

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Classification:</b>	<b>Date:</b>	<b>Meeting Name:</b>
5.1	OPEN	17 September 2013	Planning Committee
<b>Report title:</b>	<b>Development Management planning application:</b> Application 13/AP/1429 for: Full Planning Permission  <b>Address:</b> FORMER MULBERRY BUSINESS PARK, LAND BOUNDED BY CANADA STREET, QUEBEC WAY AND HARMSWORTH QUAYS PRINT WORKS, LONDON SE16  <b>Proposal:</b> Redevelopment of the former Mulberry Business park to provide buildings of between 4 and 9 storeys (maximum height 42.85m AOD), comprising 770 student bedrooms with related living/kitchen and communal spaces (sui generis); 33 affordable residential units (Class C3); 610sqm retail uses (Classes A1, A2,A3); 322sqm health centre (Class D1); 75sqm area of retail (Classes A1, A2, A3) or alternate non-residential institutional use (Class D1); 4,490sqm offices (Class B1); associated car parking, cycle parking and landscaped public realm; new vehicular and pedestrian access/egress and associated works.		
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>	Surrey Docks		
<b>From:</b>	Head of Development Management		
<b>Application Start Date</b> 23/05/2013		<b>Application Expiry Date</b> 22/08/2013	
<b>Earliest Decision Date</b> 10/07/2013		<b>Planning Performance Agreement Date:</b> 30/11/2013	

## RECOMMENDATION

- 1 That planning permission be granted subject to conditions, the applicant entering into a satisfactory legal agreement and subject to referral to the Mayor of London.
- 2 In the event that the legal agreement is not entered into by 30 November 2013 then the head of development management be authorised to refuse planning permission if appropriate for the reasons set out in paragraph 257 of this report.

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

### Site location and description

- 3 The application site is the former Mulberry Business Park in Canada Water, and is bound by Quebec Way to the north, Harmsworth Quays Print Works to the east, the 'What!' commercial store to the south and Canada Street to the west. The site is broadly rectangular with an area of 1.48 hectares and is now vacant following the demolition of former business units on the site in 2008. The buildings which formerly stood on the site comprised a number of commercial / light industrial units positioned around a central courtyard parking area and large areas of hardstanding remain.
- 4 The surrounding area is mixed in character, with the Alfred Salter Primary school directly to the north of the site on the opposite side of Quebec Way; there are

industrial units further east along this road. Uses to the west are predominantly residential including Wolfe Crescent, a curved residential terrace of 3-4 storeys in height, and the Water Gardens, a residential development comprising a series of blocks of up to 10 storeys high; both of these are on the opposite side of Canada Street. There are retail uses to the south and south-west of the site comprising the 'What!' store and Decathlon.

- 5 Canada Water is designated an intensification area in the London Plan (2011) and is undergoing a period of significant change. The Harmsworth Quays printworks is soon to be vacated, freeing up a large site within the area for future development. A number of industrial units to the north-east of the site further along Quebec Way have recently obtained permission for a mixed-use development comprising retail, community uses and new homes, and the council is currently considering an application for the redevelopment of the Decathlon store (Site A) and the 'What!' retail store to the south and south-west. These are detailed in the planning history section (adjoining sites) of this report.
- 6 The local planning policy framework for managing the regeneration of this area is the adopted Canada Water AAP (CWAAP), which sets out a vision for transforming the area from an out-of-town style development to a vibrant town centre. The application site sits just outside the town centre designation, the boundary for which is to the south-west of the site along Surrey Quays Road. It does however, sit within the AAP core area which is the AAP advises is to be the focus of new development.

### **Details of proposal**

- 7 Full planning permission is sought by Kings College for a student housing-led mixed-use redevelopment of the site with the buildings ranging from 4-9 storeys in height. The student element would comprise 770 student bedspaces laid out in a cluster type arrangement of between 6-12 ensuite study bedrooms with shared kitchen and dining facilities and studio units.
- 8 Kings has advised that their standard student let is for 40 weeks but at Mulberry it is expected that up to 50% of the students would be post-graduates, and that the current lets to postgraduate students is 50 weeks. Although the application has been submitted by Kings and the student housing would most likely be occupied by their students, for reasons linked to the funding of the development the applicant has advised that any forthcoming permission cannot be restricted to Kings students only, and this is considered further in the planning obligations section of the report.
- 9 33 affordable residential units are proposed, together with 685sqm of flexible retail space which in addition to retail (Class A1), could be used for financial and services (Class A2) or cafes / restaurants (Class A3). A 332sqm health centre or alternative D1 class use (non-residential institutional) and 4,490sqm of office space are proposed.
- 10 The development would be laid out as four blocks, described in the submission as blocks A-D, with a central pedestrian route running through the site from west to east and turning north to connect with Quebec Way. An existing vehicular access at this point next to Harmsworth Quays would be retained. There would be retail units at ground floor level on either side of the pedestrian route, and the anticipated uses of these are small convenience stores, cafes and a bookshop.

### **Block A**

- 11 This would be a U-shaped block located on the southern part of the site next to the boundary with the 'What!' store. It would be 8-storeys high fronting Canada Street and

would step down to 4-storeys at the eastern boundary next to the printworks. It would contain student bedrooms (384 ensuite bedrooms and 12 studios) and associated livingrooms and kitchens, a student recreation room, reception, managers office, cycle parking and plant rooms. The principal entrance to the student accommodation would be from the central street, although there would be a secondary entrance from the southern boundary next to the 'What!' store. Two retail units would be provided on the northern side of the block fronting the pedestrian street, with a further retail unit on the south-eastern corner next to the printworks.

