiers of the development from obtaining car parking permits, ensuring they would not be eligible to park on surrounding roads that are within the controlled parking zone to the north and east of the site (e.g Drummond Road and Clements Road). If appropriate, the site specific contribution could be used to consult on an extension to the existing controlled parking zone, to extend towards the south of the site.
- 128 A small proportion of parking is to be provided for the commercial element, including disabled parking. However, the exact numbers have not been designed in detail and so would be a matter for the reserved matters and also the site wide parking management strategy.

### Cycling

- 129 For plot 1, 184 cycle spaces are proposed within bicycle stores in the development, this quantum of provision exceeds the minimum standards by 39 spaces and so is welcomed. Visitor cycle parking spaces would also be provided at the entrances. Originally Josta two tier racks were proposed. However an amendment was received to substitute these with a mix of Sheffield racks and cycle pods which represent more acceptable types of cycle provision. In order to be acceptable, Sheffield racks should

comprise at least 50% of the overall spaces provided, including at least 50% in each of the individual cycle stores within the development.

- 130 Residential cycle parking would be provided in secure stores within the undercroft car parks of the residential buildings. All of the other cycle parking would be provided within the commercial/retail units with some additional parking for visitors to the site at secure and convenient locations. A community cycle maintenance facility has also been provided; this includes cycle pumps and other cycle repair equipment that would be offered, at no cost to the occupiers of the development.
- 131 In addition, Transport for London have requested that land within the site be reserved for a cycle hire docking station to accommodate the delivery of approximately 45-63 cycles. The applicant has agreed to safeguard part of their site for this purpose, likely to be around the linear park. This safeguarding should also address the comments made by Southwark Cyclists regarding the request for cycle parking next to the park.

#### Internal street network/ road adoption

- 132 An internal network of streets has been designed to provide access for vehicular traffic without allowing the traffic to dominate the environment and detract from the public realm. Some streets would be open to general vehicular traffic and would allow access to the car parking locations. Some streets have restricted access, but would allow access for service/emergency vehicles at times. There would also be streets that would be used by pedestrians and cyclists only. The streets would also incorporate on street car parking, to be managed and controlled by the applicant.
- 133 The applicant has not proposed to offer the internal streets within the development for formal adoption. The applicant has confirmed that maintenance of the internal roads would be formally agreed within the terms of a maintenance agreement, thus guaranteeing the quality of the carriageways/footways would be adequately maintained on an on-going basis, with no financial burden on the council. There would be public rights of access over the new internal streets. However, they would not fall within the council's controlled parking zone. The applicant would therefore need to manage and maintain the roads at their own expense.

#### Viaduct route

- 134 The existing access that runs along the viaduct needs to maintain access for Network Rail at all times. It is proposed to create an active street alongside the railway viaduct that would complement the use of the railway arches. This would be designed to allow pedestrians, cyclists and limited vehicular traffic to integrate successfully. Vehicular access would be restricted to cars and small vans required to serve the railway arch uses. Further details need to be provided to ensure that the management and use of this route would be as described in the application documents.

#### Servicing and refuse collection

- 135 Servicing and refuse collection would be undertaken within the confines of the site. A delivery and service management plan would set out the specific details of the frequency and type of deliveries to be expected.

#### Travel plan

- 136 The initiatives and measures included as part of the draft commercial and residential travel plans include measures to change travel habits and such as providing information on public transport services to occupiers of the site. Some adjustments do need to be made to the residential travel plan in connection with modal split figures.

These should be incorporated into an amended residential travel plan and should be submitted before occupation of the development.

### Construction management

- 137 A construction management plan would be secured to set out construction traffic movements in relation to the phased construction period and how construction traffic would be managed.
- 138 The plan would also need to ensure that the impacts upon cyclists are taken into account, such as ensuring the lorry drivers have undertaken cycle awareness training, and also that any temporary road closures re-direct cyclists as well as pedestrians. Overall, there needs to be a fuller assessment of the impact upon cyclists, which should also address comments made by Southwark Cyclists.
- 139 Consideration should also be given to the routes used by construction vehicles to access the site; these should use the strategic roads as far as is possible to avoid disrupting residential amenities.
- 140 Comments made during consultation have also referred to the health impact during the construction phase, in particular from dust and other construction activities. The construction plan would need to set out measures to mitigate these impacts. Furthermore, the applicant should commit to sending newsletters to residents notifying them of construction progress and also display a noticeboard outside the site with the contact name and number should residents have any construction related questions.

### **Design issues**

- 141 The NPPF stresses the importance of good design and states in paragraph 56 that: *“Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning, and should contribute positively to making places better for people.”*
- 142 The scheme is made up of a number of two parts
- Detailed design for Plot 1;
  - The outline application, covering Plots 2 – 7.

### Detailed design for Plot 1

- 143 The first phase block is planned on a severely constrained triangular site located next to the viaduct. To respond to this, an open-courted design is proposed with the main mass on east and west sides of the triangle facing onto the streets and an open-sided elevated garden facing onto the widened access route along the edge of the viaduct to the south.
- 144 In its height, scale and massing the proposal establishes a general height of 7-storeys across the site rising to 9-storeys at the southern corner facing the centre of the masterplan. The design attempts to articulate this massing with set-backs at the top two floors on Clements Road, the use of chamfered corners at either end of the triangular block and deep inset balconies which break down the block into vertical bays. Two-storey maisonettes encircle the block on the east and west faces, and ensure active frontages are provided on these important streets.
- 145 On the south-western face of the block, the design has had to balance the established semi-industrial uses within the viaduct with active residential frontages to bring a much-needed vibrancy to this new street. It does this in three ways. Firstly it is set back 10m from the edge of the viaduct to create a generous landscaped route into the site from Clements Road. Secondly, this flank is taken up mainly by the edge of the

elevated garden which would benefit from a southerly aspect and incorporates a substantial landscaped screen with balconies where future occupiers could look across and onto the viaduct route to offer some passive surveillance. Finally, only two residential units are accessed directly from this southern access route, each with a strip of defensible space at the entrance to offer a degree of separation from the viaduct.

- 145 The three main entrances to the block are double-height in scale and offer direct access to the elevated communal gardens. The use of colour and a strong framing device ensure that the entrances are prominent and accessible.
- 146 In terms of the materials, the design reflects the prevailing brick residential and semi-industrial character of the area and uses a range of bricks as the primary facing material. Windows are proposed in a simple modern design to be aluminium-framed with feature details incorporated into the surrounds of openings especially where windows have been coupled, or in the design of balconies. On the street-side balconies are inset to reflect the urban character of these facades and reinforce the brick character of the development. Facing onto the elevated courtyards the facades are more informal in character with overhanging balconies finished in vibrant metal cladding which will animate this face.
- 147 The quality of this design will rely to a great degree on the quality of the proposed brickwork, how it is detailed and the choice of bricks including the mortar colour and finish. Officers recommend conditions relating to the architectural detailing of the facade including the sills, jambs and heads of all openings, as well as sample panels of brickworks and all facing materials to be presented on site for approval by the council.
- 148 In terms of its proportions and geometry, the design presents a confident and ordered design. The block has been designed with a well defined base, middle and top with the scale and arrangements of openings subtly altered to give the facade a vertical articulation that echoes the design of a traditional mansion block. In some parts the design could appear repetitive however, the relatively short lengths of facades, their subdivision into vertical and horizontal bays and the careful detailing of the proposed openings result in a design that is acceptable and would offer a reasonable level of interest and variety in this urban context.

#### The outline phase

- 149 i) the subdivision of the site with gridded streets and character areas

The designers have used streets to subdivide the site and create manageable plots for every phase of this development. These new streets link up with surrounding local street patterns and connections and gives the site the appearance of a new 'urban quarter', allowing access and permeability across the site, separating commercial from residential development and improving access to and through the railway viaduct reinforcing local links that could stretch from Southwark Park to the Blue.

- 150 The new east-west street is one of the primary streets through the development, and encompasses both new and existing buildings. The proposal here is to create a new tree lined street, with a mix of both residential and commercial uses.
- 151 The nature and character of these new streets is defined in the parameter plans and controlled in the Design Code document. Maximum distances range from 15m to 17m between the faces of buildings and includes not just the carriageway but also on-street parking, a zone for tree planting and pavements. This would ensure that the minimum overlooking distance of 12m as recommended by the Residential Design Standards

SPG would always be achieved. Further, the blocks have been designed with maisonettes arranged around their perimeter with front doors facing onto the streets to present active frontages to the public realm and give each block a highly articulated base.

152 ii) the character areas

The site has been subdivided into four character areas; the park, the Drummond Road and Clements Road character areas as well as the new east-west street character area. Each character area is defined in the Design Code which sets out the approach to facing materials and features as well as building heights and articulation. For the park area the Design Code defines the strong edges and places a particular emphasis on the new block which is at the entrance to the site from Drummond Road and on the axis of the park.

