

Item No. 7.1	Classification: OPEN	Date: 9 July 2013	Meeting Name: Planning Sub-Committee B
Report title:	Development Management planning application: Council's own development Application 13/AP/0683 for: Council's Own Development - Reg. 3 Address: CHARLES DICKENS PRIMARY SCHOOL, LANT STREET, LONDON, SE1 1QP Proposal: Installation of a modular building comprising two classrooms with ancillary toilets on land to north of former Lant Street to serve Charles Dickens School.		
Ward(s) or groups affected:	Cathedrals		
From:	Head of Development		
Application Start Date 11/04/2013		Application Expiry Date 06/06/2013	
Earliest Decision Date 29/06/2013			

RECOMMENDATION

- 1 To grant a limited planning permission for seven years, with conditions.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Site location and description

- 2 The site is located to the north of the Charles Dickens Primary School and comprises a recently formed multi-sports pitch and service area and an area of wood chipped land. The school recently gained planning permission for this area to be used as outdoor play garden, multi-sports area and service area which has been partially implemented. The area is next to an existing structure, an eco house and gardens. There are existing vehicle access gates on both sides of the site.
- 3 To the north of the site are the flats of Isaac Way. The surrounding area is also predominantly residential dwellings in the form of both houses and flats; in the wider area there are also commercial uses.
- 4 The site is not situated within a conservation area nor are there any adjacent listed buildings. It falls within the Central Activities Zone, Air Quality Management Area, Archaeological Priority Zone, Bankside and Borough Town Centre and Opportunity Area.

Details of proposal

- 5 Planning permission is sought by the Council's Children's Services Department for the erection of a modular classroom building containing two classrooms, and which would measure 17 metres in length, 8 metres in width and with a height of 3.2 metres. To the front of the building there would be a deck with canopy over, measuring 17 metres in

length with a projection of 2.7 metres and a height of 2.9 metres; the canopy would have a sedum roof. There would be folding doors out onto the deck area to allow the in/out flow of children during teaching times, playtimes, lunch times and for the school clubs. The decked area would provide a covered play area when wet, shade when hot and would enable some outdoor teaching to take place. The service area previously approved to the east of the proposed classroom would become a dual use area, primarily to be used as a play space but also for servicing outside school hours. The building would be located 1.1 metres from the boundary with the flatted premises in Isaac Way.

- 6 With regard to materials, the building would be timber clad with powder coated aluminium windows and a single ply membrane roof.
- 7 The building is to be sited on the area where permission was granted for a garden space with play decks and a play area. The building would be located in this area so that the tarmac multi sports area that has been provided for football and netball court could be retained.
- 8 The proposal would remove the need for fencing which divided the play garden and sports pitch, which the applicant has stated would have the benefit of freeing up additional space and giving a feeling of openness.
- 9 The applicants have confirmed that the classrooms are required as there is a need to provide accommodation for an additional 15 children in addition to the further 15 accommodated in the previous year due to local demographic need.

Planning history

- 10 02-CO-2124 – Planning permission granted for the installation of photovoltaic (solar) panels and ancillary equipment on school roof.
- 11 04-CO-0015 – Planning permission refused for closure of part of Lant Street and use of the former highway land and adjoining land on north side of Lant Street as a playground, multi use game area and garden for the school together with the erection of boundary fencing.

Reason for Refusal:

- 12 The proposed playground extension would, by reason of its need to permanently close Lant Street preventing through traffic from accessing Southward Bridge Road or Borough High Street via Lant Street, fail to give priority to improve safety conditions for essential traffic contrary to Southwark's Unitary Development Plan [July 1995].
- 13 04-CO-0151 – Planning permission granted for change of use of part of Lant Street to provide a nursery playground, a multi use games area and garden for primary school. A Traffic Assessment was submitted with application detailing how there would be no material impact upon the traffic movements on the local highway and of those pedestrian trips that would be diverted, the walking distances would increase only slightly. The Council as Highway Authority, and Transport for London, had no objections to the proposal.
- 14 07-AP-2740 – Planning permission granted for removal of existing external entrance stair and refurbishment of the existing building and new build extension to create a new accessible welcome and reception area, a new teaching space with roof deck and an external teaching terrace. Changes to pedestrian and vehicular access.
- 15 08-CO-0021 – Planning permission granted for construction of a new single storey "eco canopy" shelter, perimeter fencing and creation of garden on western part of site.