- 12 The space at the centre of this block would contain a garden area on the eastern part at ground floor level. This would be for student use, although the submission indicates that it could be made available to the community by arrangement. The western section at ground floor level would contain a student recreation room and refuse and cycle stores, and there would be a terraced garden above this at first floor level. There would be two roof terraces along the southern arm of block A and another along the northern arm facing the central street.

#### Block B

- 13 This block would also be U-shaped but in the reverse formation and located on the opposite side of the central street, on the northern part of the site. It would be between 4 and 7-storeys high, with the taller element located on the eastern section of the block near the boundary with Harmsworth Quays. It would then step down terminating with a 4-storey element at the junction of Quebec Way with Canada Street. It would contain student bedrooms (369 single bedrooms and 5 studios) with associated common room facilities and again, the principal entrance would be from the central street, with a secondary entrance from Quebec Way. There would be four retail units fronting the central street and a 332sqm health centre next to the eastern boundary facing the print works (at ground floor level within the 7-storey element). There would be a further retail unit with outdoor seating area close to the junction of Canada Street with Quebec Way.
- 14 The space at the centre of block B would contain a garden area on the eastern side closest to the print works, and a further garden at first floor level closer to Canada Street. There would be 3 roof terraces above this block.
- 15 Block B would incorporate an integral parking area comprising 5 accessible parking spaces accessed from a new vehicular access off Quebec Way. There would be 4 further accessible spaces and a car club space in front of the health centre, which would be accessed from the existing vehicular access off Quebec Way.

#### Block C

- 16 This would comprise a 9-storey office building located on the eastern part of the site; it would face the printworks and close off block A. It would measure 42.85m AOD in height (36m above ground level) and as it would exceed 30m in height would be classed as a tall building. It would provide 4,490 sqm of office space which would be accessed from the central street. It would contain a basement which would house an energy centre for the whole development and there would be a roof terrace overlooking the central street. There would be a gated entrance at the corner of the office block leading to a landscaped area around the edges of block A and to the retail unit next to the 'What!' store; the applicant has advised that this area would be closed off at night.
- 17 The submission advises that the office block would be occupied by administrative and professional teams from King College who would be relocated there from other campuses, allowing the vacated space to be used for other college activities.

## Block D

- 18 This block would be part 7, part 8-storeys high and would contain 33 affordable housing units; it would close off block B and would front Canada Street. There would be a communal terrace and children's playspace on the roof of the 7-storey element. The entrances to the ground floor units would be from Canada Street and the other units would be accessed from the central street. A full breakdown of the unit mix, size and tenure is provided at paragraphs 91 and 136 of this report.

	<b>Social rented</b>	<b>Intermediate</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Percentage by mix</b>
1 bedroom	9	4	13	40%
2 bedroom	9	4	13	40%
3 bedroom	5	2	7	20%
<b>Total units</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100%</b>

## 19 Materials

The proposed buildings would be faced with brick of various types, glass, aluminium and reconstituted cast stone. A mix of green and brown roofs are proposed.

## Amendments

- 20 Amendments have been made to the elevational treatment of block D containing the affordable housing. The amendments comprise the provision of balconies at first floor level, alterations to the layout of the ground floor amenity space, provision of railing rather than solid balustrades to the balconies, removal of metal cladding and replacing with contrasting brick, and the provision of window surrounds. Internally a number of open-plan kitchen and living spaces have been subdivided to form two separate rooms.
- 21 Amendments have also been made to the entrances to the student blocks from the central street to increase their prominence, and an area has been designated for the possible future installation of a cycle hire docking station outside the retail unit at the junction of Canada Street with Quebec Way (block B).

## **Planning history**

- 22 11-AP-2893 - Continued works to implement planning permission 07-AP-2806, relating to the redevelopment of the site for a series of buildings up to 8 storeys in height for residential and commercial purposes, following the carrying out of 'material operations', specifically the demolition of buildings, that has been carried out at the site. Lawful development certificate (proposed) GRANTED in October 2011.
- 23 11-AP-0537 - Application to extend the time limit by a further 3 years to implement existing planning permission 07-AP-2806 for: Demolition of existing buildings and the erection of a series of buildings up to 8 storeys comprising 256 residential units, 5105m<sup>2</sup> of Class B1 (Office) floorspace, basement car park with access to Canada Street, and landscaping works. Planning permission was REFUSED in June 2011.
- 24 07-AP-2806 - Demolition of existing buildings and the erection of a series of buildings up to 8 storeys comprising 256 residential units, 5105m<sup>2</sup> of Class B1 (Office) floorspace, basement car park with access to Canada Street, and landscaping works. Planning permission was GRANTED in April 2008 following the completion of a legal agreement.
- 25 This proposal included 53 affordable housing units which equated to 35% of the

habitable rooms, including an allowance for wheelchair affordable housing.

- 26 04-AP-0337 - Redevelopment of site to provide a part 7, part 8 and part 10 storey building for mixed use development comprising office (Class B1) space, 14 live/work units, 407 flats and a gymnasium together with associated car parking and landscaping. An appeal was lodged against non-determination which was dismissed in 2005.

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

#### Canada Water Sites A (Decathlon) and E ('What' store)

- 27 12-AP-4126 - Application made under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (England and Wales), accompanied by an ES under the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2011 seeking Outline planning permission for the demolition of existing buildings on the site (the 'Decathlon' and 'What' Retail Stores) and the erection of 5 buildings (C1-C4 and E1) ranging from 5 to 40 storeys (150.86m AOD) comprising a maximum overall floorspace of up to 138,146.8sq.m GEA.
- 28 New buildings to comprise: up to 97,851sq.m of residential accommodation (Class C3) (equating to a maximum of 1,030 residential units), up to 12,300.9sq.m Class A1 retail store (including 10,178sq.m (net) sales area, 745sq.m ancillary office accommodation and 308sq.m ancillary cafe); up to 4,352.3sq.m of other retail (Class A1/A2/A3/A4 floorspace); up to 2,800sq.m of office space floorspace (Class B1), up to 658sq.m of health centre floorspace (Class D1) and up to 698.2sq.m of cinema floorspace (Class D2); 19,486.5sq.m ancillary parking (equating to up to a maximum of 466 parking spaces), plant and storage accommodation, including the provision of basements to provide vehicle and cycle parking, circulation, servicing and plant areas; new vehicle and pedestrian accesses and new public amenity space and landscaping including new public square.
- 29 This application is UNDER CONSIDERATION.