153 The park is approx. 80m by 20m in size and is a substantial resource at the heart of this new urban quarter, where the retail and community uses are concentrated. It not only establishes a meaningful focus for the development but also offers a variety of uses and thoroughfares which could encourage permeability across the site, helps to mediate between the commercial and residential uses and offers the opportunity to provide for the needs of future occupiers. It also serves to identify and emphasise the route through to The Blue. For it to work, it should remain open to the public allowing access to and through the viaduct for both residential and commercial occupiers of the site.

154 On Drummond Road, the character is defined by the scale of the street together with the combination of uses. This is the 'civic' face of this development with the new residential buildings proposed to sit side by side with the existing and new commercial uses on the site. The substantial scale of Drummond Road and its access through the viaduct to the south has been reflected in the master plan for the site with taller elements located at either end of the site and at the centre where a taller element has been included to act as a gateway to the site. The buildings range from 4 to 6 storeys in height with limited taller elements ranging between 8 and 10 storeys. This is appropriate in this context.

155 On Clements Road the development is more residential in scale. The blocks have been scaled down to respond to the residential character of the road and to reflect the Victorian terrace of properties opposite. The masterplan for the site places taller elements at either end of the site at the junction with Drummond Road and at the approach to the viaduct and ranges from 7-9 storeys at these extremities down to 3-4 storeys for the central part of Clements Road. This is appropriate for this quiet road and responds appropriately to its residential context.

156 iii) The proposed building heights

The scheme proposes a range of heights and each plot is developed as a continuous perimeter block. The base of blocks is to be defined by a two-storey datum defined by outward-facing maisonettes and double-height entrances that offer access to the main building cores and the elevated communal gardens at the centre of each plot. Above these maisonettes, each perimeter block is subdivided by the design code into 'mansion block' type elements with vertical and horizontal articulation that reflects a strongly urban character. Defensible space has been incorporated for the maisonettes by a set-back into the building however, the proposed modest set-back at the base and the minimal articulation at the top of the buildings could give these substantial blocks a monolithic appearance. Since all matters of design have been reserved in the outline application, more can be done in the reserved matters applications to give these substantial blocks a more modulated and articulated appearance especially at

the roof-line through set-backs and further division of the roof-top accommodation.

157 The views submitted with the application are in wireline which is appropriate given the outline nature of the application and demonstrate that in most instances the proposed building masses reflect the local context and do not dominate their surroundings inappropriately. On Drummond Road the height of the new blocks is set at between 6-9 storeys to reflect the scale and massing of the commercial buildings on the site and the substantial scale of the Four Squares estate across the way. The tallest elements are located at the extremities of the site and at the main gateways which are an appropriate urban response especially where sites abut the railway line. On Clements Road the response to the domestic scale of this context is articulated through a deliberate step in scale down from the corner with Drummond Road. At the junction with Storcks Road the leap in scale is articulated at the northern end of Plot 1 by a considerable set-back at the 5<sup>th</sup> floor to mediate between the 2-4 storey prevailing context and the proposed rise to 7-storeys at the corner.

158 There are no designated heritage assets on the site or immediately adjacent to it. The railway viaduct itself is a substantial structure and forms a backdrop to many views. In the main the existing industrial buildings on the site, with the exception of some of the buildings on Drummond Road, are utilitarian in character and lack any merit. All the existing buildings of quality are retained by this proposal and integrated to the masterplan resulting in a truly mixed-use quarter that will not only add variety and interest to the site but offers a mix of building types and uses centred on the main public park which will give the area the feel and appearance of a true urban quarter.

159 iv) Elevated court block design

The principle of a perimeter court design will give the masterplan a cohesive appearance with well defined streets and building frontages. However, the repeated format of full perimeter blocks could result in a monolithic built form and a potentially overbearing sense of enclosure in the communal courtyards particularly where the southern flanks of the blocks are enclosed and do not offer the opportunity the sun to reach the elevated gardens.

160 Added to this, at the centre of the new quarter the proposal suggests that the main east-west road could be flanked on both sides by 70m long blocks rising to up to 10 residential storeys. This street is on an east-west alignment and would be overshadowed by the block to the south for much of the day. Officers have encouraged the designers to articulate these blocks further with more meaningful steps or breaks to reduce the monolithic nature and uniform appearance of the blocks. A mix of three-storey houses and gaps offering glimpses through to the courtyards on these frontages have been considered and should not be precluded when each site is designed in detail in due course. The quality of proposed accommodation, its impact on the street-scene including adjacent plots, and the design and appearance of these streets are all reserved matters and will need to be agreed through future applications. The outline application framework which sets out a maximum number of units – and no minimum – suggests that reasonable adjustments could be made at that time to ensure that the quality of urban and architectural design of this new residential quarter can be secured through further dialogue with officers.

161 The design relies on a strong, outward-facing and animated base established by the two-storey datum of maisonettes facing onto the streets. These are designed to offer future occupiers front doors directly off the new streets and encircle the proposed car parking at grade and elevated communal gardens at the heart of each block. This urban model attempts to reconcile the need to preserve the streetscene with the requirement for car parking across the site whilst providing good amenity of future occupiers. It is a model that has been used elsewhere with some success.

- 162 The courtyards appear generous in scale and offer the potential for a good mix of communal and private amenity for future residents. Added to this, the design code places particular emphasis on the main entrances which are proposed to be double-height in scale to offer occupiers direct visual and physical access to the elevated communal gardens. Care should be taken in the design of ventilation grilles to ensure that the street scene is not affected by large areas of louvres. The scale of the courts offers the opportunity for the car park ventilation to be designed into the layout of the elevated gardens without affecting the street frontages.
- 163 The perimeter blocks would also include four storey townhouses, which would be of a smaller scale and help to achieve variety across the buildings.

#### Design Review Panel

- 164 The scheme was presented to the DRP on two occasions whose comments are included at Appendix 2. Following the reviews, a number of changes were made to the scheme including to address some of the comments:
- The provision of a widened viaduct route including more generous entry point at the northern end;
  - Revised elevational treatment to the blocks; and
  - Development of the design of the main entrances to the blocks.

#### **Landscaping and trees**

- 165 The submitted Landscape Design Statement provides an outline masterplan encompassing private residential amenity spaces within the courtyard blocks and the streets and public spaces. These comprise some planting within courtyards, above podiums and in raised planters, major streetscape planting, together with a new park and green pocket spaces.
- 166 The site is bordered by street trees on the pavements of Drummond Road and Clements Road which are proposed for retention. Conditions should be imposed to ensure the protection of the street trees during construction. Six semi-mature Plane trees on site are however to be removed in order to facilitate development. These trees have been classed as Category B trees which are moderate value trees. Their loss would be compensated for and the biodiversity of the site enhanced through their proposed replacement with more than 180 trees.
- 167 The aim of the landscape strategy is to provide suitable connections into and across the site and the focusing of green links to Southwark Park. Other key features include the use of planters along the internal streets, a coherent hard landscaping palette, permeable surfaces, an amenity lawn, hedging and extensive play space. The park is located at the intersection of access routes to form a natural communal space. The use of a 'biscuit' motif in the layout helps to provide a historical connection to the former industrial use and is successful in providing different use zones (play, event, and seating). Here, careful consideration of the planting species and palette would be needed. Given the size of the park and the need for animation, the inclusion of water is welcomed, and this could be combined with attenuation tanks and sustainable drainage used on adjacent streets.
- 168 Overall, the tree species palette would need to include the appropriate use of natives. The proposed tree species include lime, oak, birch, pine, magnolia and holly, all of which are acceptable. In order to have the required impact and immediate contribution to amenity, the planting would require semi-mature specimen sizes as a minimum [height at planting to be at least 8m]. To ensure that the type and quality of landscaping aspired to is sustainable it needs to achieve a reasonable level of

maturity. These details would ultimately be secured by condition.

- 169 The replacement trees would more than make up for the six to be removed, in terms of quality and tree girth. However, in order to adapt to heat stress and drought, most large planting would need to be of more tolerant and longer lived species. More ornamental types are suitable for raised areas such as Himalayan birch, katsura and multi stemmed specimens.
- 170 Tree pit specification will require special consideration in order to ensure successful establishment and growth. The design and location of service runs to allow suitable trenching for street tree planting would therefore need to be considered at an early stage. Where gaps have occurred on Clement Road and Drummond Road new street trees should be introduced.
- 171 Adequate planting depth would need to be achieved for the courtyard design; this would be controlled by condition. Overall, the proposed landscape layout is well designed, subject to further details being secured by condition.

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

- 172 Saved Policy 2.5 of the Southwark Plan and Policy 8.2 of the London Plan advise that planning obligations can be secured to overcome the negative impacts of a generally acceptable proposal. Saved Policy 2.5 of the Southwark Plan is reinforced by the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on Section 106 Planning Obligations, (which sets out in detail the type of development that qualifies for planning obligations), and Circular 05/05, which advises that every planning application will be judged on its own merits against relevant policy, guidance and other material considerations when assessing planning obligations. Strategic Policy 14 – Implementation and delivery of the emerging Core Strategy states that planning obligations will be sought to reduce or mitigate the impact of developments.
- 173 The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations came into force on 6 April 2010. The regulations state under 122 – “Limitation on use of planning obligations” that it is unlawful for a planning obligation to be taken into account when determining a planning application for a development, or any part of a development, that is capable of being charged CIL if the obligation does not meet all of the following tests:
- necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
  - directly related to the development; and
  - fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
- 174 The following table sets out the contributions payable based on the Section 106 Planning Obligations SPD and what the applicant has proposed to offer. The contributions are set out based the provision of 800 new residential units, in a typical mix as set out in paragraph 78.

