

Item No.	Classification:	Date:	Meeting Name:
7.1	Open	15 May 2013	Planning Sub-committee B
Report title:	Development Management planning application: Application 12/AP/3987 for: Full Planning Permission Address: LARNACA WORKS, GRANGE WALK, LONDON SE1 3EW Proposal: Change of use of 454sqm of vacant ground floor commercial floorspace (flexible Use Class A1, A2, A3, B1 & D1 floorspace) to residential (Use Class C3) and associated elevational changes. The proposed residential use comprises 7 residential units (4 x 1 Bed, 2 x 2 Bed & 1 x 3 Bed). The application also proposes additional door openings to the ground floor commercial unit located in block C (adjacent to Grange Yard).		
Ward(s) or groups affected:	Grange		
From:	Head of Development Management		
Application Start Date 23/01/2013		Application Expiry Date 20/03/2013	

RECOMMENDATION

- 1 That planning permission is granted, subject to conditions.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Site location and description

- 2 The site is situated to the south side of Grange Walk. The site was formerly known a 'Larnaca Works' which following permission granted in 2007 (06-AP-2272), has been redeveloped into a residential led (90 units) scheme known as 'Grange Gardens'. The Grange Gardens development currently accommodates 90 residential units and 1100sqm of commercial space (flexible Use Class A1, A2, A3, B1 & D1 floorspace) to the ground floor (currently vacant) in 3 blocks between 5 and 7 storeys in height. The site area is 0.25 hectares.
- 3 The immediate context surrounding the site is predominantly residential, however there are a number of commercial uses to the south and west of the site. The built form surrounding the site is varied at between 2 and 7 storeys in height.

Details of proposal

- 4 The application proposes to change the use of 454sqm of the existing ground floor commercial space to 7 residential apartments (4 x 1 Bed, 2 x 2 Bed & 1 x 3 Bed). Each proposed residential unit would be on the ground floor and have a small private terrace area. The proposal would convert existing space and with the exception of balustrading to form new private terrace areas at ground level, no new buildings or structures are proposed and there would be minimal external alterations to the building.

Relevant planning history

- 5 **11-AP-2136** for: 'Variation of condition 19 (detailing approved drawing numbers) to allow for minor material amendments to the existing planning permission 06-AP-2272. Amendments consist of:

Within Block B:

- Introduction of 14 balconies to the south and east elevations
- Reduction in the number of residential units from 38 to 35.
- Amended housing mix from 15x1 bed, 22x2 bed, 1x3 bed to 8x1 bed, 25x2 bed, 2x3bed.

All amendments relate to planning permission 06-AP-2272 for the demolition of existing buildings and canopy structure and redevelopment to provide three buildings of between five (18m) and seven (24m) storeys in height comprising 1105m² of floorspace for either A1, A2, A3, B1 or D1 Use Class and 90 flats (comprising 31 x 1 bed; 49 x 2 bed; 9 x 3 bed; 1 x 4 bed), plus car and cycle parking, amenity and public open space.

APPROVED 29/03/2012

- 6 **10-AP-3722** for: 'Variation to legal agreement to substitute obligation to building two public squares on land to the east of the application site and pedestrian street land to the west with a financial contribution for alternative works'.
AGREED 15/02/2011
- 7 **10-AP-2283** for: 'Non-Material Amendment to application 06-AP-2272 dated 25 June 2007 (for the erection of three buildings between 5 and 7 storeys in height to provide commercial floorspace and 90 flats) to add an additional condition relating to the list of application drawings approved'.
AGREED 17/09/2010
- 8 **Deed of Variation** AGREED 25/03/2009 to amend the housing tenure mix to remove the obligation to provide 9 shared ownership units within Block A.
- 9 **09-AP-1300** for: 'Alterations during the course of construction to planning permission 06-AP-2272 dated 27 June 2007 (being for demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment to provide three buildings of between five (18m) and seven (24m) storeys in height comprising 1105m² of floorspace for either A1, A2, A3, B1 or D1 Use Class and 90 flats, plus car and cycle parking, amenity and public open space) for revisions to floor and storey heights resulting in an increase in the overall building height by 1 metre'.
WITHDRAWN by applicant 15/10/2009
- 10 **06-AP-2272** for: 'Demolition of existing buildings and canopy structure and redevelopment to provide three buildings of between five (18m) and seven (24m) storeys in height comprising 1105m² of floorspace for either A1, A2, A3, B1 or D1 Use Class and 90 flats (comprising 31 x 1 bed; 49 x 2 bed; 9 x 3 bed; 1 x 4 bed), plus car and cycle parking, amenity and public open space'.
GRANTED subject to legal agreement 25/06/2007

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Summary of main issues

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

- a] the principle of the development in terms of land use;
- b] the impact of the development on adjoining occupiers;
- c] the impact of adjoining uses on the proposed development;
- d] design issues;
- e] Housing mix and quality of accommodation;
- f] the impact of the development in relation to traffic;
- g] sustainability and energy;
- h] section 106 implications.