#### Decathlon (site C)

- 30 09-AP-1783 - Redevelopment of existing retail warehouses and erection of 6 buildings varying in height from 4 to 10 storeys comprising 430 residential units (Class C3), 9104sqm retail store (Class A1), 1287sqm of other Class A1/A3/A4/A5 space, 644sqm of office space (Class B1a), 528sqm of Class D1 community space, access, basement car park for 340 cars, public realm, landscaping and communal amenity space. Planning permission with legal agreement was GRANTED in March 2011 but has not been implemented.

#### Quebec Way Industrial Estate

- 31 11-AP-2565 - Demolition of three existing warehouse buildings and construction of 7 blocks between 3 and 6 storeys high (max 21m AOD); containing 366 residential units (142x 1 bed, 113x 2 bed, 98x 3 bed and 13x 4 bed) and commercial floorspace for Class A1 (shops) / A3 (restaurant/cafes) / D1 (non-residential institutions) / D2 (assembly and leisure)uses; with basement car parking, motorcycle and cycle storage, ancillary storage spaces and a new route through the site into Russia Dock Woodlands. New vehicle and pedestrian accesses to be created from Quebec Way. Planning permission was GRANTED in March 2012 and is expected to be implemented shortly.

## **KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

### **Summary of main issues**

- 32 The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:
- a) principle of the proposed development and conformity with strategic policies and the Canada Water Area Action Plan, including the need for student accommodation;
  - b) Density;
  - c) Affordable housing;
  - d) Impact upon the amenities of neighbouring residents and occupiers;
  - e) Quality of accommodation and dwelling mix;
  - f) Impact of adjoining uses on the proposed development;
  - g) Transport;
  - h) Design;
  - i) Trees and landscaping;
  - j) Planning obligations (s106) and community infrastructure levy;
  - k) Sustainability;
  - l) Ecology;
  - m) Archaeology;
  - n) Flood risk;
  - o) Contaminated land;
  - p) Air quality;
  - q) Wind tunnels;
  - r) TV / Radio interference.

### **Planning policy**

- 33 The site is designated as:

Intensification area in the London Plan (2011)  
Urban Density Zone  
Air Quality Management Area  
Canada Water Action Area  
Proposals site CWAAP 9  
PTAL 4-6a  
Flood Risk Zone 2

#### Canada Water Area Action Plan

- 34 The site forms part of the CWAAP Core Area and a Strategic Heating Area. The boundary for the Canada Water town centre lies to the south-west of the site, along Surrey Quays Road.
- 35 The AAP was adopted in March 2012 following an examination-in-public (EIP) which was held during summer 2011. Also in 2011, the Daily Mail group announced that it would be vacating Harmsworth Quays printworks. This has implications for the AAP which is based upon the printworks remaining in-situ. The Council is in the process of reviewing the AAP and is currently consulting on a draft revised area action plan, and this is considered in the 'principle' section of this report.

#### Core Strategy 2011

- 36 Strategic Targets Policy 1 - Achieving growth  
Strategic Targets Policy 2 - Improving places  
Strategic Policy 1 - Sustainable development  
Strategic Policy 2 - Sustainable transport

Strategic Policy 3 - Shopping, leisure and entertainment  
 Strategic Policy 4 - Places for learning, enjoyment and healthy lifestyles  
 Strategic Policy 5 - Providing new homes  
 Strategic Policy 6 - Homes for people on different incomes  
 Strategic Policy 7 - Family homes  
 Strategic Policy 8 - Student homes  
 Strategic Policy 10 - Jobs and businesses  
 Strategic Policy 11 - Open spaces and wildlife  
 Strategic Policy 12 - Design and conservation  
 Strategic Policy 13 - High environmental standards

Southwark Plan 2007 (July) - saved policies

- 37 The council's cabinet on 19th March 2013, as required by paragraph 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.
- 38 Policy 1.1 - Access to employment opportunities  
 Policy 2.2 - Provision of new community facilities  
 Policy 2.5 - Planning obligations  
 Policy 3.1 - Environmental effects  
 Policy 3.2 - Protection of amenity  
 Policy 3.3 - Sustainability assessment  
 Policy 3.4 - Energy efficiency  
 Policy 3.6 - Air quality  
 Policy 3.7 - Waste reduction  
 Policy 3.9 - Water  
 Policy 3.11 - Efficient use of land  
 Policy 3.12 - Quality in design  
 Policy 3.13 - Urban design  
 Policy 3.14 - Designing out crime  
 Policy 3.19 - Archaeology  
 Policy 3.20 - Tall buildings  
 Policy 3.28 - Biodiversity  
 Policy 4.2 - Quality of accommodation  
 Policy 4.3 - Mix of dwellings  
 Policy 4.4 - Affordable housing  
 Policy 4.5 - Wheelchair affordable housing  
 Policy 4.7 - Non self-contained housing for identified user groups  
 Policy 5.1 - Locating developments  
 Policy 5.2 - Transport impacts  
 Policy 5.3 - Walking and cycling  
 Policy 5.6 - Car parking  
 Policy 5.7 - Parking standards for disabled people and the mobility impaired

Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) / Documents (SPD)