- 16 12-AP-1547 - on 11.12.2012 Planning Sub-Committee B granted planning permission for the extension of the playground for the school to the north of Lant Street and refurbishment of existing playground comprising: hard and soft landscaping with new tree and shrub planting, timber installations, new servicing area accessible by vehicles at the eastern end of the site; re-siting of fences within the site, new gates erected within the site to allow emergency vehicle access.
- 17 This has been partially implemented, with the multi sports area and servicing area having been provided.

Planning history of adjoining sites

23 Lant Street

- 18 02-AP-1231 - Planning permission granted 29.10. 2002 for the erection of a six storey residential development to form 6, 2 bedroom units.

Land bounded by Lant Street, Sanctuary Street, Weller Street and Peabody Estate

- 19 00-AP-1820 - Planning permission granted 08.01.2003 for the erection of 3, five storey blocks comprising of 55, one bedroom, 36, two bedroom and 3, three bedroom units (Isaac Way).

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Summary of main issues

- 20 The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:
- a] the principle of the development in terms of land use and conformity with strategic policies;
 - b] the design of the proposal;
 - c] the impact upon the amenity of adjoining occupiers;
 - d] transport.

Planning policy

Core Strategy 2011

- 21 Strategic Policy 1 - Sustainable development
Strategic Policy 2 - Sustainable transport
Strategic Policy 4 - Places for learning, enjoyment and healthy lifestyles
Strategic Policy 12 - Design and conservation
Strategic Policy 13 - High environmental standards

Southwark Plan 2007 (July) - saved policies

- 22 The Council's cabinet on 19th March 2013, as required by para 215 of the NPPF, considered the issue of compliance of Southwark Planning Policy with the National Planning Policy Framework. 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.

- 23 Policy 3.2 Protection of amenity
Policy 3.12 Quality in design
Policy 3.13 Urban design
Policy 5.2 Transport impacts

Residential Design Standards SPD (2011)

London Plan 2011

- 24 Policy 3.6 Children and young people's play and informal recreation facilities
Policy 7.5 Public Realm

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

- 25 The NPPF is a material planning consideration. The sections relevant to the consideration of this application are
- 26 Section 7. Requiring good design.
Section 8. Promoting healthy communities

Principle of development

- 27 In principle there is no objection to the development which seeks to provide additional classroom space. The applicant has put measures in place to off-set the loss of the outdoor play space for the school by using the service area as a play space during school hours and opening up the site internally, by not providing previously permitted fences. The school currently staggers the use of these areas to ensure adequate supervision and no overcrowding, both actual and perceived.
- 28 There is a requirement to enhance community facilities under Strategic Policy 4 'Places to leaning, enjoyment and healthy lifestyles' of the Core Strategy, with its aim of improving existing schools to provide improved education opportunities. It is accepted that there is a need to provide, in the short term, additional classroom accommodation within the school and no objections are raised in principle.

Environmental impact assessment

- 29 Not required due to the small scale of the development.

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

- 30 It is not considered that the use of the classroom during normal school hours would adversely affect the amenity of adjoining occupiers.

Loss of sunlight and daylight

- 31 Residents have raised concerns about loss of sunlight and daylight. The classroom would be located to the north of the nearest residential properties in Isaac Way, within 1.1 metres of a 2.1 metre high brick wall (measured from the school site) which adjoins flat 8 Isaac Way and its private amenity area. It would be 1.1 metre from the 1 metre high brick wall with 1 metre high railings over which serves the communal garden of Isaac Way. Issac Way flats and their communal garden is approximately .4

metre lower than ground level of the school.

- 32 On applying the basic sunlight tests there is one window affected, a secondary window to a combined living/dining/kitchen area at 8 Isaac Way. The eastern rear corner of the proposed building would be very slightly higher than the 25 degree line upwards from a point two metres above ground level. However, this window is also affected by the current boundary wall and the overhang of the apartment above it is not considered that the proposal would be demonstrably harm the amenities of the residents of 8 Isaac Way. It should also be noted that the room also has a larger window/door serving the room.
- 33 A resident has raised concerns that additional structures may be placed on the roof which would increase the height, therefore a condition restricting this is recommended.

Loss of privacy

- 34 The proposed building would have high level windows to the northern elevation. The applicant has agreed that these should be obscured to prevent overlooking of adjoining properties in Isaac Way. A resident has identified that the residential design standards SPD states there should be a minimum of 21 metres between facing windows, however, an obscure glazing condition would prevent any loss of privacy.