Planning policy

- 12 Under the Southwark Core Strategy, the site is situated in the Urban Density Zone, an Air Quality Management area, an Archaeological Priority Zone and a Flood Risk Zone. The site is not situated in a conservation area, nor is it located adjacent to any Listed Buildings. The site has a TfL Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 3, which indicates medium access to public transport.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

- 13 Relevant documents include:
 Section 1 'Delivering Sustainable Development'
 Section 4 'Promoting Sustainable Transport'
 Section 6 'Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes'
 Section 7 'Requiring good design'

London Plan 2011

- 14 The relevant policies for the London Plan include:
- Policy 3.3 - Increasing housing supply
 - Policy 3.4 - Optimising housing potential
 - Policy 3.5 - Quality and design of housing developments
 - Policy 3.6 - Children and young people's play and informal recreation facilities
 - Policy 3.8 - Housing choice
 - Policy 3.9 - Mixed and balanced communities
 - Policy 5.1 - Climate change mitigation
 - Policy 5.2 - Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
 - Policy 5.3 - Sustainable design and construction
 - Policy 5.12 - Flood risk management
 - Policy 5.15 - Water use and supplies
 - Policy 6.9 - Cycling
 - Policy 6.10 - Walking
 - Policy 6.13 - Parking
 - Policy 7.1 - Building London's neighbourhoods and communities
 - Policy 7.2 - An inclusive environment
 - Policy 7.3 - Designing out crime
 - Policy 7.4 - Local character
 - Policy 7.5 - Public realm
 - Policy 7.6 - Architecture
 - Policy 7.8 - Heritage Assets and Archaeology

Core Strategy 2011

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

Southwark Plan 2007 (July) - saved policies

- 16 Policy 1.4 – Employment sites outside the preferred office and industrial locations;
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 3.8 – Waste management;
Policy 3.9 – Water;
Policy 3.11 – Efficient use of land;
Policy 3.12 – Quality in design;
Policy 3.13 – Urban design;
Policy 3.14 – Designing out crime;
Policy 3.15 – Conservation of the historic environment;
Policy 3.19 – Archaeology;
Policy 3.28 – Biodiversity;
Policy 4.1 – Density of residential development;
Policy 4.2 – Quality of residential accommodation;
Policy 4.3 – Mix of dwellings;
Policy 5.1 – Locating developments;
Policy 5.2 – Transport Impacts;
Policy 5.3 - Walking and Cycling;
Policy 5.6 – Car parking;

Adopted Supplementary Planning Documents

- 17 Relevant documents include:
Residential Design Standards (2011)

Principle of development

- 18 The site is outside of a designated employment area, and does not have any proposal site designation within the Core Strategy. The site does not have direct access to a classified road, nor is it within a Public Transport Accessibility Zone, Central Activities Zone or a Strategic Cultural Area and therefore the proposal complies with saved policy 1.4 of the Southwark Plan 'employment sites'. Consequently, any former employment uses at the site such as office use or retail spaces are not protected by planning policy. Therefore the change of use of the in principle would not be contrary to planning policy.
- 19 The commercial spaces would have contributed to creating active frontages at ground level and a level of vibrancy from the mix of uses in line with the aspirations of the original development. The applicant has provided justification for the proposed change

of use in the form of marketing evidence. The marketing report confirms that the commercial floorspace has been marketed since 2007. In October 2010, the commercial space was completed and prospective tenants were able to view them complete, however the space remained vacant. In a further attempt to attract tenants, the applicant fitted out the commercial units with kitchens, bathrooms and flooring in February 2012. However, despite continuous marketing for a number of years, including fitting out the units to make them more attractive, it has not been possible to find tenants. The marketing report outlines that a combination of the location, residential character of the area, distance from public transport hubs and lack of established commercial market within the area, contributed to the lack of interest in the units. Overall, based on the information provided it is considered that the applicant has made convincing attempts to find tenants for the units over a significant period, however has been unsuccessful.

- 20 In terms of planning policy, there is no requirement to retain the existing commercial uses within this location, and on the basis that the commercial units have remained vacant despite active marketing, the change of use is considered acceptable. The provision of residential uses would be appropriate in accordance with the existing land uses in the area and Southwark's strategic aim of providing new homes in the borough.

Environmental impact assessment

- 21 A screening opinion has not been issued, however it is not considered the development constitutes EIA development as the development does not fall within Schedule 1 or 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011.
- 22 The proposal does not constitute an 'Urban Development Project' under Schedule 2 10(b) on the basis that the site area falls below the 0.5 hectare threshold. Furthermore, taking into account the 'selection criteria' set out in Schedule 3 of the Regulations, the proposal would not give rise to significant environmental effects or cumulative impacts. Whilst the development is outside any designated 'sensitive site' as defined in the regulations the local context will be an important consideration when assessing the impacts of the development. Overall, it is considered that the proposal falls outside of the formal definition of EIA development and therefore an EIA would not be required. The likely environmental effects could be addressed and mitigated where required as part of the planning application procedure.

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

- 23 Saved policy 3.2 'Protection of Amenity' within the Southwark Plan seeks to protect the amenity of existing and future occupiers in the surrounding area or on the site.
- 24 Overlooking, outlook and sense of enclosure
The proposed development would convert existing ground floor space within the development. Due to the location and orientation of the proposed units, there would not be any harmful overlooking between habitable windows within the development itself, or towards neighbouring residential occupiers. The proposed terraces would allow a degree of overlooking to neighbouring terraces and the public courtyard, however this is not an unusual or unacceptable situation. The proposed development would have an acceptable outlook for future occupiers, and would not have a harmful impact on outlook or create a sense of enclosure to any neighbouring occupiers.
- 25 Daylight and Sunlight
Given the development is a conversion of existing space within a building, no new

structures are proposed that would cause any harm to the daylight and sunlight to existing neighbouring occupiers. Whilst no formal daylight and sunlight report has been submitted regarding the daylight and sunlight levels to the proposed flats, given the proposed large windows, layouts of the units and reasonably open orientation, there is no concern with regard to daylight and sunlight levels.