- 39 Section 106 Planning obligations SPD (2007)  
 Affordable housing SPD (2008)  
 Sustainable design and construction SPD (2009)  
 Sustainable transport SPD (2010)  
 Residential Design Standards SPD (2011)

London Plan 2011

- 40 Policy 2.13 Opportunity areas and intensification areas  
Policy 3.3 Increasing housing supply  
Policy 3.1 Ensuring equal life chances for all  
Policy 3.8 Housing choice  
Policy 3.9 Mixed and balanced communities  
Policy 3.10 Definition of affordable housing  
Policy 3.11 Affordable housing targets  
Policy 3.12 Negotiating affordable housing on individual private residential  
Policy 3.18 Education facilities  
Policy 4.1 Developing London's economy  
Policy 4.7 Retail and town centre development  
Policy 4.10 New and emerging economic sectors  
Policy 4.12 Improving opportunities for all  
Policy 5.1 Climate change mitigation  
Policy 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions  
Policy 5.3 Sustainable design and construction  
Policy 5.5 Decentralised energy networks  
Policy 5.6 Decentralised energy in development proposals  
Policy 5.7 Renewable energy  
Policy 5.9 Overheating and cooling  
Policy 5.15 Water use and supplies  
Policy 5.10 Urban greening  
Policy 5.11 Green roofs and development site environs  
Policy 5.12 Flood risk management  
Policy 5.13 Sustainable drainage  
Policy 6.3 Assessing effects of development on transport capacity  
Policy 6.13 Parking  
Policy 6.9 Cycling  
Policy 6.10 Walking  
Policy 6.11 Smoothing traffic flow and tackling congestion  
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 7.7 Location and design of tall and large buildings  
Policy 7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology  
Policy 7.11 London View Management Framework  
Policy 7.12 Implementing the London View Management Framework  
Policy 7.21 Trees and woodlands  
Policy 7.13 Safety, security and resilience to emergency  
Policy 7.14 Improving air quality  
Policy 7.15 Reducing noise and enhancing soundscapes  
Policy 8.3 Community infrastructure levy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

- 41 Section 1 - Building a strong, competitive economy  
Section 4 - Promoting sustainable transport  
Section 6 - Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes  
Section 7 - Requiring good design



Section 8 - Promoting healthy communities

Section 10 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

Section 11 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

### **Principle of development**

- 42 The Core Strategy and AAP vision for Canada Water is to transform it from an out of centre style development into a vibrant town centre which combines shopping, civic and leisure, business and residential uses. The vision notes that existing facilities in the centre are separated and poorly linked and that development in the town centre should create a street based environment with high quality public realm and open spaces. Alongside the target for new homes, the vision also notes that around 2,000 jobs will be generated.
- 43 The adopted Canada Water AAP designates a number of proposals sites within the action plan area, and the Mulberry site is designated as Proposals Site 9. Although not within the town centre designation, it does form part of the CWAAP Core Area which is to be the focus of new development.
- 44 The site is specifically designated for residential and business use, with community use listed as the only other acceptable use. The estimated capacity is 250 residential units and 3,000sqm of business space. The supporting text to the designation advises that the site layout requires careful consideration owing to the proximity to Harmsworth Quays Print Works and noise generated from activities there. It states that new businesses should be provided to create a non-residential buffer adjacent to the printworks, that phasing of the development will be critical to ensure that an effective noise barrier is created prior to the occupation of any dwellings, and that a noise assessment would be required with any planning application for noise sensitive development such as residential.

### **Review of the CWAAP**

- 45 As stated earlier, the AAP was adopted in March 2012 following an examination-in-public (EIP) which was held in summer 2011. Also in 2011 the Daily Mail group announced it would be vacating Harmsworth Quays printworks and the adopted AAP is predicated on the printworks remaining in situ. In light of this Council is in the process of reviewing the AAP and is currently consulting on a draft revised area action plan.
- 46 The revised draft creates a much larger site designation, CWAAP24, incorporating the Mulberry site, Canada Water site E (the "What!" store), the printworks and Surrey Quays Leisure Park. The required uses are a mix of employment generating uses such as business use (Class B1), retail (Class A), community use including education and health (Class D) and hotel use (Class C1). Residential and student accommodation are identified as other acceptable uses.
- 47 With regard to the weight which should be attributed to the revised draft AAP, its preparation is still at an early stage in the process. At this point, the revised plan has little weight. Generally, it will attain more weight as it moves towards examination and adoption and as the certainty that the revisions will be adopted increases.
- 48 However, the decision of the council to review the adopted AAP in light of changed circumstances would be expected to reduce the weight which could be attached to the adopted policies and designations where these are expected to be revised. The draft revised plan, although in its early stages, does give a clear indication of the direction the council would like to take, subject to consultation and examination.

### Aspirations for an educational campus at Canada Water

- 49 The proposed development would potentially add vitality to what is to be an expanded and revitalised town centre to the south-west of the site, and would introduce a new student community into the area, creating greater vibrancy and a more mixed community; this could support the long-term aspirations of the Council to create a vibrant town centre for Canada Water which contains a range of town centre uses and functions. It is considered that the proposal would go some way to achieving this, particularly in terms of its contribution to the day-time economy as students are likely to spend considerable periods of time studying and socialising in the area and the potential benefits of this for local businesses should be noted.
- 50 The AAP review is considering the potential to develop a new university campus on the printworks site, and this is of interest to Kings which has ambitions to take this forward. This would be a very significant benefit not just for Canada Water but for the borough, in terms of inward investment, job creation and the reputational benefits of a world class educational institution locating in this part of the borough; the starting point for this could be the establishment of a student base at the Mulberry site. Kings has advised that regardless of whether they are able to meet this wider aim, they are committed to the Mulberry site and moving their administrative and professional teams into the proposed office building. It is noted that the proposed development, particularly in terms of its layout, has considered how this could tie in with a more comprehensive development including the adjoining printworks site.
- 51 Notwithstanding comments in relation to the weight that can be afforded to the AAP review, the Council owns the freehold of the printworks site and on 8 March 2013, Southwark's Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Corporate Strategy agreed to formally consent to Associated Newspapers Ltd's (ANL's) application to assign its leases to a developer, British Land (BL). In making the decision, Southwark noted the additional information provided by British Land in support of their application, which states that they intend to pursue a mixed-use redevelopment of the site. It also stated that "BL are enthusiastic about the possibility of a university campus and advantages it would bring to the area including direct employment opportunities" and that they wished to work with Southwark to determine whether a university can be accommodated. It must be emphasised however, that the situation with regard to the adjoining site is uncertain.
- 52 Although as noted Kings cannot accept a personal permission for the site due to funding constraints, the College has invested a considerable amount in pursuing its interests on this site and has advised that they are committed to investing in this part of the borough.