Sense of enclosure

- 35 The nearest resident at 8 Isaac Way has raised concerns that the proposal would result in a sense of enclosure. The building would be 2 metres from the edge of the property and 1.1 metre from the private amenity space to this flat. There is a tall boundary wall where the development is closest to this property at approximately 2.5 metres high, but there is a lower ground level distance of .4 metres on the Issac Way side. The wall on the school side is 2.1 metres the additional height of the development above the wall would therefore be 1.1 metre. The window of 8 Isaac Way is already enclosed to a degree owing to the L-shaped footprint of the building, the boundary wall and an overhanging apartment above. In light of this, and because the classroom would be located 1.1m beyond the boundary wall and would only be 1.1m higher than it, it is not considered that any significant loss of amenity would occur.

Security

- 36 A resident has objected to the proposal on the grounds that the classroom could be used to scale the boundary wall to Isaac Way and facilitate access to the communal areas. However, they would have to gain access to the school grounds which are protected by high gates and fences and therefore it is considered that this would deter intruders from trying to use the proposed or indeed existing structures to gain access to Isaac Way.

Noise and disturbance

- 37 Due to the loss of what would have been a play area, the remaining spaces would be more intensively used. The applicant has confirmed there will be a need to stagger the use of the existing play spaces, and the proposed building would mean that the children will not be playing near to the boundary of 8 Isaac Way or the communal gardens, which should help to mitigate the use of the play areas for a longer period. The building would shield the properties and communal garden of Isaac Way from these play areas and therefore any additional hours that the areas are used should be mitigated by this - why would they be used for longer hours?

- 38 Construction noise has been raised as a concern but as this would be a modular building there would be very little disturbance. However, a condition restricting construction hours is recommended given the proximity to Isaac Way.

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

- 39 Whilst the area is predominantly residential, the users of the proposed scheme will not be affected by adjoining users or occupiers.

Traffic issues

- 40 There are no changes to the access arrangements already granted consent, although the service area would act as a play area during school hours. The installation of classrooms on the unused part of the site would have no transport impact other than minimal impacts during construction. The addition of 15 children onto the school roll for the next educational year would similarly have a minimal impact. The school has achieved "bronze" accreditation for its travel plan that was updated recently, and through this the impact of travel to and from the school would be further reduced.

Design issues

- 41 The modular building has been designed as a temporary structure, although it is considered to be of a good design which would have similarities to the existing eco-building on the site through the use of timber cladding on its elevations. Notwithstanding that, given its temporary nature a condition permitting the structure to remain in place for seven years only is recommended.

Impact on trees

- 42 There are no trees on this part of the site.

Planning obligations (S.106 undertaking or agreement) and CIL Liability

- 43 None required due to the scale of the development and educational buildings are not liable for a Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) payment.

Sustainable development implications

- 44 The design would incorporate the use of sustainable materials and a sedum roof for the canopy.

Archaeology

- 45 The proposed building would have no impact upon significant archaeological remains.

Other matters

- 46 Residents have raised the issue that the school was aware of the shortage of accommodation in 2011 and queried why it was not addressed sooner. Whilst this is noted, this application should be determined on its merits. Residents have also raised concerns regarding the closure of Lant Street, but this part of Lant Street is now fully integrated into the school site and this is not considered to be a material planning consideration in relation to the proposal.

- 47 In respect to a previous application submitted for the use of the application site for a further outdoor facilities, residents have queried why this has not been provided. At that time the applicant, the school, not the current applicant, stated that there was a severe lack of open, flat space for sports activities. Therefore it was considered that the multi pitch area needed to be retained to provide the flat space for sports facility urgently required by the school. While it is regrettable the garden play area can not be provided due to the need for the classroom this can be provided once the need for the classroom is over.

Conclusion on planning issues

- 48 The proposal would provide much needed additional classroom space for the school and in planning terms, it is not considered to adversely impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties. The applicant has put measures in place to mitigate the loss of the previously approved play garden, which on balance are considered to be acceptable given the need for the additional classrooms. The design of the proposal would be acceptable subject to a condition limiting the amount of time that the structure can remain in place, and it is recommended that planning permission be granted.

Community impact statement

- 49 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.
- 50 a) The impact on local people is set out above.
- 51 b) The following issues relevant to particular communities/groups likely to be affected by the proposal have been identified above.
- 52 c) The likely adverse or less good implications for any particular communities/groups have been also been discussed above.