26 Impact on existing amenity space

One of the main concerns raised in representations is that the proposed ground floor terraces would encroach into the existing communal courtyard, thus reducing the scale of this space and inhibit accessibility along the existing walkways. To seek to address these concerns, the applicant submitted amended plans reducing the width of the terraces, removing some terraces and replacing them with narrow privacy strips. The walkways around the terraces as amended are now between 1800mm and 2080mm, which is considered acceptable in terms of accessibility for all users including those with pushchairs or wheelchairs.

27 A number of representations have raised concern that the proposed ground floor terraces would result in narrow walkways leading to dark corners, thus raising concerns over safety and security. The residents concerns have been considered and the applicant has agreed to reduce the height and material of the balustrades serving the terraces, to reduce the feeling of enclosure and increase natural surveillance from the new dwellings over the courtyard. On this basis, it is considered that the proposal would result in an improvement to safety and security by occupying the existing vacant spaces and providing active uses that overlook the courtyard.

28 The applicant proposed a play area in the southern area of the existing courtyard, however this has been amended during the course of the application. The space would not be a formal play area and would be a general landscaped amenity space which could be enjoyed by residents of all ages. Representations raised concern that a dedicated childrens play area could give rise to noise and disturbance, however the amended plans remove any formal play equipment, and show that this space would be integrated into the existing courtyard. The communal spaces would be publicly accessible in accordance with the existing situation, and given the plans do not show a formal play area, it is not considered non-residents would be attracted to use the area over and above the existing situation. Therefore it is not considered there will be harmful impacts on the existing residential amenity and the proposal would provide an enhanced space for both existing and future residents. Full details would be secured by condition to ensure the landscaping is acceptable.

29 Taking into account the amended ground floor terraces and appropriate walkway widths, and the proposed landscape enhancements to the southern edge of the courtyard, it is not considered that proposal would have an unacceptable impact on the availability of amenity space for existing residents.

30 Loss of existing residents lounge

The existing Grange Gardens development utilises part of the existing vacant ground floor space as a residents lounge for meetings and socialising. Consequently this has become an important amenity space to existing residents, and a number of representations object to the loss of this space. It is understood that the resident lounge was part of the development when residents purchased their properties, and therefore may be part of the lease agreement. However, this would be a separate matter and does not form a material planning consideration. The provision of a residents lounge was not a requirement of the original planning permission for the development, nor is such a space a planning policy requirement. However, in response to the representations, the applicant amended the scheme during the course of the application and has provided an 18sqm lounge space in block A. Whilst this space is moderate in scale, it would serve the purpose of a meeting place for residents

and in terms of planning policy, no objection is raised.

31 Construction

It is acknowledged that there may be some impacts during construction, particularly to neighbouring residential occupiers within close proximity of the site. However given the nature of the proposal which primarily involves internal works, there is unlikely to be significant construction impacts. Works outside acceptable daytime hours would be controlled under Environmental Protection legislation.

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

- 32 The area surrounding the site is predominantly residential in nature with the exception of some commercial uses in the area. However, given the nature of existing surrounding uses, it is unlikely that future occupiers would experience unacceptable noise and disturbance. Whilst the site is in an Air Quality Management Area, it is located over 100m away from an A or B road and no significant pollutants are located within immediate vicinity of the site. The development itself is car free, and given its scale, would not have a notable impact on local air quality. Overall, it is not considered there would be unacceptable amenity impacts in terms of air quality.

Design issues

- 33 The proposal would utilise the existing envelope of the building. New windows and doors would be incorporated into the elevations, however these would be of a similar scale and design to the existing elevations. The proposal would include new openings onto the east elevation overlooking an adjacent site in different ownership, currently under construction. Within the neighbouring development a new pedestrian and vehicle street would run parallel with the boundary of the application site and therefore creating new windows and balconies overlooking the street, is considered a benefit in animating the new street and ensuring a successful public space. All the proposed windows and doors in the east elevation would be situated within the red line boundary. The use of the ground floor for residential purposes would result in natural surveillance over the public courtyard areas and active frontages which is considered a benefit to the development.
- 34 The proposed residential elevations would use similar materials to match the appearance of the existing building including green glazed brick, anodised window frames and stainless steel laser cut screens. The proposed balustrades serving the ground floor terraces, would be a laser cut stainless steel with a patterned design. This matches a similar feature used on the existing building for the doors serving bin and bike stores. A number of representations have raised concern regarding the scale and appearance of the balustrading, which is 1.5m in height. Furthermore, issues regarding the durability of such a material have been questioned, due to existing problems with rust where it is used currently within the development. The use of a high quality and durable material is crucial and in response to concerns, the applicant has agreed to reduce the height of the balustrading and put forward alternative material finishes. This would reduce the prominence of the terrace screens and also improve natural surveillance over the courtyard. Full details will be secured by condition attached to any permission granted.
- 35 The existing landscaped courtyard is for use of residents and is also publicly accessible. It is clear from the number of representations received from residents, that due to the lack of communal amenity space elsewhere within the development, this space is highly valued by existing residents. The ground floor of the development was intended as commercial frontages which would have provided activity to the space. The space immediately in front of the ground floor commercial frontage would have

effectively been a circulation space, which in the current proposal would become a privacy strip or ground floor terrace area for the occupiers of the proposed units.