### Provision of student housing

- 53 In Southwark student housing is considered to be non self-contained accommodation and defined as 'Sui Generis' under the Use Classes Order. As such, the proposal to provide the majority of floorspace on the site as student accommodation would be a departure from the adopted AAP. In assessing the proposal, consideration must be given to whether the departure would undermine the vision and objectives of the Core Strategy and AAP, whether there is a need for the proposed uses, and whether the proposed uses would bring benefits beyond those deriving from the designated uses. It is noted however, that student housing is considered as housing for monitoring purposes through the council's and GLA's monitoring reports.
- 54 The core Strategy sets a target of providing at least 24,450 new homes between 2011 and 2026. The council's London Plan target is to provide a minimum of 20,050 homes between 2011 and 2021, a rate of 2005 per year. Paragraph 47 of the NPPF states

that local authorities should identify sites sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against their housing requirements, with an additional buffer of 5% to ensure choice and competition in the market for land. They should also identify a supply of specific, developable sites or broad locations for growth, for years 6-10 and where possible, for years 11-15.

- 55 The council's current capacity assessment and trajectory identifies sites for 19,105 homes which would be completed between April 2012 and March 2025. This application proposes 33 homes, which would be 223 less than the extant permission for the site, thereby reducing the overall capacity to 18,882 homes. Whilst both the figures of 19,105 and 18,882 are less than the Council's London Plan target, it should be noted that there is much less certainty over sites expected to come forward for trajectory years 11-15 and the Council would expect to meet the extra number of homes through small site completions or windfalls (which are not currently counted in the above figures). Moreover, the overall capacity figure does not include non-conventional homes such as student housing, which as stated would also contribute to meeting the London Plan target.
- 56 With regard to a five year supply of homes, Southwark's trajectory shows capacity for 12,630 homes, which is above the NPPF expectation of 10,526 homes. Whilst the current proposal would reduce the number of homes expected to come forward by 223, Southwark still has sufficient sites to meet the NPPF expectation of a 5 year supply plus 5%.
- 57 Both the Core Strategy and London Plan set a target for Canada Water of providing at least 2,500 new homes (Core Strategy policy 5 and London Plan annex 1). The Council's evidence base, which is reflected in the capacity figures set out in the adopted AAP, suggests that there is capacity for 3,102 homes, of which 2,266 already have planning permission. It is not considered that the small reduction in capacity that would result from a lower number of homes being built on the Mulberry site would compromise the council's ability to meet and exceed the Canada Water housing target. The above figures also do not take into account the availability of the Harmsworth Quays site which is a material change in circumstances and which presents an opportunity to provide additional homes in the area.
- 58 In light of the above it can be concluded that the development of the site for predominantly student homes rather than conventional housing would not compromise the Council's ability to meet the housing targets set out in the AAP, Core Strategy or the London Plan. It is therefore necessary to consider whether there is a need for the proposed development.

#### Need for student homes

- 59 London Plan policy 4.10 requires boroughs to give strong support for London's higher and further education institutions, recognising their need for accommodation. London Plan policy 3.8 requires boroughs to ensure that strategic and local requirements for student housing meeting a demonstrable need are addressed by working closely with stakeholders in higher and further education and without compromising capacity for conventional homes. The supporting text to this policy states that whilst there is uncertainty over future growth in the London student population and its accommodation needs, there could be a requirement for some 18,000-27,000 places over the 10 years to 2021.
- 60 In line with the London Plan, Core Strategy policy 8 aims to meet need by encouraging more student homes whilst balancing them with the need for conventional homes. In terms of student housing schemes completed, 123 student rooms were completed in 2009/10, 235 in 2010/2011 and 397 in 2011/2012. SP8

acknowledges that there is a need for student housing across London and Southwark, and sets out the councils' approach over the future plan period (2011-2026). It states that this will be achieved by:

- 61 - Allowing development of student homes within the town centres, and places with good access to public transport services, provided that these do not harm the local character.  
  