Consultations

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

Consultation replies

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

Summary of consultation responses

- 55 Residents have objected to the proposal on grounds of loss of sunlight and daylight, privacy, noise and disturbance, loss of previous public access and loss of outdoor play space for the school.

Human rights implications

- 56 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.

57 This application has the legitimate aim of providing additional classrooms. 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/1460-B Application file: 13/AP/0683 Southwark Local Development Framework and Development Plan Documents	Chief executive's department 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH	Planning enquires telephone: 020 7525 5403 Planning enquires email: planning.enquiries@southwark.gov.uk Case officer telephone: 020 7525 5453 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	Michèle Sterry, Planning Team Leader West Team	
Version	Final	
Dated	21 June 2013	
Key Decision	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Strategic Director of Finance & Corporate Services	No	No
Strategic Director, Environment and Leisure	No	No
Strategic Director, Housing and Community Services	No	No
Director of Regeneration	No	No
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team		27 June 2013

Consultation undertaken

59 Site notice date: 02/05/2013

Press notice date: N/A

Case officer site visit date: 2.5.2013 and 11.6.2013

Neighbour consultation letters sent: 8.5.2013

Internal services consulted:

60 Transport Planning
Environmental Protection Team

Statutory and non-statutory organisations consulted:

Metropolitan Police

Neighbours and local groups consulted:

FLAT S 1-49 LANT HOUSE LANT ESTATE LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1PJ
1A GAITSKELL WAY LONDON SE1 1EF
UNIT 5 AND UNIT 6 52 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1QP
UNIT 2 52 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1QP
FLAT 10 56A LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RD
FLAT 11 56A LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RD
FLAT 8 56A LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RD
FLAT 9 56A LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RD
FLAT 12 56A LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RD
FLAT 15 56A LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RD
FLAT 13 56A LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RD
FLAT 14 56A LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RD
FLAT 7 56A LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RD
FLAT 33 56 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RE
FLAT 1 56A LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RD
FLAT 31 56 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RE
FLAT 32 56 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RE
FLAT 2 56A LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RD
FLAT 5 56A LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RD
FLAT 6 56A LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RD
FLAT 3 56A LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RD
FLAT 4 56A LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RD
FLAT 15 14 WELLER STREET LONDON SE1 1QU
UNIT 1 14 WELLER STREET LONDON SE1 1QU
FLAT 13 14 WELLER STREET LONDON SE1 1QU
FLAT 14 14 WELLER STREET LONDON SE1 1QU
UNIT 2 14 WELLER STREET LONDON SE1 1QU
UNIT 4 52 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1QP
UNIT 1 52 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1QP
15 WELLER STREET LONDON SE1 1QU
13 TRUNDLE STREET LONDON SE1 1QT
FLAT 12 14 WELLER STREET LONDON SE1 1QU
FLAT 5 14 WELLER STREET LONDON SE1 1QU
FLAT 6 14 WELLER STREET LONDON SE1 1QU
FLAT 3 14 WELLER STREET LONDON SE1 1QU

FLAT 4 14 WELLER STREET LONDON SE1 1QU
FLAT 7 14 WELLER STREET LONDON SE1 1QU
FLAT 10 14 WELLER STREET LONDON SE1 1QU
FLAT 11 14 WELLER STREET LONDON SE1 1QU
FLAT 8 14 WELLER STREET LONDON SE1 1QU
FLAT 9 14 WELLER STREET LONDON SE1 1QU
FLAT 1-9 TRUNDLE HOUSE LANT ESTATE TRUNDLE STREET LONDON SE1 1QS
FLAT 62-144 DOUGLAS BUILDINGS MARSHALSEA ROAD LONDON SE1 1JW
1- 47 ISAAC WAY LONDON SE1 1EE
6 GAITSKELL WAY LONDON SE1 1EF
APARTMENT 19 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 20 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 17 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 18 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 21 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 24 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 22 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 23 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 16 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 37 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 38 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 35 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 36 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 39 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 42 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 43 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 40 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 41 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 34 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 27 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 28 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 25 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 26 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 29 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 32 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 33 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 30 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 31 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 9 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 10 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 7 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 8 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 11 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 14 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 15 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 12 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 13 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 6 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 46 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 47 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 44 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 45 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 1 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 4 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 5 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 2 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
APARTMENT 3 4 SANCTUARY STREET LONDON SE1 1EA
FLAT 4 56 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RE
FLAT 5 56 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RE
FLAT 2 56 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RE
FLAT 3 56 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RE
FLAT 6 56 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RE
FLAT 9 56 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RE