- 36 The proposed terraces and planting strips to the front of the proposed units would encroach into the landscaped courtyard and push circulation space further into the courtyard. This issue has been raised as a concern by a large number of residents and consequently, during the course of the application, the applicant submitted amended plans reducing the scale of the proposed private terraces and planting strips outside the proposed residential windows, to seek to overcome such concerns. Furthermore, the application proposes to create an enhanced landscaped and seating area within the existing courtyard, to provide a meaningful space for residents of all ages to use.
- 37 The amendments to the scheme during the application have reduced the depth of the proposed ground floor terraces by between 250mm and 400mm and flats 4 and 7 now have recessed terraces. The terraces have also been reduced to narrow privacy strips outside bedroom windows and reduced in scale away from corners of the building and the communal entrances. The walkways around the terraces within the courtyard as amended, are between 1800mm and 2080mm, which is considered acceptable in terms of accessibility for residents including those with pushchairs and wheelchairs. Further neighbour consultation was carried out following the amendments, and whilst some objections remain, the amendments have resulted in less concern over this matter.
- 38 The principle of residential use is supported within the majority of representations and the benefits of an occupied space providing natural surveillance and activity onto the courtyard is acknowledged. Whilst the impact on the current courtyard is a key issue, this needs to be balanced against the acceptability of the proposed accommodation for future occupiers. The proposed residential units would convert the existing vacant ground floor space and given the ground floor location fronting publicly accessible spaces, each unit requires at least some form of defensible space to provide separation between habitable windows and public spaces for privacy and security. Furthermore, in accordance with Southwark's Residential Design Standards SPD (2011) new developments must provide each unit with private amenity space ideally 10sqm in scale. The proposed terraces would not all meet this standard and an application would not normally be granted. However, to balance the needs of existing residents, whilst recognising the benefit of bringing a long term vacant space into an active use, in this case the amenity space is considered acceptable.
- 39 The amendment during the course of the application to reduce the scale of the ground floor terraces is considered to significantly improve the quality of the remaining space within the courtyard, whilst retaining acceptable levels of private amenity space and defensible space for the proposed units. The circulation space surrounding the terraces would be sufficient for all users including wheelchair users and users with pushchairs. The provision of an enhanced seating and landscaped area within the communal space is of benefit to both existing and future occupiers. Whilst it is acknowledged that some resident concerns remain, it is considered that taking on balance the benefit of providing an appropriate ground floor which provides an active use and natural surveillance, thus enhancing the courtyard space, in conjunction with the amendment to reduce the terrace areas, an acceptable landscaped courtyard space would be retained as a result of the proposed development.
- 40 It is noted that the site layout plan included with the application shows an area of 's.106 landscaping' that does not exist and will not be delivered as it is outside the applicant's ownership. Representations raised concerns that because this space is outside the applicant's ownership, the circulation space particularly around the terrace serving unit 1, would be narrower than the plans indicate. Whilst some of the land on the plans is outside the applicant's ownership, any future development of the adjacent

site would require planning permission and the amenity impacts on existing occupiers would need to be found acceptable. As such, development close to the red line ownership boundary would be controlled, and any future development coming forward would be assessed against the impacts to existing amenity spaces and occupiers. Notwithstanding this, the distance of the terrace serving the living room of unit 1 is 1600mm from the red line boundary of the site, which is considered sufficient space for the circulation walkway.

- 41 Overall, the proposed design alterations are acceptable. Further details regarding materials, detailed finishes and landscaping will be secured by condition to ensure the anticipated and required design quality to ensure the scheme is a success, is achieved.

Housing Mix and Quality of Accommodation

- 42 The application proposes 4 x 1 bed, 2 x 2 bed and 1 x 3 bed. The proposed development provides 7 units in total and is therefore below the 10 unit threshold set out within Strategic Policy 6 of the Core Strategy 2011 and consequently no affordable housing is proposed. Whilst the proposed units would form part of a larger residential development, the original development was granted planning permission in 2007 and has been completed and occupied for some time. As such, this application has been assessed as a stand alone application and affordable housing is not required. Given the proposal is not a major development of 10 units or more, there is no requirement for dedicated wheelchair accommodation and no units are proposed.
- 43 The proposed housing mix provides a range of unit sizes which is considered acceptable. The overall internal space standards for all dwellings accords with and in some cases exceeds the minimum floor areas set out within the Southwark Residential Design Standards SPD 2011 which is acceptable. The majority of units would have a dual aspect, and there are no north facing single aspect units. All units would have dedicated internal storage space and private amenity space in the form of a ground floor terrace. Whilst some of the terraces are below the standard normally expected, this is considered acceptable in this case, due to the need to ensure the terraces do not negatively impact the circulation space within the existing courtyard. Future occupiers would have direct access to the communal courtyard and would therefore have adequate access to a amenity space.

Traffic Issues

- 44 The scale of development is not such that it is expected to create a vehicular trip generation which will have a significant negative impact on the highway network. No car parking or additional vehicle accesses are proposed for the new units. The site is situated in an area with good access to public transport as such, it considered suitable for 'car free' development. To prevent possible overspill parking from the development onto surrounding streets, occupiers of the development would be excluded from eligibility to apply for an on street parking permits. Whilst it is acknowledged that this would not stop cars parking on the street outside the CPZ times, this would discourage car ownership and minimise any impacts of the development. This would be secured by condition.
- 45 The proposed units would form part of an existing development and utilise the existing cycle storage areas. All stands would be provided internally within the building, within lockable stores using double stacker stands. Whilst double stacker stands are not a suitable option for all users, this is the existing situation at the site and therefore it would be unreasonable to seek amendment to the existing stands serving the development. The amended plans show 91 spaces within lockable stores at ground floor level. An additional 11 Sheffield stand spaces have been proposed in the

basement, which would provide an acceptable alternative to double stackers. Overall, there would be sufficient cycle spaces to serve the Grange Gardens development as a whole (proposed as 97 units in total).