- Requiring 35% of student developments as affordable housing in line with policy 6 and figure 22 (Strategic policy 6 - Homes for people on different incomes).
- 62 The site sits at the edge of the Canada Water town centre designation but is well located for public transport, with a PTAL ranging from 4 (medium) to 6a (high). With regard to the impact upon local character, concerns have been raised by a neighbouring resident that the proposal would change the dynamics of the neighbourhood which they describe as a quiet, residential area occupied by young adults and professionals. Whilst this is noted, the proposal would potentially support the aspirations to strengthen Canada Water as a town centre, by introducing a new housing type and community into the area which could help to support the daytime economy and the Council's aims to support mixed and balanced communities. Although student housing would be the predominant use on the site, it is not considered that it would be of a scale that would have a significant impact upon the overall demographic mix in the area. The provision of affordable housing within the development is considered separately below.
- 63 Saved policy 4.7 of the Southwark Plan states that new development which provides non-self-contained residential accommodation will normally be permitted where the need for and suitability of the accommodation can be demonstrated. In addition, there must be adequate local infrastructure and the proposed accommodation must be of a satisfactory standard. The new development should not result in a significant loss of amenity to neighbouring occupiers.
- 64 This is expanded upon in section 4.3 of the adopted Residential Design Standards SPD which requires proposals for student housing to demonstrate an identified need for this type of housing, including a letter from a recognised educational establishment. In addition, confirmation that the accommodation would be affordable to that user group and details of the security and long-term management arrangements are required.
- 65 The application has been submitted by Kings College, which has campuses at Waterloo, Denmark Hill, Guys, St Thomas's and the Strand and has student accommodation in various locations including Stamford Street and Great Dover Street in the borough.
- 66 At present there are just over 20,000 full-time students at the College and in 2012 it had 2,180 bedspaces in directly managed stock. This will increase to 2,830 in 2014 when a student housing development at Champion Hill is completed. When nominated residences are factored in, the current stock is around 3,700 bedspaces. The submission states that every year the number of applications received for student housing far outstrips the supply and in 2012/2013 there were 7,000 applications for King's residences.
- 67 Over the period 2011/2012-2017-2018 the total full-time equivalent number of students is expected to rise from 20,267 to 23,270, an increase of around 3,000. The College would like to be able to guarantee an offer of student accommodation to all first year and international post-graduate students, and is unable to do so at present. The College has set itself a target of having sufficient stock to house 25% of the

student body. This would require an additional 5,800 student bedspaces by 2017/2018 and to accommodate this, around 2,000 additional bedspaces would need to be provided. In light of this it is considered that the need for the student housing has been adequately demonstrated.

#### Affordability of the student accommodation

- 68 The draft Affordable Housing SPD and Residential Design Standards SPD require details of affordability for student housing. This is to ensure that it would be affordable to that user group by being benchmarked against other similar student accommodation.
- 69 The submission indicates that Kings direct-let accommodation varies from £120 -£158 per week for 40 weeks, compared to £190 per week for accommodation in partnerships (nominations agreements), £350 per week for private providers and £250 per week in the private rented sector.
- 70 Rent levels for the student accommodation are set out in an accompanying viability report as £190 per week for an ensuite study bedroom within a cluster unit and £350 per week for a studio unit. The District Valuers Service (DVS) has confirmed that this is reflective of current market rental levels for student accommodation.

#### Security and long-term management

- 71 The college is a signatory to the Student Accommodation Code which sets out the features that students can expect from their university accommodation and what their obligations are as tenants. In addition, students would be required to sign up to a Residence Agreement with the College which sets out clear codes of conduct for the students which would be enforced through the College's disciplinary procedures.
- 72 A Residence Management Plan has been submitted with the application which advises that on-site management of services as well as support and advice to the student population would be provided. The management team would be accessible on site at all times, which would be supplemented at key periods by students or other temporary employees to provide student and help desk services from 08:00-19:00; the management team would provide out of hours support on a rota basis and there would be a 'hotline' telephone number to the local management team for neighbouring residents. A range of contractor-led services would be provided, including cleaning, window cleaning, refuse management and ground maintenance.
- 73 There would be security on-site at all times. Entrances to the student blocks would be gated, with entry controlled by a key-fob system. There would be a reception for each student block and late at night students would have to come in through the reception rather than through the gate. No smoking would be permitted within the buildings and designated quiet hours would be between 23:30-08:00. Any visitors would have to report to reception and sign in. It is recommended that management and security measures be secured through the s106 agreement and for these to remain in place throughout the lifetime of the development.

#### Proposed business use

- 74 The proposed development would include 4,490sqm of business space (B1) within a 9-storey building next to Harmsworth Quays. This quantum would exceed that required by CWAAP 9 and is welcomed, and would comply with strategic policy 10 of the Core Strategy 'Jobs and businesses'. As stated it is intended that it would be occupied by Kings staff bringing 300 employees to the site, relocated from existing campuses. This would have a positive impact on the local economy and would help to

support the proposed retail uses within the development, as well as the wider town centre.

- 75 The CWAAP designation requires the provision of non-residential space along the boundary with Harmsworth Quays, to act as a noise buffer against the activities undertaken there. However, the Daily Mail group which occupy the building has constructed a new printworks in Essex is likely to have vacated Harmsworth Quays by autumn 2013. It is considered unlikely that the site will be used as a printworks again, hence the AAP review.
- 76 Whilst there is not yet any certainty as to how the neighbouring printworks will be developed, the location of the office building would provide a non-residential buffer part way along the boundary with Harmsworth Quays. The ground floor health centre would provide a similar buffer further north in the site, albeit with student accommodation above. Given the expected changes on the printworks site, the absence of a continuous noise buffer is not considered an issue which should cause concern.

#### Proposed health centre

- 77 The CWAAP site designation lists community use (Class D) as the only other acceptable use. The proposal would incorporate a 322sqm health centre which would comply with this land-use designation, and it is noted that policy 29 of the AAP recognises the need for new health facilities in the area. It would be located in the north-eastern corner of the site, occupying the ground floor of block B facing the printworks. It is not yet known what facilities it would provide and whether it would be available only for students or for the wider community, and this is considered further in the planning obligations section of this report.