<b>Topic area</b>	<b>S106 SPD</b>	<b>Applicant's S106 offer</b>
Education	£1,382,921	£1,382,921
Employment during construction	£594,982	Developer elected to provide their own WPC to value of £594,982.
Employment during construction management fee	£46,629	£46,629
Public open space	£125,710	£125,710
Children's play equipment	£104,251	£104,251
Sports development	£613,540	£613,540

<b>Topic area</b>	<b>S106 SPD</b>	<b>Applicant's S106 offer</b>
Transport Strategic	£401,135	£401,135
Transport Site Specific	£400,000	£150,000 + in kind works to deliver the route to The Blue to the value of £250,000
Transport for London	£450,000	£450,000
Public Realm	£600,000	£600,000
Health	£903,116	£903,116
Community Facilities	£129,891	£129,891
Admin charge	£87,522	£87,522
<b>Total</b>	<b>£5,839,696</b>	<b>£5,839,696</b>

- 176 The total contributions are as per those listed in the table above.
- 177 It should be noted that Transport for London have advised that contributions towards bus service improvements (£450,000) are required. The applicant has agreed to meet this request.
- 178 The applicant is proposing to off set part of the transport site specific contribution in order to deliver the viaduct link to The Blue. Accordingly, the applicant has only proposed to make part of the Transport Site Specific payment.
- 179 In addition to the terms set out above, the legal agreement would also secure the following:
- the provision of four car club parking spaces (the applicant has offered 20 year membership)
  - travel plans for both the residential and commercial elements
  - 10% wheelchair housing
  - Parking management plan
  - Delivery of the link to The Blue together with viaduct improvements
  - Phasing plans
  - Public realm plans
  - Connection to the SELCHP facility
  - 50% limit placed on occupation of market accommodation until the affordable housing in each plot is delivered
  - Review mechanisms in case of a delayed commencement and for each subsequent phase to secure an increased proportion of affordable housing if viability has improved.
- 180 The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) regulations came into force on 6 April 2010. The regulations state that it is unlawful for a planning obligation to be taken into account when determining a planning application for a development, or any part of a development, that is capable of being charged CIL if the obligation does not meet all of the following tests:
- necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
  - directly related to the development; and
  - fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

It is considered that the planning obligations sought meet the planning tests of Circular 05/05 and the CIL regulations. The contributions would be spent on delivering new school places as a result of the development, job creation during construction, improvements to open spaces and sports facilities, improvements to increase the capacity of transport provision across the borough, improvements to the public realm, health provision and improvements to community facilities.

- 181 Some of the adjoining neighbours have suggested ideas for how the Section 106 monies could be spent. These suggestions are welcome and can be taken into account, subject to conformity with the CIL regulations and Circular 05/05 Planning Obligations.
- 182 A neighbour has also raised concern over the impact upon health, education and transport infrastructure, but as described above, the development would make financial contributions to provide upgrade facilities and infrastructure to mitigate the impacts of the new population.
- 183 As mentioned above in paragraphs 54-55, the route through to The Blue is a significant benefit of the proposals. Further assurances are required from the applicant regarding its deliverability as the land required to deliver it is in Network Rail ownership. This would need to be provided prior to commencement. The applicant has proposed to deliver the route in the fourth phase; but discussions will be ongoing to determine whether it could be provided any earlier.
- 184 In accordance with the recommendation, if the Section 106 Agreement is not signed by 30 August 2013, the Head of Development is authorised to refuse planning permission, if appropriate, for the reason below:

'In the absence of a signed Section 106 Agreement, there is no mechanism in place to avoid or mitigate the impact of the proposed development on the public realm, public open space, sports facilities, education, health, affordable housing, the transport network, community facilities and employment and the proposal would therefore be contrary to Saved Policy 2.5 'Planning Obligations' of the Southwark Plan and Policy 14 – 'Implementation and delivery' of the Southwark Core Strategy, the Southwark Supplementary Planning Document 'Section 106 Planning Obligations' 2007, and Policy 8.2 Planning obligations of the London Plan 2011.'

#### Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

- 185 The Mayor's CIL came into effect in April 2012 and apply a financial levy against all developments which will go towards the delivery of Crossrail. The levy is not discretionary and must be applied to all developments at a rate of £35 per square metre in Central London and will be prioritised over all other planning obligations. The levy against the proposed development is indicated to be in the region of £4,069,752.28, however, this is subject to confirmation at reserved matters stage.

#### **Sustainable development implications**

- 186 The energy statement demonstrates how the energy hierarchy has been applied to the proposed development in order to achieve the carbon reduction targets set out in Strategic Policy 13 of the Core Strategy and the London Plan. The Core Strategy and the London Plan also state that there is a presumption that all major development proposals will seek to reduce carbon dioxide emissions by at least 20 per cent through the use of on-site renewable energy generation wherever feasible.

#### Energy Efficiency

- 187 A range of passive design features and demand reduction measures are proposed to reduce the carbon dioxide emissions of the proposed development. This includes improvements to air permeability and heat loss. Other features include lighting control systems and mechanical ventilation. The demand for cooling will be minimised through solar control glazing.

### District heating

- 188 The nearby South-East London Combined Heat and Power Plant (SELCHP) has been in operation for a number of years producing electricity in the local area. It is proposed that the development would connect to this district heating network to provide heat and electricity for the development. An obligation would be included in the legal agreement to ensure this connection.
- 189 If for any reason, the development is not able to connect to SELCHP, it is proposed that a small combined heat and power plant would be installed in Plot 03 as a back-up to supply some of the heat and electricity demand for the whole development. However, the applicant has committed to connecting to SELCHP and it is envisaged that the back up provision would not need to be utilised unless a problematic issue occurs with connectivity to SELCHP. A reduction in regulated carbon dioxide emissions of 479 tonnes (26%) would be achieved if connection to the SELCHP is made.

### Combined Heat and Power (CHP)

- 190 Should the development not be connected to the SELCHP network, then the applicant is proposing to install three gas fired CHP units as the lead heat source for the site heat network. The reduction would be 417 tonnes per annum if the development is served by CHP units in an energy centre.

### Renewable energy

- 191 A feasibility assessment of renewable/low carbon technologies is included in the energy statement, which include Solar Thermal network, PV, Wind Turbines, Ground source heat pumps, air source heat pumps, and Biomass. PV is the only technology which is considered feasible for the residential element. It is proposed that solar PV's are incorporated into the development. The application of a 230sqm Hybrid PV array to the roof of Plot 1 could provide CO2 emissions savings of 1%. Furthermore, 1,600sqm of the most efficient hybrid PV panels incorporated across the entire development could potentially result in a site wide annual CO2 emissions savings of 6.8%. For the commercial element, the use of Air Source Heat Pumps to meet the heating demand of the commercial office and retail units is proposed for the development and could provide a CO2 emissions reduction of 1.9%.
- 191 Cumulatively, the 8.7% reduction from renewable energy is a considerable way short of the 20% target, but it would be very difficult to achieve any more than this given the savings already secured by energy efficiency and district heating.

### Overall carbon savings

- 192 In total a reduction of 519 tonnes of carbon dioxide per year in regulated emissions is expected, equivalent to a saving of 28%. This exceeds the London Plan target of 25%. It does fall short of the Core Strategy target of 44% but it is considered that the overall strategy has maximised the savings as far as possible, and accordingly is considered acceptable. In addition, the overall saving figure has included a calculation for the retained commercial buildings, for which there is limited scope for achieving savings.

### Green and brown roofs

- 193 Green and brown roofs are included in the Plot 1 details and also in the remaining plots. The inclusion of these roofs would provide additional biodiversity and sustainability benefits and accordingly is welcomed.

## Code for sustainable homes and BREEAM

- 194 The preliminary code for sustainable homes (CfSH) assessment report indicates that the development would achieve a code level rating of 4. This meets the minimum Core Strategy standard as set out in Policy 13. The preliminary BREEAM pre-assessment report indicates that the development would achieve a rating of 71.67%, which equates to 'excellent'. This also meets the Core Strategy standard as set in SP13.

## Ecology

- 195 An ecological survey has been undertaken of the site. The survey reveals that it is unlikely that bats are roosting and therefore no further action or request for further bat surveys are required. Native planting has been included in the scheme which will provide further benefits.

## Conclusion on sustainability

- 196 In summary, the energy, sustainability and ecological aspects of the scheme are considered acceptable and would maximise carbon dioxide savings as well as increase the biodiversity value of the site.

## **Other matters**

- 197 A letter has been received by the Mayor's Office for Policing for Crime (MOPAC) and Metropolitan Police Service on the application, requesting that conditions be attached requiring airwave interference studies to ensure no impact to the Rotherhithe Police Station's airwave reception. However, the station is over 800m away from the site, and given the scale and height of buildings, would be unlikely to cause an impact. Accordingly, the conditions requested are not considered appropriate or necessary.