- 46 Taking into account the scale of the existing development, the additional units would not result in significant additional servicing needs. Servicing would take place from the street in accordance with the existing arrangements for the development, which is considered acceptable. Dedicated bin stores serve each block and are considered sufficient in scale to serve the overall needs of the development, including the additional units.

Sustainable development implications

- 47 The site is situated in a sustainable location close to public transport and shops and services. No car parking has been proposed, which would encourage alternative modes of transport to the private car. The additional units would utilise the existing heating system within the building. In accordance with Strategic Policy 13 'high environmental standards' of the Core Strategy, new residential development should achieve at least Code for Sustainable Homes (CfSH) level 4, however the proposal is a conversion of existing space which would have been constructed to a different standard, however a condition would seek the applicant uses best endeavours to meet Code 4.

Planning obligations (S.106 undertaking or agreement)

- 48 Policy 2.5 of the Southwark Plan advises that planning obligations can be secured to overcome the negative impacts of a generally acceptable proposal. This policy is reinforced by the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for Section 106 Planning Obligations, which sets out in detail the type of development that qualifies for planning obligations, and Circular 05/05, which advises that every planning application will be judged on its own merits against relevant policy, guidance and other material considerations when assessing planning obligations.
- 49 The proposal is a minor development, and such minor developments are not normally subject to a s106 agreement. It is not considered that the proposal would result in any adverse impacts that would require mitigation through planning obligations, and any required mitigation can be appropriately secured by way of condition.

Other matters

Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

- 50 S143 of the Localism Act 2011 states that any financial sum that an authority has received, will, or could receive in the payment of CIL is a material "local financial consideration" in planning decisions. The requirement for Mayoral CIL is a material consideration. However, the weight to be attached to a local finance consideration remains a matter for the decision-maker. Mayoral CIL is to be used for strategic transport improvements in London, primarily Crossrail. The levy is applied to all developments at a rate of £35 per square metre in Southwark. At the time of writing this report, the floorspace has not been used for its primary purpose for 6 of the last 12 months. As such the CIL contribution is based on all the additional floorspace created. The amount of proposed floorspace is 454sqm and therefore 454 multiplied by 35 results in a CIL payment of £15,890.

Amendments

- 51 During the course of the application a number of amendments were made to the scheme. The changes related to the internal layout of the proposed units, the scale of

the private terrace amenity spaces was reduced, further landscaping details, the location of bike and refuse storage areas amended. Further consultation was carried out by letter 13 March 2013 to all neighbouring occupiers immediately surrounding the site, to obtain any additional comments on the amended plans. All the additional comments received have been considered in conjunction with the previous comments received.

Issues raised in neighbour consultation responses

- 52 In total, 24 neighbour consultation responses have been received raising the following issues and objections (in summary):
- Impact of the ground floor terraces on the communal courtyard
 - Safety and security
 - Inappropriate materials
 - Playspace would lead to disturbance
 - Lack of cycle parking
 - Loss of existing residents lounge

It is considered that the material planning matters raised, have been considered within the main report, or are considered in the paragraphs below.

Conclusion on planning issues

- 53 The proposed development is considered acceptable in land use terms. It would provide an appropriate and sustainable development providing much needed housing in the borough. The housing proposed is considered to be of a good quality, and the unit sizes, layout and aspect are all acceptable. The proposal provides a mix of dwelling sizes to provide housing choice.
- 54 The proposal is considered acceptable in terms of scale and design. The design, using material to match the existing development is acceptable. The use of materials would be secured by condition and details of the alternative terrace screen material will require approval by condition. Overall, subject to conditions, it is concluded that the development in terms of its form, scale and materiality, is acceptable.
- 55 The amenity impacts have been considered, and overall the proposal would not result in harm to residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers in terms of daylight and sunlight, outlook, sense of enclosure and overlooking. It is not considered the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on the existing communal amenity space and would continue to be useable and functioning.
- 56 The transport impacts of the proposal have been assessed and concluded that the proposal would not have a significant impact on the surrounding highway network. To ensure there is not an unacceptable impact on parking pressures within the local area, the majority of units would be excluded from applying for on-street parking permits. This would be secured within the s.106 agreement.
- 57 It is considered that the amendments during the course of the application have addressed the majority of objections raised in neighbour representations. In response to the representations received, the scale and form of the terraces has been reduced to ensure appropriate circulation space remains within the existing courtyard. The applicant has agreed to reduce the scale of the terrace screening, and put forward an alternative material finish, details of which will be secured by condition. The proposed playspace has been amended to a more general needs landscaped area for residents of all ages and would not include formal play equipment. Full details would be secured by condition. The amendments to the cycle storage and additional spaces in the basement, have overcome the concerns that there would be insufficient spaces to serve the development as a whole. The applicant has provided a residents lounge

within block A in response to representations.

58 Therefore it is recommended that permission be granted, subject to conditions.

Community impact statement

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

Consultations

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

Consultation replies

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

Human rights implications

62 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.