#### Proposed retail uses

- 78 The development would provide 685sqm of retail floorspace in the form of 8 retail units. A flexible consent is sought which would allow these to be used for classes A1 (retail), A2 (Financial and professional) and A3 (Restaurant / Cafe) uses.
- 79 Whilst retail use is not listed within the site designation as an 'other acceptable use' and the site does not fall within the town centre designation, the extent of the retail proposed is not considered to be such that it would undermine the Core Strategy and AAP objectives for reinforcing the town centre to the south-west of the site and would not impact upon its potential vitality and viability. Furthermore, policy 4 of the AAP permits small scale shopping to meet day-to-day convenience needs, cafes and restaurants, and this is considered to be a considerable benefit of the scheme by providing shops and services which could be used by local residents. In order to maximise this benefit a condition is recommended to ensure that no more than 50% of the retail units can fall within food and drink uses (Use Class A3).
- 80 In summary, although the proposal would represent a departure from the adopted CWAAP, there are no objections to the principle of the proposed development in land use terms in this location. Student housing is considered as housing for monitoring purposes and it would not compromise the ability to meet the housing targets set by the AAP, the Core Strategy or the London Plan, particularly given the availability of the Harmsworth Quays site. It is further noted that the provision of purpose built student housing could free-up some accommodation in the private-rented sector. The need for the student housing has been addressed, it would be affordable to that user group, and adequate details of the long-term security and management have been provided. The provision of an excess of office space above the AAP requirement is welcomed, and because it is intended that Kings would occupy the office space, this would lead to

more certainty about it being brought forward. The provision of the retail units would be of benefit to the local community and would add vibrancy, activity and active frontages to the development.

### **Density of the proposed development**

- 81 Strategic policy 5 of the Core Strategy and CWAAP policy 24 require that residential developments in the urban density zone to fall within a range of between 200-700 habitable rooms per hectare. The density ranges set out in both the Core Strategy and the London Plan were derived from an understanding of the space needs and general configurations of mainstream (Class C3) housing. It assumes a standard layout of accommodation, with flats or houses each with their own kitchen and bathroom and living rooms. It also assumes space requirements for things like play, and for car parking. The straight translation of the density ranges to non-self contained accommodation is not therefore considered to be as relevant, since the floor areas and likely number of occupiers would not be directly comparable.
- 82 Nonetheless the density of the proposed development has been calculated. It would equate to 785 habitable rooms per hectare if the internal floor area of the student accommodation is divided by 27.5 in the same way as the commercial floorspace, and based on a net site area of 1.3ha. This would exceed the prescribed density range for the site. If the density is calculated with each student bedroom and kitchen / dining space counted as a habitable room the density of the proposed development would increase to 860 habitable rooms per hectare, also in excess of the required density range. However, as set out below, the design of the proposal, its height and massing and the standard of accommodation are considered to be acceptable, therefore the fact that the numerical density range would be exceeded is not considered to be an overriding issue in the determination of the application.

### **Affordable housing**

- 83 Strategic policy 6 of the Core Strategy requires the provision of 875 affordable homes in the Canada Water Action Area between 2011 and 2026. As stated, strategic policy 8 requires student housing schemes to provide 35% affordable housing in line with strategic policy 6. The draft affordable housing SPD provides policy guidance and states that student schemes which would provide 30 or more bedspaces and living spaces or if the development site is over 0.5ha (whichever is smaller) must provide affordable housing.
- 84 The SPD also sets out the method for calculating the affordable housing and states that each student bedroom and communal living / dining room must be counted as a habitable room. For developments of 15 or more units, affordable housing is calculated as a percentage of the habitable rooms rather than of the total number of units.
- 85 The planning statement advises that 10% affordable housing would be provided. The student housing would contain 770 bedrooms and 86 communal kitchens / livingrooms, equating to 856 habitable rooms within the student element. The submission states that the affordable housing block would provide a further 93 habitable rooms bringing the total across the development to 949.
- 86 However, this does not factor in that some of the habitable rooms would exceed 27.5sqm and can therefore be counted as two habitable rooms. This would result in an additional 11 affordable habitable rooms in the development, increasing it to 104 and the total to 960. This however, would only equate to 11% affordable housing, significantly below the 35% policy requirement. Even if the discount permitted under saved policy 4.5 of the Southwark Plan were applied because three wheelchair

affordable units are proposed, the level of affordable housing would remain at 11%.

- 87 The applicant has submitted a viability report seeking to demonstrate that the proposed development cannot support any more affordable housing. This has been reviewed by the DVS and although there are some differences of opinion over certain elements, the DVS report concludes that the development would be unviable. The principle reason attributed to this is the high market value of the site.
- 88 Given that the site is designated for predominantly residential use and the extant permission secured 35% affordable housing or 53 affordable units, officers have been in discussion with the applicant as to why a lesser amount of student housing and greater amount of affordable housing could not be provided on the site.
- 89 The applicant has advised that, viability aside, Kings has an urgent operational need to provide at least 2,000 additional bedspaces, and is seeking permission on this site to meet a significant proportion of this need. Kings has advised that there are economies of scale in providing student accommodation in relation to the construction, management and staff costs associated with it, and that the need for 770 bedspaces on the site is driven by the need to deliver a critical mass of rooms that can be efficiently operated by King's, whilst responding appropriately to the site's context and surroundings. Additional office space over and above the AAP requirement is required in order to relocate existing staff, and the scale of these two uses limits the amount of the site that could be given over to affordable housing. This low level of affordable housing provision therefore has to be weighed against the wider regeneration benefits which the scheme could potentially deliver.
- 90 As stated earlier, the council's ability to meet its housing targets set by the AAP, Core Strategy and London Plan would not be unduly compromised by accepting a lower number of residential units on the site. Whilst each site should be required to make a fair and reasonable contribution to affordable housing in accordance with adopted policy, the DVS has advised that no more affordable housing could be provided. If Members consider that the longer term aspiration of creating a new university campus in Canada Water and the benefits that could ensue is a key priority for the area, then in this instance a lower level of affordable housing on the site could be accepted on the basis that the opportunity to provide student accommodation and office space for a world class educational establishment could be the first phase in a much greater investment by the College in the area.