## **Conclusion on planning issues**

- 198 The provision of a mixed use development is welcomed and supported and would generate economic benefits for the local and wider area. It would retain and refurbish a significant amount of the employment generating floorspace, create additional new commercial floorspace and redevelop the remainder of the site to provide a large number of new dwellings which would significantly contribute to meeting the borough's housing target. The mix of uses provided is diverse and should contribute to urban regeneration including helping to increase the viability of The Blue shopping centre.
- 199 The amount of affordable housing proposed, at 26% (measured by habitable room) is considered to be a reasonable quantum, taking into account a review of the development's viability. It may be possible to secure additional units through the review mechanisms, if the market conditions improve through the development period.
- 200 The development has the potential to deliver a high quality of design. The overall site layout is considered acceptable and would establish new streets which would integrate into the surrounding street pattern effectively. The heights proposed are generally acceptable, subject to a more detailed assessment at reserved matters stage. The new public space at the heart of the development would provide amenity for both the existing and future occupiers, and also be open for the public to use and enjoy. The route to The Blue is a further benefit, increasing the permeability in the area.
- 201 The new housing is considered to be of a high quality and would on balance justify the density, which is above the range expected for the urban density zone. The level of

parking is considered low but when considered with the other transport measures is considered acceptable, in line with policies to reduce reliance on private cars.

202 The conclusions of the environmental impact assessment, including impacts on neighbouring occupiers such as daylight have been considered and no substantial harm has been identified which could not be mitigated by works secured by conditions.

203 It is therefore recommended that permission be granted, subject to conditions as set out in the attached draft decision notice, completion of a S106 agreement on terms as set out above, and referral to the GLA.

### **Community impact statement**

204 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.

205 A Statement of Community Involvement has been submitted with the application. The statement sets out the details of the pre-application consultation that was carried out by the applicants with local parties including residents, local businesses, ward members, the Four Squares and Keatons Estate Tenants and Residents Associations and Southwark College.

206 In terms of the consultation carried out, meetings were held with the residents associations, briefings took place with councillors, MPs, the Bermondsey community council and members of the planning committee. A public exhibition was also held in November 2011 (attended by 108 people) and July 2012 (attended by 46 people).

207 A number of responses were made during the pre-application consultation period. The submitted statement has summarised the responses, and reviewed the feedback received. A number of changes were made to the scheme comprising of height reduction, expansion of the public square, reduction in the numbers of units and also the preparation of a construction management plan to minimal impact and disruption during demolition and construction.

### **Consultation**

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

### **Consultation replies**

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

### Summary of consultation responses

210 An objection has been received from the Four Squares and Tenants Association. Nine objections have been received from neighbours. The main points raised by objectors include:

- concerns over the height of the development
- construction impacts
- request for S.106 monies to enhance the Four Squares Estate
- loss of daylight and sunlight
- queries about provisions made to relocate existing businesses

- traffic impact
- impact on television reception
- lack of public access through the site
- loss of businesses
- health impacts during construction
- concern over capacity of schools, doctors, bus routes.

Two letters of comment and two letters of support received:

- 211
- proposals will be of a benefit to local businesses
  - support new access to The Blue.

#### Reconsultation

6 letters of objection received. The main points raised include:

- loss of daylight and sunlight
- health impacts during construction
- impact on cyclists
- construction impacts
- concern over building height
- suggestions for how S.106 monies could be spent.

#### **Human rights implications**

212 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.

213 This application has the legitimate aim of providing a mixed use development with residential units and commercial space. 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.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY ADVICE FROM OTHER OFFICERS**

214 N/a

#### **BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

<b>Background Papers</b>	<b>Held At</b>	<b>Contact</b>
Site history file: TP/310-A Application file: 12/AP/2737 Southwark Local Development Framework and Development Plan Documents	Chief Executive's Department 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH	Planning enquiries telephone: 020 7525 5403 Planning enquiries email: planning.enquiries@southwark.gov.uk Case officer telephone: 020 7525 5513 Council website: www.southwark.gov.uk

## APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	Consultation undertaken
Appendix 2	Consultation responses received
Appendix 3	Environmental Impact Assessment
Appendix 4	Neighbour consultee map
Appendix 5	Recommendation

## AUDIT TRAIL

<b>Lead Officer</b>	Gary Rice, Head of Development Management	
<b>Report Author</b>	Kiran Chauhan, Team Leader, Major applications team	
<b>Version</b>	Final	
<b>Dated</b>	25 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 and Corporate Services	No	No
Strategic Director of Environment and Leisure	No	No
Strategic Director of Housing and Community services	No	No
Director of Regeneration	No	No
<b>Date final report sent to Constitutional Team</b>		<b>25 April 2013</b>

# APPENDIX 1

## Consultation Undertaken

**Site notice date:** 26/10/2012

**Press notice date:** 26/10/2012 & 11/04/2013

**Case officer site visit date:** 26/10/2012

**Neighbour consultation letters sent:** 22/10/2013 & 03/04/2013

### **Internal services consulted:**

Archaeology Officer  
Environmental Protection Team  
Public Realm  
Planning Policy  
Transport Planning Team  
Parks and Open Spaces  
Arboriculturalist  
Ecology  
Housing Regeneration Initiatives  
Economic Development  
Design Review Panel  
Southwark Primary Care Trust

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

Transport for London  
Metropolitan Police  
Environment Agency  
London Fire & Emergency Planning  
Thames Water  
EDF Energy  
Greater London Authority  
London Borough of Lewisham  
London Borough of Lambeth  
Natural England  
Department of Communities and Local Government  
Arqiva Digital Telecommunications  
BAA  
English Heritage

### **Neighbours and local groups consulted:**

The following groups were consulted:

Southwark Cyclists  
Friends of Southwark Park  
Bermondsey Neighbourhood Forum

Letters were also sent to neighbours as shown on the map at Appendix 4.

### **Members presentation:**

The scheme was presented to the following members on 3 July 2012: Councillors Dolezal, Robin Crookshank-Hilton, Adele Morris, Anood Al-Samerai and Darren Merrill.

### **Re-consultation:**

All statutory and non statutory organisations, neighbours, local groups and internal consultees were consulted on the revised plans.

## APPENDIX 2

### Consultation Responses Received

#### Internal services

Ecology: The Environmental Statement is acceptable and we agree with its findings. It is unlikely that bats are roosting here.

Welcome the new open spaces however the illustrations do appear to show a lot of hard surfacing. Given the amount of buildings here, the park should have as much permeable surfacing as possible.

The park should contain at least 30% native planting. The suggested plants will meet this percentage.

Urban Forester: The site is bordered by streets on which trees are proposed for retention, with only six on site to be removed in order to facilitate development. The potential damage to street trees during development can be controlled via condition.

The aim of the landscape strategy is to provide suitable connections into and across the site with a key new southern entrance via the railway viaduct arch, the opening of new uses parallel to the viaduct and the focusing of green links to Southwark Park. The patterned biscuit layout helps to provide a historical connection to the former industrial use and is successful in providing different use zones (play, event, seating). Here, careful consideration of the species palette would be needed to aid clear and legible routes. Overall, the tree species palette would need to combine the appropriate use of natives, including Lime.

In order to have the required impact and immediate contribution to amenity, planting would require semi-mature specimen sizes. Prior agreement in principle is necessary with highways in order for any planting of street trees to be acceptable and to an adoptable specification.

To ensure that the type and quality of landscaping aspired to is sustainable it needs to achieve a reasonable level of maturity.

Overall, the proposed landscape layout is well designed.

Archaeology: The business complex is not located within an archaeological priority zone, however, the site has been in long use and important for the industrial history of Bermondsey. The buildings have been occupied and altered since their use as part of the biscuit factory, however they are worthy of record prior to demolition. As this project involves a staged process of work it may be the case that the condition might relate to the individual sites or requires alteration to fit with the structure of conditions relating to the application.

Public realm: Advice issued in connection with building streets to adoptable standards, maintenance and adoption, enforcement, street width, tree planting, and the new viaduct route.

#### Environmental protection team:

##### i) Air Quality

The main sources of pollution will be from residential use, transport and commercial activities. The development will consist of new road layouts and green spaces and car free area which should allow for better distribution/dilution of air pollutants. Also the plan

to use SELCHP will be positive with regards to minimising the pollution burden. The development will incorporate CHP which the assessments indicate will not lead to a significant effect on air quality.

Dust and other environmental impact created during the demolition and development stages will be controlled by measures included in the Environmental Management Plan.

Although the proposal is for a very large development within an air quality management area, the design and other mitigating effect will minimise the impact to existing air quality and EPT supports the development.

ii) Noise

The main source of noise will be from the rail, road and commercial units. Considered the assessments carried out by Cundall Associates which indicated that the residential property is exposed to Category type C. At this category the glazing specified is calculated to meet British Standards. EPT recommends that this is conditioned in order to ensure compliance.

iii) Noise from plant

Considered and agreed with the submission to design external building elements to achieve a 10dB reduction over and above the glazing attenuation. Details of the proposed energy centre will be required in due course.

iv) Protection from Vibration

The development must be designed to ensure that habitable rooms in the residential element of the development are not exposed to vibration dose values in excess of 0.13 m/s during the night-time period of 23.00 – 07.00hrs.