63 This application has the legitimate aim of providing a housing development. The rights potentially engaged by this application, including the right to a fair trial and the right to respect for private and family life are not considered to be unlawfully interfered with by this proposal.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Site history file: TP/31-6 Application file: 12/AP/3987 Southwark Local Development Framework and Development Plan Documents	Chief Executive's Department 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH	Planning enquiries telephone: 020 7525 5403 Planning enquiries email: planning.enquiries@southwark.gov.uk Case officer telephone: 020 7525 5657 Council website: www.southwark.gov.uk

APPENDICES

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

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Gary Rice, Head of Development Management	
Report Author	Laura Webster, Senior Planner Major applications team	
Version	Final	
Dated	2 May 2013	
Key Decision	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments Included
Strategic Director of Finance and Corporate Services	No	No
Strategic Director, Environment and Leisure	No	No
Strategic Director, Housing and Community Services	No	No
Director of Regeneration	No	No
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team		2 May 2013

APPENDIX 1

Consultation undertaken

Site notice date: 04/02/2013

Press notice date: N/A

Case officer site visit date: 04/02/2013

Neighbour consultation letters sent: 25/01/2013

Internal services consulted: 25/01/2013

Environmental Protection
Public Realm
Transport

Statutory and non-statutory organisations consulted: 25/01/2013

Thames Water
Environment Agency

Neighbours and local groups consulted:



Re-consultation: 13/03/2013

APPENDIX 2

Consultation responses received

Internal services

Environmental Protection - No comments received to date

Transport - The applicant will be replacing the existing (double stacking) cycle storage, however the Transport Group would welcome a mix of cycle storage stands (two tier and Sheffield stands) to ensure that all cycle users (young, (children) old, mobility impaired etc) are able to use the proposed cycle storage. The applicant is required to submit to the Council, for approval, detailed and scaled drawings to demonstrate the storage to be of the dimensions, and be of a recommended style as stated in our best practice guidance

The proposal site is situated in a CPZ. Therefore, in order to prevent possible overspill parking from the development, the applicant should be informed that a planning condition will be imposed preventing any occupiers of this development being eligible for on-street parking permits.

Statutory and non-statutory organisations

Thames Water - No objection

Environment Agency - No objection on flood risk grounds

Neighbours and local groups

Please note that Haven Way and Grange Gardens are properties at the application site (formerly known as Larnaca Works). All objections have been summarised.

Objection received from Flat 527, 2 Haven Way (Grange Gardens development) raising the following issues:

- No objection in principle however request changes to minimise impact on existing residents and the external common areas;
- Proposed terraces should be recessed to avoid harm to existing communal space;
- The courtyard facing terraces to unit 2 and 3 should be removed;
- A new residents lounge should be provided to replace the existing one to be lost

Objection received from (address unknown) raising the following issues:

- removal of residents lounge, a communal space used frequently as part of the community of the development
- size and protrusion of the proposed ground floor terraces and impact on space, and movement around the communal courtyard
- Would make the communal courtyard cramped and less attractive
- childrens play area could lead to noise, loitering and disturbance
- Insufficient bike storage
- Is it possible for landlords to restrict access to private amenity spaces

Further letter received following the reconsultation regarding the amended plans:

- The material proposed for the terraces is inappropriate and
- Bike storage insufficient
- Residents lounge is not been adequately provided for

Objection received from Flat number withheld, 1 Haven Way (Grange Gardens

development) raising the following issues:

- Impact on amenity of existing residents
- Loss of cycle storage
- Existing cycle storage well used
- The proposed ground floor terraces would compromise the existing communal space enjoyed by residents
- The development was sold as having a shared communal space with significant landscaping features, which would be reduced by the proposal
- Poor retrofitting of flats in a space not designed as such
- Number of flats could be reduced and terraces recessed to minimise harm to the existing development
- access and security issues
- narrow walkways as a result of the terraces make it difficult for people with buggies to visit or enter the building
- Cramped spaces would be particularly uncomfortable at night
- A proposed water feature on block A would potentially render the ground floor terraces as useless
- Loss of residents lounge
- The proposed children's play area results in a loss of space that can be used by all and may give rise to noise and loitering

Further letter received following the re-consultation regarding the amended plans:

- The residents lounge was part of the marketing of the development and therefore it is expected that a similar facility is reprovided. The suggested lounge in the foyer of block A on the amended plans, is not a separate area and should be amended.
- The submitted site plan is not 'as built'. The s.106 landscaped works indicated do not exist and the existing boundary kerb does not include this area. The terrace serving unit 1 would extend into this area.
- The proposed terrace screen material is inappropriate. Glass is considered more suitable.
- Proposed play area is considered unnecessary and request no formal playground equipment is included
- The number of cycle parking spaces should be increased in line with the number of flats and suggest addition spaces in the basement

Objection received from Flat 532, 1 Haven Way (Grange Gardens development) raising the following issues:

- Object to the proposed conversion and in particular, the balconies take up too much of the existing communal space.

Objection received from 1-2 Haven Way (Grange Gardens development), on behalf of the Grange Gardens Residents Association (current membership of 32 leaseholders and 2 tenants), raising the following issues:

- Supportive of conversion to residential, however object to the form of the current application
- Loss of communal amenity space
- Reduction in the width of walkways (reducing accessibility) around the development as a result of the proposed ground floor terraces
- Recessed balconies would be more suitable
- The existing landscaped communal courtyard is of high amenity value to many of the existing residents without balconies
- Loss of residents common room, which has been used for the last year as a meeting place, thus strengthening the sense of community
- Loss of green space and replacement with children's play area
- Noise and disturbance from the proposed play area.
- Relocation of bike storage

Further letter received following the re-consultation regarding the amended plans:

- The revised plans are an improvement but the following objections and issues remain:
- The submitted site plan is not 'as built'. The s.106 landscaped works indicated do not exist and the existing boundary kerb does not include this area. The terrace serving unit 1 would extend into this area.
- Support the reduced terrace widths, however the proposed terrace screen material is inappropriate. Glass is considered more suitable.
- Unsure how the proposed informal play area can be enforced as for residents only and request no formal playground equipment is included
- The number of cycle parking spaces should be increased in line with the number of flats and suggest addition spaces in the basement
- The residents lounge was part of the marketing of the development and therefore it is expected that a similar facility is re-provided. The suggested lounge in the foyer of block A on the amended plans, is not a separate area and should be amended.