FLAT 10 56 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RE
FLAT 7 56 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RE
FLAT 8 56 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RE
FLAT 1 56 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RE
FLAT 13 54 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RF
FLAT 14 54 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RF
FLAT 11 54 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RF
FLAT 12 54 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RF
FLAT 15 54 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RF
FLAT 18 54 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RF
FLAT 19 54 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RF
FLAT 16 54 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RF
FLAT 17 54 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RF
FLAT 23 56 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RE
FLAT 24 56 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RE
FLAT 21 56 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RE
FLAT 22 56 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RE
FLAT 25 56 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RE
FLAT 28 56 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RE
FLAT 29 56 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RE
FLAT 26 56 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RE
FLAT 27 56 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RE
FLAT 20 56 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RE
FLAT 13 56 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RE
FLAT 14 56 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RE
FLAT 11 56 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RE
FLAT 12 56 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RE
FLAT 15 56 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RE
FLAT 18 56 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RE
FLAT 19 56 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RE
FLAT 16 56 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RE
FLAT 17 56 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RE
FLAT 10 54 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RF
10 GAITSKELL WAY LONDON SE1 1EF
11 GAITSKELL WAY LONDON SE1 1EF
8 GAITSKELL WAY LONDON SE1 1EF
9 GAITSKELL WAY LONDON SE1 1EF
12 GAITSKELL WAY LONDON SE1 1EF
FLAT 3 54 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RF
FLAT 4 54 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RF
FLAT 1 54 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RF
FLAT 2 54 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RF
FLAT 5 54 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RF
FLAT 8 54 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RF
FLAT 9 54 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RF
FLAT 6 54 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RF
FLAT 7 54 LANT STREET LONDON SE1 1RF
FLAT 3 2 WELLER STREET LONDON SE1 1QZ
FLAT 4 2 WELLER STREET LONDON SE1 1QZ
FLAT 1 2 WELLER STREET LONDON SE1 1QZ
FLAT 2 2 WELLER STREET LONDON SE1 1QZ
FLAT 5 2 WELLER STREET LONDON SE1 1QZ
FLAT 6 2 WELLER STREET LONDON SE1 1QZ
1-7 GAITSKELL WAY LONDON SE1 1EF

Re-consultation: N/A.

Consultation responses received

Internal services

Transport Planning

The installation of classrooms on the unused part of the site will have no transport impact other than minimal impacts during construction.

The addition of 15 children to the school roll this educational year will similarly have minimal impact. Further, this school has achieved "bronze" accreditation for its travel plan that was updated recently, and through the this transport impact of travel to/from school and for school operations will be reduced.

Environmental Protection Team

Statutory and non-statutory organisations

Metropolitan Police

Neighbours and local groups

Objections to proposal

Flat 2 56 Lant Street

Having already commandeered public land to provide essential playground facilities to accommodate all the children they are now seeking to reclaim that playground for classrooms instead

If the school has outgrown the current accommodations, it is time for them to look at alternative sites entirely, proposal only a short-term fix and exacerbates their playground shortage.

Flat 14, 54 Lant Street would like to support above comments plus the following comments:-

For the last 5 years, the outside of the school has looked like a tip. We were overjoyed to see that work was at last progressing a few months ago and are now totally dismayed to hear that the intention is no longer to have a garden area but to expand the school! We were more than happy to forego access along the whole length of Lant Street if it meant providing a play area for the school children but not for building works and a school extension.

Flat 28, 56 Lant Street supports comments from Flat 2 56 Lant Street

plus - It also remains the case that I see no reason why a development could not have permitted safe pedestrian access at dedicated times.

Flat 17 56 Lant Street

I too strongly object. The site has looked a disgrace for many years - abandoned skips, rubbish on the floor and derelict wasteland. I have lived here since the block was built and we were never informed that the road was going to be closed.

I still can't understand why a pathway could not have been built allowing direct access to the other side of Lant St. The closure of the road has also killed off the small businesses (cafes) which relied heavily on the passing footfall.

Flat 29, 56 Lant Street supports comments from Flat 2 56 Lant Street and states

I want the best for both the school and for local residents but the space has been poorly utilised to date, and the new plan for this to be developed into modular classrooms indicates the failure of previous plans.