Have considered the vibration survey report undertaken by Bickerdike Allen Partners. It indicated that for the residential properties mitigating work is required to meet the recommended standards. A report shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to the commencement of the use hereby permitted and shall be permanently maintained thereafter and the development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with any such approval given.

v) Land contamination

Satisfied that that assessment is adequate to inform the phase II assessment. However the following condition is recommended to ensure compliance.

Economic Development Team:

i) Loss of Employment Floorspace

The overall loss of over 20,000sqm of employment floorspace within the borough from a single development is unwelcome. Well designed, well located and affordable business space is essential for the sustainability and growth of Southwark's small business economy, which provides the majority of employment within the borough. A mix of uses with a greater re-provision of employment space would further strengthen the location as a small business hub, better meet the ongoing demand for high quality small business space in City-fringe locations and further mitigate the considerable loss of employment land to non-employment use.

ii) Impact on the local area

The principle of opening up an access route through the railway viaduct to the Blue is supported as potentially improving access and footfall to the existing retail provision in the area and supporting the Blue as a viable local retail centre.

However, there is potential for the additional proposed retail space within the development to displace existing retail activity and therefore impact negatively on the existing local economy. A retail impact assessment should be considered as part of the application.

The principle of facilitating the regeneration of the railway arches is supported. Further commitments on public realm improvements to support existing businesses in the arches as well as facilitating suitable new uses would be expected at reserved matters stages.

iii) Retention of existing businesses and support for relocation for displaced businesses  
The application suggests that the majority of existing workshop and small business uses will be retained on the site after the development, this is supported. However, it is unclear what, if any, disruption or potential movement existing businesses might face during the demolition and redevelopment and what mitigation the applicant proposes putting in place. This information should be supplied.

Similarly a commitment that existing businesses within the workshop space will be retained following the development should be provided.

Where businesses are not to be retained following the development proposals should be submitted for how their relocation will be supported by the applicant.

Planning policy: No key objections to the proposal subject to further consideration of the quantum of retail, and the provision of the maximum level of affordable housing as is financially viable.

Transport Group: Quantum of cycle parking exceeds minimum standards so accepted. Details of the type of rack need to be provided. The level of parking is considered low and so the higher provision of cycles and also car clubs is welcomed. Disabled parking at one space per wheelchair accessible unit should be provided. Further details of servicing arrangements need to be confirmed.

Design Review Panel: The panel reviewed the scheme on two occasions on 11 June 2012 and also on 17 September 2012, the comments made on both occasions are summarised below.

11 June 2012 DRP:

The Panel felt the scheme could do more to create a generous public realm at the entrances to the viaduct which could be linked to improved lighting and visibility in the viaduct and offer wider benefits for current and future residents.

The Panel questioned the relationship of the scheme to the viaduct and how it engages with the businesses within the arches on the southern edge of the site.

The proximity of the current businesses relative to proposed future residents needs to be considered in detail. This separation appeared more generous in some parts of the masterplan but in others, the separation was not sufficient.

The Panel noted that the triangular block at the south-west corner of the site was proposed to be covered by a detailed planning application. They raised significant concerns over its proximity to the viaduct, its relationship with the corner at the entrance to the viaduct and its scale on Clements Road.

The current layout illustrates a full storey separation between the street frontage and the elevated garden to the rear with car parking accommodated at grade to the rear. This proposal establishes active frontages onto the street and hides the car parking but

separates the key family spaces including the kitchen from the unit's main communal and private amenity space on the elevated garden. The Panel requested a more direct relationship between it and the private amenity space.

In relation to the proposed arrangement for large scale perimeter blocks the Panel were satisfied that these embodied sound urban design principles.

The Panel questioned the way the designers proposed to achieve dual aspect on this site.

Finally, the Panel noted the sketch designs for the main entrances to the blocks. They felt the early studies for the entrances gave them a sense of the identity of each block. These are not just the main access points to the development but will become the identity for each of the 'mansion' blocks and the main route to the courtyards for future residents.

The Panel questioned the proposal for a larger 'master' entrance for each block and felt this would turn the other entrances into secondary access points leading to the perimeter blocks becoming effectively 'gated' communities.

In conclusion the Panel felt there were many aspects of the proposal that they would applaud. They encouraged the architects to develop their proposals further to address the points they raised especially about the wider benefits of the scheme and its relationship to the railway viaduct, the detailed design of the phase 1 block and the detailed design principles of the proposed perimeter blocks.

#### 17 September 2012 DRP:

The Panel were aware of the points raised by the earlier DRP (11 June 2012).

The Panel considered the architectural expression and massing proposed for the Plot 1 scheme and felt this raised a number of concerns. Their concerns included the 'mansion-block' aesthetic of the exterior and the detailed design of the courtyard especially how the scheme reconciles the amenity needs of future occupiers and reduces overlooking.

Further, they felt the courtyard design raised specific concerns in relation to flats at inner corners which would be overlooked by the proposed projecting balconies at immediately adjacent units. They also noted a number of discrepancies between the plans.

The Panel referred to a point raised by the earlier DRP about the public realm and felt the Plot 1 proposal had not addressed this issue. The earlier Panel felt the scheme could do more to create a generous public realm at the entrances to the viaduct. Whilst they acknowledged the set-back from viaduct had been increased to 10m, they felt the scheme did not articulate the important entrance to the masterplan appropriately and lacked the necessary generous public space at the corner of the St John's Road Arch.

The Panel felt not enough had been done to clarify issues which may arise as a result of the close relationship between the proposal and the busy viaduct. They raised questions over the arrangement of the block and how noise from the railway and the viaduct itself could reverberate around the open-ended courtyard affecting the units whose only outlook is only towards the viaduct.

The Panel referred to a general detailed design concern raised by the earlier DRP about the split-level units and felt the Plot 1 proposal had not addressed this issue. The earlier Panel had raised concerns about the separation of key family spaces including the kitchen from the unit's main communal and private amenity space on the elevated garden. They felt this remained an issue in Plot 1.

In conclusion, the Panel were encouraged by a number of aspects of the Plot 1 scheme. These included the choice of materials and detailing and its increased separation from the railway viaduct. However, they were unable to endorse the scheme for Plot 1 at this stage and they challenged the designers to revise their scheme to address the points they raised in relation to: the architectural expression, massing and residential amenity; the provision of public realm at the entrance to the viaduct; the environmental implications of the railway viaduct; and the internal design of the split-level townhouses and maisonettes.

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

English Heritage: No comments. The application should be determined in accordance with national and local guidance, and on the basis of your specialist conservation advice.

Greater London Authority: The application complies with some policies but not others and on balance does not comply with the London Plan. The reasons and the potential remedies to issues of non compliance are set out below[

- Principle of development: Further information required in relation to any displaced businesses, provision of affordable employment units and local employment and training measures. Further clarification is needed in relation to quantum of retail, community and leisure uses to be delivered.
- Housing: An independent assessment of the applicant's viability needs to be carried out and justification needed from the application with regards to the social rented provision. Further information and clarification is sought with respect to indicative mix for the outline affordable element and also in relation to single aspect units and residential density.
- Children's playspace – Child yield calculations need to be provided.
- Inclusive access – Further information needed in relation to inclusive design and wheelchair accessible units.
- Sustainable development: Further detail in relation to regulated carbon emission reductions in tonnes needed.
- Transport: A number of queries raised by Transport for London require response.

Transport for London: The applicant has not submitted a phased assessment within the TA, and so TfL will consider the application based on the end state of the development.

- Highway Impact

Given the limited amount of car parking, TfL are content that the proposal will have no adverse impacts on the operation of the TLRN. However, should existing uses be retained as part of the development, and a reduction in car parking be implemented, TfL are concerned that this would lead to overspill parking on surrounding streets.

- Car parking

It is noted that for the residential element, between 160 and 170 spaces are proposed at a ratio of 0.20 and 0.21 spaces per home. TfL welcome this, subject to all future occupiers being prevented from obtaining parking permits.

An extension to the CPZ to the south of the site should be developed and secured.

TfL welcome the provision of 4 car clubs and the commitment to provide 20 year membership to residents. This should be secured through the legal agreement.

The draft Delivery and Servicing Management Plan does not justify the servicing vehicle parking requirement based upon future occupiers of the site. TfL consider that the number of parking spaces required for servicing should be based on the number of anticipated deliveries and their use should be controlled through either the Delivery or Car Park Plan.

TfL require clarification on the number of parking spaces for the commercial element of

the development.

The provision of disabled car parking is welcomed but seek clarification on how the spaces would be managed and what provision is made for disabled visitors to the site. Welcome the commitment to provide 20% of parking spaces with active electric vehicle charging points and a further 20% with passive electric vehicle charging capability.

- Cycling

Welcome the commitment to create routes for cyclists through the site, especially given the Cycle Superhighway 4 is due to open in 2015 which would run along Jamaica Road. The commitment to provide cycle parking in line with the London Plan standards is welcomed. The applicant is encouraged to provide showers and changing facilities.