Objection received from Flat 422, Haven Way (Grange Gardens development) raising the following issues:

- The proposal contradicts the lifestyle concept marketed by the developer to purchasers now living in the development
- The loss of existing communal amenity space as a result of the proposed ground floor terraces
- Proposal would result in cramped narrow walkways and associated safety and security issues
- A proposed water feature on block A would potentially render the ground floor terraces as useless
- Potential noise, disturbance and loitering as a result of the new play area.
- Loss of the residents lounge
- Relocation of bike storage

Further letter received following the re-consultation regarding the amended plans:

- The material for the terrace screens is inappropriate. Glass is considered more suitable
- The level of cycle storage should be increased in line with the number of flats
- The proposed residents lounge is not a private area and request this is further amended
- Informal play area not considered necessary and should be redesigned

Objection received from Flat number unknown, Grange Gardens development, raising the following issues:

- Supportive of conversion to residential, however object to the form of the current application
- Loss of existing communal amenity space
- Recessed terraces would be more suitable
- The proposed play area could result in disturbance and security issues

Objection received from Flat 210, 2 Haven Way (Grange Gardens development) raising the following issues:

- The proposed terraces would create narrow walkways reducing accessibility
- Use of dark metal materials to screen the terraces, would appear dark and restrictive
- Provision of a play area removes part of the existing landscaped area and is considered unnecessary
- Although current area doesn't support commercial use, once more apartments are built, increased footfall would support the emergence of new uses such as those at Maltby Street and Bermondsey Square market.

Objection received from address unknown (Grange Gardens development) raising the following issues:

- Supportive of conversion to residential, however object to the form of the current

application

- The intrusion onto existing communal walkways and landscaped communal amenity space
- Narrow walkways would result in accessibility and health and safety issues
- Conflicts with the original landscaping design of the original approved development 06-AP-2272 (and condition 9 regarding landscaping details). Landscaping details have not been completed in accordance with the condition
- Provision of a children's play area so close to the water features raises health and safety concerns
- Loss of residents lounge which creates an important community function within the development

Objection received from Flat 431, 1 Haven Way (Grange Gardens development) raising the following issues:

- Supportive of conversion to residential, however object to the form of the current application
- The depth of the proposed terraces would restrict the width of the current walkways to the detriment of the communal space
- relocation of the cycle store to the basement raises security concerns due to the lack of existing security (no fob access gate at present)
- Proposed play area could lead to noise and security issues
- The use of laser cut steel screens should be avoided, given the existing screens within the development have rusted and age badly

Objection received from Flat 105, 1 Haven Way (Grange Gardens development) raising the following issues:

- Supportive of conversion to residential, however object to the form of the current application
- The depth of the proposed terraces would restrict the width of the current walkways to the detriment of the communal space
- Width of the proposed terraces should be reduced
- The metal screens would further make the space feel enclosed
- Relocation of cycle store
- Loss of resident lounge
- Proposed play area could lead to noise and security issues

Objection received from Flat 103, 1 Haven Way (Grange Gardens development) raising the following issues:

- The depth of the proposed terraces would reduce the amount and quality of the existing communal amenity space
- The proposal is contrary to the original vision for the development
- The loss of the residents lounge
- The proposed play space would result in the loss of an existing landscaped area and raises concerns regarding noise and security

Objection received from Flat 212, 1 Haven Way (Grange Gardens development) raising the following issues:

- Supportive of conversion to residential, however object to the form of the current application
- loss of communal amenity space
- Terrace screens reduce walkways and raise security concerns
- Proposed terraces should be removed or reduced in scale
- loss of residents lounge
- Proposal is contrary to the vision of the original development

Further letter received following the re-consultation regarding the amended plans:

- The proposal is still contrary to the vision of the original development

- security concerns remain relating to the scale of the terrace screening
- The submitted site plan is not 'as built'. The s.106 landscaped works indicated do not exist thus the space around the terrace serving unit 1 would be more constrained than indicated, raising accessibility issues
- concerns remain regarding the play space and non-residents using this space
- reduction in cycle storage

Objection received from Flat unknown, Haven Way (Grange Gardens development) raising the following issues:

- Loss of cycle storage
- the proposed terraces would compromise the communal courtyard amenity space
- The proposal is contrary to the vision of the original development and were led to believe shops would be moving into the ground floor spaces
- The proposed children's play area is unnecessary and could result in anti-social behaviour

Further letter received following the re-consultation regarding the amended plans:

- The submitted site plan is not 'as built'. The s.106 landscaped works indicated do not exist and the existing boundary kerb does not include this area. The terrace serving unit 1 would extend into this area.
- Support the reduced terrace widths, however the proposed terrace screen material is inappropriate. Glass is considered more suitable.
- Concerns remain regarding the play area
- Residents lounge proposed is not a separate space
- Unclear who the storage area in block A is for