Lant Street was commandeered from local residents on the basis that it would deliver a much-needed play area, and has not been followed through on. I would like to see a plan that creates access for local residents when the school is not open, makes appropriate use of the space, enables the children to have a proper play area and stops the building works which have been going on for months with no progress towards the promised outcome set out in the original application.

Objector who only gave a name and not an address states they would like to object to this development.

Planning permission was granted for a play area and that is not a reason to now change it to expanding the school.

Resident of the RISE development objects on the following grounds:-

This new application is not inline with what was originally proposed, if submitted as part of the original application the residents would most certainly have been more vociferous in their objections.

The closure of Lant Street was quite controversial and the council and the school have ignored concerns and behaved in a non-cooperative and very dictatorial way. This new application for development of classrooms does nothing but to reinforce this view and the belief that this was the school's intention all along. Since the council first approved permission for Charles Dickens the school did very little except to block off the road off. It was only in very recent times that the school started allowing children to play on the undeveloped road as it is.

8 Isaac Way

1) Proximity of proposed buildings.

I am a direct neighbour to Lant Street and reside in a flat on the ground floor of Isaac Way facing West. My property is directly adjacent to the proposed development.

The proposed development will be within one meter of the perimeter wall of my residence and within 2 metres of the main windows into my property. As stated in Southwark's 2008 Residential Design Standards, new developments should be a minimum distance of 21 meters at the rear of the building. No justification for this minimum distance being breached is provided in the School's Design and Access Statement.

2) Overshadowing/ loss of light

The proposed installation appears from the plans to be approximately one metre away and metres in height above the existing boundary wall with my property. I am therefore very concerned about a loss of light as my property which only has west facing windows which would be directly affected by the proposed development. Please note these

windows are the sole source of light into my property. My property also has a small patio area that would also suffer a loss of light under the current proposals. Given the proposed building is to the South of my property I do not believe that the current proposal would pass the “25 degrees” test as outlined in the Building Research Establishment (BRE) guidelines.

3) Intended purpose of site

The recent planning approval for this site (12/AP/1547) made on the 17 January 2013 stated that the Lant Street site was being developed into “much needed outdoor play area for the school children and in planning terms will not impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties, will provide a new ‘greener environment’ and improve the appearance of the area”.

I am very supportive of creating new green areas in Southwark and am disappointed that this original intent now appears to have rescinded.

I would also like to note that the January 2013 planning approval application was considered with regard to various policies including:

Strategic Policies of the Core Strategy 2011

Strategic Policy 12 – Design and Conservation

Strategic Policy 13 – High Environmental Standards

Policies of the London Plan 2012

3.6 Children and Young Peoples’ play and informal recreation facilities

7.5 Public Realm

Southwark Plan 2007

3.2 Protection of Amenity – seeks to protect and enhance amenity standards throughout the borough

3.13 Urban design – seeks to secure a high standard of urban design from all developments

3.28 Biodiversity

I believe that the application submitted (classrooms as opposed to the green, landscaped garden space described in the *Design and Access Statement*) detracts from achievability of these objectives and that the limited measures noted in the application proposal are an unacceptable compromise given the grounds under which the last planning application was recently approved (Jan 13).

4) Loss of Privacy

The proximity and height of the proposed development to our boundary wall (and therefore our direct living space) also concerns me from a privacy perspective. Furthermore the proposed development has windows that would be directly overlooking our main living area. I would urge you to consider the responsibilities of the council under the Human Rights Act in particular Protocol 1, Article 1 which states that a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment of their possessions which includes the home and other land. We believe that the proposed development would have a dominating impact

on us and our right to the quiet enjoyment of our property.

5) Security

The communal area at the rear of my property has experienced 2 incidents of trespass in the 3 months both of which resulted in lead cladding being stolen from the buildings. The police were involved in both incidents and are working with the residents to improve the security of this communal area. Incidents of trespass have increased recently following the construction of new structures (a bike shed and a pergola) on the North side of the North wall of the communal area, allowing trespassers to climb over the North wall. If a building was to be built in close proximity to the South wall this would further increase the access to the communal area for trespassers.

6) Noise

The proposal by the school to manage the more limited play space by staggering lunch times will increase the duration of noise (which is significant) to neighbouring properties.