- Cycle Hire

TfL welcome the commitment towards cycle hire and therefore request a contribution of £220,000 or land safeguarded for the provision of a docking station within the site – for between 45 and 63 cycles.

- Walking

TfL welcome the creation of a pedestrian/cycle route through the viaduct connecting the site to Bombay Street. The applicant should consider a wayfinding strategy to establish the existing provision of signage in the area, the suitability of the signage and the need for signage as a result of the scheme.

- Bus network

TfL note that the 1 and C10 bus services operate close to capacity during the AM and PM peaks. TfL consider that the development is likely to create strong demand on these routes given the connections they provide to Central London, Surrey Quays and Canada Water. As a result, TfL consider that as additional phases of residential units to come forward, additional services would be required. As a result, TfL request a £450,000 contribution to provide 1 additional return bus journey, per day for a period of 5 years. The service changes associated with the contribution would ensure that the development does not place an unacceptable burden upon the public transport network and compromise the sustainability of the site as outlined in the London Plan. The trigger point of the payment would be at half way point in the development.

- London Underground

TfL are content that sufficient capacity exists at Bermondsey station and does not seek any contribution towards the underground.

- Taxi/private hire

The TA indicates a significant number of trips by taxi/private hire vehicle during the AM and PM peak. TfL request that the Car Parking Management Plan addresses this issue.

- Construction

A construction logistics plan should be secured by planning condition/legal agreement and should include cumulative impacts of construction traffic, likely construction trips generated and mitigation proposed. It should also consider impact on cyclists and identify any potential conflicts and mitigation.

- Travel Plan

The draft travel plans have been assessed. The residential travel plan has failed the ATTrBuTE assessment tool due to omission of modal split figures. The commercial travel plan is acceptable.

Metropolitan Police Service: No comments to make. Consultation has been undertaken with the applicant.

Environment Agency: No objection subject to conditions.

Natural England: Natural England does not consider that this application poses any likely or significant risk to those features of the natural environment for which NE would otherwise provide a more detailed consultation response and so does not wish to make specific comment on the details of this consultation.

Southwark Public Health: Welcome many aspects of the proposal such as the housing, the open spaces and green infrastructure as well as opportunities for employment. However, there are a number of issues that need to be raised.

The HIA states that the current level of health care in the vicinity is good and supports this by stating that there are 17 practices within a mile of the development. However of these only 16 are accepting new patients and two are in Tower Hamlets (Wapping and St Katharine's Dock) and are less accessible to people living south of the river. Five of the remaining practices have 2 or fewer GPs indicating a likely difficulty in accommodating large numbers of new patients.

The cumulative impact of other developments in the area needs to be modelled and kept under consideration. Population increase in Canada Water is likely to put the many of the general practices in the vicinity of the proposed scheme under pressure.

Thames Water: Comments made in relation to waste and water and conditions recommended.

Southwark Cyclists: Welcome the commitment within the application to improve permeability throughout the site and are pleased that the application acknowledges that the current site creates a barrier to cycle permeability.

The inclusion of a new one acre public space within the development is to be applauded. However, given that this space will attract leisure users, it is disappointing there are no proposals for public cycle parking next to this space. That requires rectification before the application proceeds.

The proposals for a Barclays Cycle Hire stand are welcomed, although, given the distance from any other docking station we would propose that the developer is required to enter into agreement with the operator to manage the facility in such a way that cycles may always be hired or docked without hindrance, and the docking station is never full. While the applicant confirms that the development will have cycle parking spaces above the minimum standards laid down in the London plan, there is no indication of what level they would be provided at.

We would propose that cycle parking is provided at the following levels:

- Residential at a factor of 1.5
- Office B1 at a factor of 1.75
- Retail Food at a factor of 2

Acknowledge that the viaduct route is beyond the scope of this application are pleased that the application envisages this as a mixed pedestrian and cyclist area, and the reality must be that this is the case regardless of the use to which the railway arches are put.

It is noted that Legible London Wayfaring signs are to be provided for pedestrians, we would ask that similar is provided for cyclists.

Turning to the draft Construction Plan we are of the opinion that many of the proposals within are unacceptable. The document states that the safety of vulnerable road users will be ensured by the use of banksmen, Southwark cyclists are of the position that safety for vulnerable road users must be designed into the construction operation.

Note with alarm that the applicant proposes no membership standard of FORS, and we would suggest that all vehicular contractors on site meet Silver as a minimum standard.

Also propose that all vehicles are fitted with side guards to the same standard as vehicles on the Crossrail project which has set exemplary standards for cycle safety.

Note that any temporary road closures will have diversions to facilitate pedestrians, the same must apply to cyclists.

Note that access to site is proposed via Southwark Park Road - but concern that this is quite unsuitable as it is a calmed area with traffic weaving in and out of parked cars. In fact, TfL operate a small bus on this route to reflect this. This access is not suitable for the proposed development.

Instead propose that access is via Drummond Road from Jamaica Road westbound, traffic can easily access this by using the roundabout at the start of the Rotherhithe Tunnel.

Traffic exiting should use Jamaica road to access the TLRN on Tower Bridge Road and proceed from there.

London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority: development should comply with the requirements of Approved Document B of the Building Regulations. A full building consultation will take place with when the application is received from them.

Mayor's Office for Policing and Crime (MOPAC) and Metropolitan Police Service: Request conditions be attached requiring airwave interference study's to ensure no impact to the Rotherhithe Police Station's Airwave reception.

### **Neighbours and local groups**

One objection from a local group:

Four Squares Tenants and Residents Association:

Object to the application unless the following guarantees are provided.

- None of the buildings should exceed six storeys;
- The association must be consulted in the logistics of the operation;
- The association must have a say in the procedures being used to control dust and noise;
- All site traffic be directed down St James Road/Clements Road and not Drummond Road;
- S.106 monies be used for enhancement and improvement of the Four Squares/New Place Estate and residential dwellings in Clements Road and not distributed to any other part of the borough.
- Request that the association be kept informed of any changes.

Two comments received.

29 Collett Road: No comments at this stage but wish to be kept informed of the progress with the application.

201 Grange Road: Same issues as raised by Southwark Cyclists, please see their comments above.

Nine objections received:

16 Webster Road: Concerns about the potential loss of sunlight and, in regards to the wider community, the increase in traffic, noise and pollution on the quiet residential area of Clements Road. The street is narrow and believe that the additional volume of traffic will be detrimental to the whole neighbourhood. Also, what provisions have been made for the existing businesses?

166 Lockwood Square: Object to the height of the proposed buildings, being 4 to 9 storeys; these would be out of character with the area. Those living in the terraced houses on Clements Road would feel dwarfed by the proposals. The four squares estates are 7 storeys. Flanning Court built in 2008 is only 6 storeys as well.

92 Webster Road: This height would seriously affect daylight to the adjacent properties. Especially with the proposed development being due south of the housing in Clements

Road and Webster Road. The nearby properties do not exceed four to six storeys.

98 Layard Square, Drummond Road:

Building Height:

Workspace assured the buildings would be no more than 6 storeys so as to be in keeping with the buildings of the Four Squares Estate that lies opposite on Drummond Road.

The maximum height given is nine storeys or 32.45m. This means heights of 11 storeys are being planned which is virtually double the height of the 6 storeys of the area and as such, not in keeping with the immediate area.

Transport - Tube:

The transport survey states that there will be no discernable impact however with an additional 800 residential units this cannot be the case.

Can Transport for London deliver a service that is more frequent so that the people who live in Bermondsey are able to get onto the service without undue delay and the dreadful overcrowding?

Transport - bicycles:

London is a busy city that needs to transport the working population who are the life blood of the economy as a whole. Bicycles in the bus lanes slow the buses down to the same speed as the cyclist and therefore delay all those on the bus.

Furthermore, the UK has an ageing population. Doubt the ageing population is going to be cycling around the city therefore efficient modes of transport that do not discriminate against the elderly ought to be developed instead, for example, a more frequent tube service.

Section 106 funding:

Is there any Section 106 funding for the Four Squares Estate which will be inconvenienced for years by the noise, dust, vibration and extra heavy goods traffic and which requires funding for its own impending Major Works programs?

90 Webster Road: Concerned about the height and quantum of the proposed development and what impact it would have on daylight/sunlight.

What is the height of the buildings proposed to replace the Block F area? What impact would the height of proposed buildings have to daylight/sunlight on my garden and back of house rooms?

Also query impact on television reception.

This is a huge project involving large scale demolition and building development. What impact will this have on this property and the quality of my day to day living and rest periods and what consideration do you give to the impact on local residents and how will the works be managed in relation to people who live round here?

94 Webster Road, first and Second floor flat: two letters received:

- The demolition of a heritage industrial site over 100 years should not be allowed
- It is a successful site and brings industry and business potential.
- The proposed buildings are too high and will seriously affect the light as they are south facing.
- The planned vehicle access and highway works are too narrow
- The landscaping is all internal with no feeling of public/space access through the site.