Objection received from Flat 632, 2 Haven Way (Grange Gardens development) raising the following issues:

- Supportive of conversion to residential, however object to the form of the current application
- The proposed terraces would reduce the existing communal amenity space and reduce the widths of the walkways which would in particular, would make movement around the site for wheelchair users difficult. In one case the walkway is 1.2m which is only the minimum specification within the wheelchair design guidance.
- Terraces should be reduced in scale
- Proposal is contrary to the vision of the original development

Further letter received following the re-consultation regarding the amended plans:

- The revised plans are an improvement but the following objections and issues remain:
- The submitted site plan is not 'as built'. The s.106 landscaped works indicated do not exist and unless they are built, there will not be the space shown to manoeuvre around the terrace of flat 1. This would cause difficulties for existing wheelchair users within the development.
- The proposed terrace screen material is inappropriate. Glass is considered more suitable.
- Unsure how the proposed informal play area can be enforced as for residents only and request no formal playground equipment is included
- The number of cycle parking spaces should be increased in line with the number of flats and suggest addition spaces in the basement
- The residents lounge was part of the marketing of the development and therefore it is expected that a similar facility is re-provided. The suggested lounge in the foyer of block A on the amended plans, is not a separate area and should be amended.

Objection received from Flat 428, 1 Haven Way (Grange Gardens development) raising the following issues:

- The depth of the proposed terraces would restrict the width of the current walkways making it difficult to manoeuvre around the site

- The proposal would be aesthetically harmful the existing communal space

Objection received from Flat 633, 2 Haven Way (Grange Gardens development) raising the following issues:

- The proposal results in the loss of existing communal amenity space and narrows the existing walkways causing accessibility issues
- loss of residents lounge
- Proposal is contrary to the design vision of the original development

Objection received from Flat 631, Haven Way (Grange Gardens development) raising the following issues:

- Supportive of conversion to residential, however object to the form of the current application
- The loss of existing landscaping to accommodate a play space
- Proposed play space may give rise to noise and disturbance
- Loss of cycle storage for existing residents
- Proposal should not reduce the existing communal amenity space and walkways

Objection received from Flat 208, 1 Haven Way (Grange Gardens development) raising the following issues:

- The depth of the proposed terraces would restrict the width of the current walkways to the detriment of the communal space
- Terraces should be recessed or reduced in scale / removed
- Loss of resident lounge
- The proposed play space would be unnecessary and results in the loss of an existing landscaped area for residents
- Proposal is contrary to the design vision of the original development

Objection received from Flat 212, 2 Haven Way (Grange Gardens development) raising the following issues:

- Impact on safety, security and amenity
- The proposed terraces would reduce the existing communal amenity space and reduce the widths of the walkways reducing accessibility.
- Restricted views and spaces give rise to safety concerns
- Loss of residents lounge
- Proposal is contrary to the design vision of the original development

Objection received from Flat 430, 1 Haven Way (Grange Gardens development) raising the following issues:

- Supportive of conversion to residential, however object to the form of the current application
- The depth of the proposed terraces would restrict the width of the current walkways to the detriment of the communal space
- Impact of proposed water feature on block A, on the proposed terraces
- The proposed play area is not considered necessary and would result in the loss of amenity space for existing residents
- Loss of the residents lounge

Further letter received following the re-consultation regarding the amended plans:

- Broadly supportive of the amendments, subject to two conditions.
 1. That the screening is not the same metal as currently used elsewhere within the development - which is unsightly. Glass or wood considered more appropriate
 2. No formal play equipment should be provided in the communal area

Objection received from Flat 316, 1 Haven Way (Grange Gardens development) raising the following issues:

- Supportive of conversion to residential, however object to the form of the current

application

- The depth of the proposed terraces would restrict the width of the current walkways and impede accessibility and reduce the scale of the existing communal space
- The proposed metal screens to the terraces raises safety concerns due to the sharp edges, and would reduce space and light to the courtyard. Inconsistent with the existing balcony treatment on the blocks
- Removal of the existing residents lounge
- The proposed play area is not considered necessary and would result in the loss of amenity space for existing residents
- Loss of cycle storage (particularly for block A)

Further letter received following the re-consultation regarding the amended plans:

- Concerns remain regarding the reduction in communal amenity space and walkways. Recessed terraces should be provided.
- Cycle parking should be increased in accordance with the number of units
- Concerns remain regarding the play area
- The proposed materials for the terrace screen is inappropriate

Objection received from Flat 314, 1 Haven Way (Grange Gardens development) raising the following issues:

- The depth of the proposed terraces would restrict the width of the current walkways and impede accessibility and reduce the scale of the existing communal space
- Effectively the developer is selling the space twice for profit, once as an amenity space, and again as a private space
- The proposal would harm the visual appearance of the development
- The proposed metal cladding would deteriorate quickly (as it has on the existing development)
- The proposed play space is small and unnecessary and should be a space open to all residents

Objection received from Flat 536, 1 Haven Way (Grange Gardens development) raising the following issues:

- Supportive of conversion to residential, however object to the form of the current application
- Unnecessary amendment to the existing communal garden which could give rise to noise, disturbance and security issues. The proposed area for redesign should remain as existing
- Noise and disturbance may arise from the play area
- Loss of residents lounge. The proposed relocation to block A on the revised plans, would not be a meaningful enclosed space due to its location in the lobby. The residents lounge was part of the vision of the development
- The screening material for the terraces should be sympathetic and stand the test of time