7) Process

I am concerned that the school was aware in December 2012 that there was a forecast shortage of classroom space as stated in the "Planning Statement from the Children's and Adults Services" dated 20 April 2013, however, the planning approval for the school playground and garden area development was approved after this on 17 January 2013. We have already experienced disruption from building works on the weekends (and bank holidays including 6 May 2013) for the completion of the original approved plans. I am now very concerned that i) there was a disingenuous planning application for the original garden plans, ii) the local residents will be subjected to further disruption which has been ongoing now for four months, and iii) the substantial costs have since been incurred by the School to create the new playground space, that is yet to be used by the pupils.

I would ask that the planning consent be considered in light of the direct impact that the classrooms will have on the school's neighbours. I would hope that the development of the school house be accelerated to avoid the negative impact on neighbours from this development, retain the recently expanded playground space and preserve the amenity of the area.

I would very much welcome the opportunity for you to visit our home to understand our very serious concerns and how the proposal could be amended to alleviate these.

Additional Comments from 8 Isaac Way

Enclosure: There is currently a 2.5m wall in place between our flat and the playground. The current plans show the proposed building being approximately 1.5M higher than the existing wall. Given the proposed building would effectively be four metres in height from our side of the wall, and within 2 metres of the main windows to our ground floor flat, it would have a dominating effect on our residence and I believe, would result in an overwhelming sense of enclosure.

Positioning on the Site: As previously mentioned, the redevelopment of the old school house would be a more optimal solution as this would provide the required classroom space whilst preserving the new playground. If this is not possible, then the proposed

new classrooms could be repositioned on the existing site to significantly reduce the impact on the neighbouring residents. For example if the building was moved eastwards, then the impact of the building would be greatly reduced. I would also like to draw your attention to the fact that our flat is on a lower level than the ground of the proposed classroom plot. This clearly contributes to the sense of enclosure and I would like this to be taken into consideration including the option to lower the level of the classroom plot to minimise impact on residents.

Restricting additional structures: The existing Eco classroom has solar panels on the top of the building which increase the building's height. Although no solar panels are currently planned, I would ask that any additional structures that could increase the size of the building be explicitly prohibited.

Resident of Isaac Way (I)

While we all love having a school in the local area the purpose of their previous application and the (still unpopular) closing of Lant street - was to increase play space.

I'm not against adding single floor, low rise, short-term modular class rooms to cover an unexpected population bulge, but no guarantee they won't ask for more space. Traffic a concern and new classrooms will add to this. There are plenty of people who live and work here during the day, and who will be affected by the increase in traffic and noise.

Resident of Isaac Way (LT)

I would like to state that I object. The concerns are that more noise, during and after the construction of such a building in this area, will cause concern and distress to myself and neighbours. Already a problem with noise from the school and promised that noise will be kept to a minimum, these promises are often broken.

Most of us that over look this area, have no 'back rooms' to go to, we have small flats and our only view (of which looks to be partly taken away by this) of outside is this.

Boundary issue: Lant Street should be re-opened for public right of way, we were told the new structure on the land to the side of Lant Street was temporary and no permanent buildings would be allowed. This is again changed, with the fact that this latest planning application is being put forward.

Please do not allow this application to go through, as the building of it and the use of it, will impact heavily upon the peace of my (and neighbours) flat, my home, my life.

30 Isaac Way

The area where the modular building is to be constructed was granted planning permission as a play ground for the school, at the time the school representatives stated that they did not have sufficient play ground space for their students.

I feel the planning application was instigated then as a back door method for increasing the number of class rooms at the school and for increasing the number of students at the school.

At present the roads surrounding the school are blocked twice a day as Parents drop off their children in the mornings and in the afternoons when the children are then collected from school. If the number of classrooms were increased and therefore the number of students increased this would exacerbate the situation even more.

For these reasons I am against the planning permission for the construction of the modular classrooms.

In support

1 Alderney Mews SE1, 14 Berwick Court Swan Street, 103 Draper House SE1, 3 Mawdley House Webber Row, 42D Davidge Street, 57a Lant Street (2 e-mails), 2 St Alphege House Pocock Street, Flat 2 56A Lant Street, 12 e-mails with no address support the scheme for the following reasons:-

There is a great need for more primary school places in Southwark.

Classrooms have been sensitively designed and located.

Classrooms will enhance educational and play opportunities for current pupils.

Too many delays in the development of Lant Street already.

Objections to this application have been well-rehearsed in previous applications.

Charles Dickens is a leading and outstanding school that has much to offer children in the local community and it would be a tremendous shame if this extension were not permitted.