Second letter

The buildings and density are too high and as south facing will block the light and make

the surrounding streets darker and noisier.

The loss of potential business and the creative hub that the factory has nurtured over the last 140 years will be never be replaced.

17 Clements Road: Concerned about the view and light impact on existing residential properties in Clements Road.

The proposals show a significant rise in the building skyline which will effect natural light available to residential properties in Storcks Road, which is objectionable.

Also raise concerns about the impact to health and environment impact such as dust on local property and young residents as well as traffic congestion during construction.

The EIA summary makes it clear that the impact on air quality has not been well assessed.

The EIA Statement saying that there will be a reduction in traffic because the number of parking spaces will be reduced from the current level is misleading.

17 Clements Road (second representation from this address).

Not against re-development of this site per se, but have some specific concerns over this planning application and suggestions. There are 3 key areas:

1. Proper assessment of the impact on the Clements Road terrace directly opposite the site.

Concerned by the potentially dramatic loss of daylight and sunlight on the Clements Road terrace. It could have a significant not a 'minor' impact on sunlight and daylight on the terrace.

2. Mitigation and compensation related to the construction phase.

Residents directly bordering the site are clearly going to have disruption to their lives, and suffer atmospheric and noise pollution during the demolition and construction phases. As well as the danger from moving or parked lorries, and the noise and dust of construction there may also be subsidence and surface cracking, and periods without utilities such as water, gas or electricity. People are naturally going to be very concerned by the presence of lorries and by dust in the air.

3. Benefits from 106 monies.

Ideas for benefits to local residents from section 106 or other compensation monies that arise from this development.

3a) Local walkways to the Blue and to Bermondsey Tube.

There will be walkways through to Blue Anchor Lane and the Blue shopping area from Clements Road, which is great as long as a) they are not left until the final part of the development in 5-10 years time, but are done as soon as possible and b) that they are safe to use late at night / on a dark winter evening.

Secondly, has any thought been given to the large numbers of new residents that will walk up and down from the Tube and how to improve this walking journey.

3b) Traffic calming and greening of Clements Road and other roads adjacent to the development. Proper traffic calming measures should be introduced on adjacent roads.

Not against re-development of this site and can see that this will have long term some positive benefits for the area as a whole. But concern about the lack of concrete data around loss of sunlight and daylight to neighbouring properties, and it is likely that the

building nearest to the south-west corner of the Clements Road terrace is too high to not have a huge impact on these properties. Information needs to be available and clear about mitigation and compensation for what local residents will have to deal with during demolition and construction and also how the section 106 monies will be spent.

23 Clements Road: Request that stringent controls are attached on the way that demolition would be carried out to reduce noise, dust, traffic and other disturbance. It is important that when the detailed application is submitted for Plot 2, that the height, distance from road, character and materials are not eroded.

Concerns about the parking and arrangements to prevent occupiers from obtaining permits.

There is very little about the way the needs of the new population would be met. For example, who will be responsible for new doctors, more school places, new bus routes? This is the first phase of a long term development. It is important that clear terms and guidelines are laid down now.

31 Clements Road: The townhouses proposed for Plot 2 would be slightly higher than the existing Block F building. The height of the proposed Plot 1 and Plot 3 to either side (replacing a car park and two storey buildings) are considerably higher than any property in this section of Clements Road. Concerned about the loss of sunlight (especially morning and evening sun) and the height of the buildings on Plot 1 and Plot 3 being overwhelming and out of keeping with properties on north side of Clements Road.

Two letters of support.

Unit B306, The Biscuit Factory: My company, Forge Dynamic Ltd, is a current tenant at The Biscuit Factory. The planned development will only serve to make the complex even more vibrant. Particularly like the increased permeability the site will have after development.

Offer full support of the scheme, the plans will be a great benefit to local businesses. The additional commercial units offer us more opportunities and the residential units offer more business for those who target the consumer market.

The Blue Bermondsey Business Association (BBBA), 9 Market Place, SE16 3UQ:

Write in support of the application. Pleased that the design and vision of the scheme compliments the neighbourhood.

The BBBA have worked with the council on many business led initiatives to regenerate the Blue.

We have had several meetings with Jonathan Skelton of Workspace over the past year or so and at our last meeting were shown the new designs and held a lengthy discussion on the pro's and con's of the scheme and are now fully satisfied that it would be a fantastic asset for the area.

We fully support the scheme and can only see good benefits for the area in the long term and the plan to open up the arches to give direct access to the Blue from the proposed development, realises one of the primary initiatives of the BBBA at the outset of our mission to 'Renew the Blue'.

### **Re-consultation comments**

Transport for London: Given that the development quantum remain as previously proposed, TfL have no further comments to make at this point.

Natural England: Natural England has previously commented on this proposal and made comments to the authority in our letter dated 12 November 2012.

The advice provided in our previous response applies equally to this amendment although we made no objection to the original proposal.

The proposed amendments to the original application relate largely to design, and are

unlikely to have significantly different impacts on the natural environment than the original proposal.

Environment Agency: Previous comments issued still stand.

Thames Water: Previous comments still stand.

Ecology: Refer to previous comments. One amendment suggested to green roof condition.

#### 6 objections received

Address not provided: The revised application raises previously submitted comments about the environmental impact of light on residential properties in Clements Road. The study now confirms that the light impact will be significant. The main concern is that this will reduce the quality of life and have potential health impact on local resident, particularly young children. It seems contradictory to now present information that verifies significant light impact while at the same time increasing the height of the building in the revised application.

No strategy in the plan to ensure that the resulting atmospheric impact by dust during the lengthy construction will not result in health and unacceptable quality of life impacts due to the particulate matter.

In the consultation phase the purpose of the development was due to the inability to rent out some of the buildings and thus to convert some to residential to create revenue for conversion to smaller business units. However some of these large units have now been let and made improvements to the area. Therefore has the requirement to convert the existing properties reduced and is it necessary to increase the height of replacements to generate revenue.

201 Grange Road: Note with disappointment and alarm the comments about the Viaduct Road. The Network Management Policy 2010 is not reflected in this document, it needs to be clear that cyclists will be given priority.

23 Clements Road: The main concern is about the proposal to increase the height on one of the plots (plot 04). This will block sunlight as well as visibility.

Address not provided: Object to its proposed height. If it goes ahead it will double the height of the buildings in situ. It will also take away a lot of light for residents in Clements Road and also the houses on Webster Road whose living rooms will be darkened by the proposed development. The new scheme's occupants will also look directly into living rooms of those houses on Clements Road and Webster Road. As such this development proposal should be disallowed. Right to light legislation should prevent this proposal from being consented in the first instance.

#### 96 Webster Road:

The proposal presents a completely different building design, elevation and layout respect to the scheme by the designer few months ago, in the way it faces Clements Road.

The new proposed buildings have now an elevation directly facing Clement's Road from 19.075m to over 24 metres, therefore not reflecting the current elevation and layout.

Concern is that the new building with a significant greedy increase of elevation will suffocate the adjacent houses facing Clements Road and all the houses in constant shadow over all year.

The designer should revert back to its original design at the initial proposal where the elevation and building layout was in more harmony and respect of the existing adjacent neighbourhood.

17 Clements Road: Not against re-development of this site per se, but still have some specific concerns over this planning application and suggestions. There are 3 key areas.

1. Impact on the Clements Road terrace directly opposite the site.

Note that the developers have now belatedly published the sunlight and daylight impact analysis (Appendix 15). Concerned by the potentially dramatic loss of sunlight and daylight on the Clements Road terrace, and other properties. Their own analysis shows losing nearly a third of winter sunlight into our home yet the sunlight impact summary says there will only be a 'minor' impact on sunlight and daylight.

2. Mitigation related to the construction phase.

There is nothing in the new documents regarding the disruption of the very lengthy development phases (2 years for plot 1 and 2 years for plot 2 will directly affect Clements Road residents for 4 years). Residents directly bordering the site are clearly going to have disruption to their lives, and suffer atmospheric and noise pollution during the demolition and construction phases.

3. Benefits to the area from 106 monies.

3a) Local walkways to the Blue and to Bermondsey Tube

3b) Traffic calming and greening of Clements Road and other roads adjacent to the development.

3c) Improvements to homes directly opposite the site to 'integrate' the new development with the existing area such as front garden improvements to 'match' the opposite new homes, this may be bin stores, walls, paving etc.

# APPENDIX 3

## Environmental Impact Assessment

The Environmental Statement (ES) sets out the results of the EIA and provides a detailed verification of potential beneficial and adverse environmental impacts in relation to the proposed development, including the following areas of impact (in the order they appear in the ES):

- Scheme description
- Air Quality
- Traffic and transport
- Noise and Vibration
- Biodiversity
- Ground Conditions
- Hydrology and Hydrogeology
- Historic Environment
- Socio-economics
- Townscape and visual
- Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing
- Wind Microclimate
- Electronic Interference.

### Air Quality

The ES has considered the impacts arising from traffic flows and the effects of this on air quality pollutants in the area. There has also been a consideration of the impacts arising from dust during construction, and the new CHP plant. The impacts from this are unlikely to be significant. The significance of these impacts has been given as negligible to slight adverse. A series of best practice measures would be proposed in relation to construction and air quality.

### Traffic and Transport

This section of the ES describes the effects in relation to highway traffic volumes, flows and capacity and the effects on public transport accessibility and capacity. There is also a consideration of the temporary effects arising from demolition and construction activities.

The assessment identifies that there would be a reduction in the number of traffic flows associated with the proposals in comparison to the existing situation. This is based on the fact that there would be a reduction in the proposed levels of parking and as residents and employees would not be eligible to apply for parking permits. The level of parking on the site is reduced overall.

There would be increased activity during construction however movements would be managed through routing agreements. The impacts would not be significant.

### Noise and vibration

Existing noise levels are dominated by rail and road noise. The assessment sets out the minimum recommended glazing and ventilation specification for the windows within the buildings so that internal noise levels inside the buildings meet the requirements of the relevant British Standard.

Noise limits for any services plant would be included (like for example on extractor fans) to ensure that they are set at 10 decibels below existing daytime and nighttime background noise levels. In relation to the outdoor spaces and balconies for the

residential flats, the noise levels would be above those set out in the World Health Organisation (WHO) guidelines at certain periods given the location adjacent to the railway viaduct. These impacts have been given as low to high and significant.

In relation to construction, there would be an increase in noise levels affecting noise sensitive receptors due to demolition and construction and road traffic noise. The construction would be undertaken in accordance with best practice guidelines and accordingly the impacts would be medium and not be significant.

In relation to vibration from the passage of trains, vibration mitigation would be required for buildings encroaching to within 10m of the railway viaduct – this would be in the form of foundation design. These impacts would therefore not be significant.

#### Ecology/Biodiversity

The ES considers the effects of the development on a series of biodiversity receptors: sites of nature conservation importance, trees located within the site, bats and breeding birds. There are no sites of nature conservation importance within the area where the effects of the development on ecology would occur. The site contains a limited number of trees (five London Plane trees).

The extended phase 1 habitat survey identified evidence of potential for breeding birds – house sparrow and feral pigeons. In relation to bats, the survey identified a very low potential to support roosting, foraging and/or commuting bats because of the buildings construction, the lack of fissures and cracks in the trees that would be used to support bats, the site being well lit and as the site not being linked to areas of off-site semi natural vegetation which may be used by bats.

As mitigation, trees would be removed between August and February to avoid any potential disturbance of nesting birds. In addition, 6 nest boxes designed to attract house sparrow would be provided. Extensive landscaping would also be included. There are no significant effects identified in relation to biodiversity.

#### Ground conditions

A phase 1 desk based assessment has been undertaken to identify past and present activities that have occurred on the site to identify if there is any potential for contamination to be present. Based on the historical and present land use of the site and the immediate vicinity it is possible that some contaminants are present. A further investigation would be undertaken prior to construction to identify any contamination in detail and put in place relevant measures to remediate these contaminants if found to be present so that there would be no effects on those living and working within the development in the long term. The impacts on human health and on the ground water have also been considered. The impact has been assessed as negligible and not significant.

#### Hydrology and Hydrogeology

The development is located within Flood Zone 3 and is classed 'more vulnerable' to flood risk because the proposed development would include residential development. A flood risk assessment has been undertaken for the site and all forms of flood risk to and from the development have been considered. The assessment finds that the effects of flood risk to people and property, both on and off site, is unlikely to be significant as environmental measures would be incorporated into the scheme, including sustainable drainage system, storm water collection, locating sleeping accommodation above ground floor level for the residential uses, construction suitable to withstand the effects of flooding and communal areas protected from flooding. Measures would also be incorporated to reduce water consumption.

On this basis, the impacts would not be significant.

### Historic Environment

A number of designated heritage assets are located in the wider vicinity of the site:

- Three World Heritage Sites within 5km (Westminster Abbey, Westminster Palace and St Margaret's Church WHS, The Tower of London WHS and Greenwich Maritime WHS);
- c. 115 listed buildings within 1km of the site;
- Seven conservation areas within 1km of the site (CA7 Bermondsey Street, CA8 Tower Bridge, CA9 St Saviour's Dock, CA11 St Mary Rotherhithe, CA16 Wilson Grove, CA17 Thorburn Square and CA41 Edward III's Rotherhithe).
- Two scheduled monuments within 1km of the site (Medieval and later Bermondsey Abbey) and the site of the Medieval Moated Manor House of Edward III; and
- One registered Park and Garden within 1km of the site (the Grade II Southwark Park).

The assessment found that there would be no substantial harm to designated or non designated heritage assets present in the vicinity of the site. The assets are distant to the application site, and accordingly would not present any impacts.

### Socio-economic

This chapter of the ES sets out the results of an assessment of the effects of the proposed scheme on the local community. The ES states that the existing secondary schools have spare capacity. In relation to primary schools, the ES notes a 12.4% surplus in spaces. But some schools are over subscribed – Southwark Park Primary School by 15% and St James C of E Primary by 2%. Also states that recent forecasts of expected numbers of primary school children up to 2015/6 indicate that there would be an 18.4% growth in pupil numbers. This suggests that existing primary schools would have limited scope to accommodate any significant increase in pupil numbers from new development in the area. The ES estimates that the scheme would produce 200 school age children with 140 primary school pupils and 60 secondary pupils. This number would require 5 new primary schools of entry and two new secondary school forms of entry.

In relation to health, the ES states that there are 47 GP practices in Southwark with 219 GPs. National standard of care is one GP for every 1,800 patients but in Southwark it is one in 1,300, so there is potential for this to take some additional growth.

The ES lists a number of outdoor sport and recreation spaces in close proximity to the development including Southwark Park, Kings Stair Gardens, Bermondsey Spa Gardens, Lucey Way/Alexis Street local park and St James Churchyard. There is also Seven Islands Leisure Centre, Southwark Park Sports Centre and Bacons College Sports Centre. The ES states that there would be an increase in demand for open space, outdoor sports facilities and playgrounds but states that the new central park would meet additional demand for new residents of the development.

The main retail centres are the town centres of Peckham and the Elephant and Castle. There is also Canada Water and London Bridge district centres, and also The Blue being the closest to the site. The ES also sets out nearby community facilities, including places of worship, libraries and police stations.

In terms of construction employment, the construction phase of the development would support 125 permanent full time jobs. Some local businesses in the local area would also benefit from the trade linkages in terms of supplying construction materials and equipment. There would also be other positive impacts, such as construction workers spending in local shops and using other local facilities.

In terms of the completed development, the ES estimates that 1,034 full time jobs would be supported. This would represent a net increase of 384 full time equivalent posts. The ES has also considered the extent to which the development would displace activities from elsewhere in the borough, for example if some businesses and jobs relocate from existing premises in Southwark into the new space provided on the site. A displacement factor of 5% has been adopted and applied, and would result in total net additional jobs in order of 365 full time equivalent. There would also be indirect jobs created by the spending on goods, supplies and services of companies based on the application site with firms in the surrounding area. The applicant has offered to maximise the benefits of the scheme locally through measures such as encouraging local recruitment, using local labour resources, products and services to be procured locally, recruitment/training for construction workers on site, skills training in conjunction with local skills partners.

In terms of population, the additional residential population that could arise from the circa 800 new dwellings in the local area would be 2,160 persons. This would be equivalent to a 0.8% population increase for the borough. This estimate assumes that all of the new dwellings would be for people not already living in the area but some of the new homes would be people already living in the borough such as those on council waiting lists for affordable accommodation. However, these may release other homes so there would still be a net growth overall.

The residual effects range from negligible to medium.

#### Townscape and visual:

The proposal would have a long construction period, and during this time, the views experienced by neighbours would be negative. But in the longer term, the development would fit in more positively into the character of the local townscape. The blank frontages of the sheds would be replaced with new buildings which will have windows and doors fronting the street. There would also be good connections to the surrounding areas to encourage movement through the site. Some buildings would be taller than the existing but the townscape does have a diversity of building heights. The site would not be visible from any strategic views identified within the London Plan. The overall impact has been assessed as being a beneficial significant impact.

#### Wind microclimate

The assessment has been undertaken to assess the effects that the construction of new buildings would have on existing local air movements. The assessment looks at the potential changes which would increase turbulence and channelling could affect both pedestrian comfort and safety. The assessment has identified that the incorporation of environmental measures into the design such as recessed entrances and landscaping in amenity spaces would protect from any wind effects and therefore no significant effects would occur. Other mitigation would be required in terms of mitigation from winds in the park, and private courtyards and amenity spaces. This would be in the form of tree planting, perimeter screening. Subject to this mitigation being secured, no significant impacts would occur.

#### Electronic interference

The effects of the proposed scheme on electrical equipment relying on broadcast signals have been assessed. There could be effects on the reception of terrestrial television services for up to 180 existing aerial installations. However, suitable mitigation measures are proposed including relocating a community antenna out of the terrestrial shadow, upgrading single dwelling aerials by increasing their height and/or gain or a transfer to a non subscription satellite service. This strategy can be secured by either a planning condition or in the legal agreement. The effects to television reception are considered to be of negligible significance.