#### Tenure split

- 91 Policy 22 of the CWAAP 'Affordable homes' requires affordable housing to be 70% social rented and 30% intermediate. The proposal would comply with this policy by providing the following tenure split and this would be secured through the s106 agreement:
- 91 Social rented (23 units - 70%)
- 8 x 1-bed, 2 person
  - 1 x 2-bed, 2 person WC flat
  - 1 x 2-bed, 3 person WC flat
  - 2 x 2-bed, 4 person flats
  - 6 x 2-bed 4 person flats
  - 1 x 3-bed, 4 person WC flat
  - 4 x 3-bed, 5 person flat.
- 92 Intermediate (10 units - 30%)



4 x 1-bed, 2 person flats  
2 x 2-bed, 4 person flats  
2 x 2-bed, 4 person flats  
2 x 3-bed, 5 person flats

### **Environmental impact assessment (EIA)**

- 93 Prior to the submission of this application, a request for a screening opinion was submitted under the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 'the Regulations'. The screening opinion was for the following development on the site:
- 94 - Up to 26,000sqm of student residential (sui generis) uses;  
- Up to 4,000sqm of residential C3 uses;  
- Up to 1,500sqm of flexible retail / health care (A1-A5, D1) uses; and  
- Up to 5,000sqm of flexible commercial space.
- 95 A negative screening opinion was given, i.e. it was concluded that the proposed development would not require an EIA to be undertaken. It was concluded that according to the Regulations, the site could be classified as a Schedule 2 'urban development project' by virtue of its site area which exceeds 0.5ha. An assessment was therefore made as to whether the development was likely to have a significant effect upon the environment by virtue of its nature, size or location, based on a review of the Schedule 3 selection criteria for screening Schedule 2 Development.
- 96 It was concluded that the nature, scale and location of the development was not such that it would be likely to give rise to environmental effects of more than local significance. The site is not located within a 'sensitive area' as defined by the Regulations and based on the information submitted, it was found that no Environmental Impact Assessment would be required (reference:13-AP-0360).
- 97 Given the similarities between the proposal subject to the screening opinion and that for which permission is now sought, it is considered that the proposal would not have a significant effect on the environment by virtue of its nature, size and location, and based upon a review of the selection criteria set out in Schedule 3 of the Regulations, and that an EIA would not be required.

### **Impact upon the amenities of neighbouring occupiers and the surrounding area**

- 98 Saved policy 3.2 of the Southwark Plan states that permission will not be granted for developments where a loss of amenity, including disturbance from noise, would be caused. In addition, saved policy 4.7 states that the provision of non self-contained housing (such as student accommodation) should not result in a significant loss of a amenity to neighbouring occupiers. The adopted Residential Design Standards SPD expands on policy and sets out guidance for protecting amenities in relation to privacy, daylight and sunlight. Strategic policy 13 of the Core Strategy 'High environmental standards' seeks to ensure that development sets high standards for reducing air, land, noise and light pollution and avoiding amenity and environmental problems that affect how we enjoy the environment in which we live and work.
- 99 Concerns have been raised by residents regarding noise, dust and disruption of roads and access points to Surrey Quays shopping centre, loss of light and overlooking, and these are considered below. Concerns have also been raised regarding the impact of an influx of such a large number of students into what is described as a quiet, residential area and the likely bars and other entertainment venues that would follow. As stated, officers recommend a condition that no more than 50% of the retail units can fall within A3 use and it is noted that no A4 (drinking establishments) or A5 (take-

away) uses are proposed. Conditions relating to the opening hours of the units and details of extraction and ventilation for any A3 units would be required.

100 A BRE Daylight and Sunlight Report has been submitted with the application. As there are currently no buildings on the site, the assessment plots the existing situation as if the former industrial buildings were still on the site and measures the impact of the proposal over and above that (Baseline V Proposed Development). The report then includes an assessment of the proposals if the Mulberry development were completed and the proposals for sites C and E were completed (Cumulative Impacts Assessment). The following buildings have been assessed:

- 101 - Giverny House  
- Pavilion House  
- Dovecote House  
- Wolfe Crescent  
- Alfred Salter Primary school

102 In terms of daylight, the following tests have been carried out:

- Vertical Sky Component (VSC) - the amount of skylight reaching a window expressed as a percentage. The guidance recommends that the windows of neighbouring properties achieve a VSC of at least 27%, and notes that if the VSC is reduced to no less than 0.8 times its former value (i.e. 20% reduction) following the construction of a development, then the reduction will not be noticeable.
- No-Sky Line (NSL) - the area of a room at desk height that can see the sky. The guidance suggests that the NSL should not be reduced to less than 0.8 times its former value (i.e. a 20% reduction).
- Average daylight factor (ADF) - this determines the natural internal light or daylit appearance of a room and the guidance recommends an ADF of 1% is achieved for bedrooms, 1.5% for living rooms and 2% for kitchens. The BRE guidance advises against relying on the ADF as a basis for assessing the impact on existing properties.
- Sunlight - Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH). This should be considered for all windows facing within 90 degrees of due south (windows outside of this orientation do not receive direct sunlight in the UK). The guidelines advise that windows should receive at least 25% APSH, with 5% of this total being enjoyed during the winter months. It should not be reduced to less than 0.8 times its former value; and
- Overshadowing - this determines the effect of overshadowing on gardens and amenity areas for both existing and new spaces. The guidance recommends that for an area to appear adequately sunlight throughout the year, at least half of the garden or amenity area should receive at least 2 hours of sunlight on 21st March. If, following a development it does not achieve this or the area that can receive this is less than 0.8 times its former value, the loss of sunlight is likely to be noticeable.

#### Giverny House

103 This is an 8-storey residential block which forms part of the Water Gardens development and is located to the south-west of the application site. There would be a separation distance of 39m between this building and the closest part of the Mulberry development and this is considered to be sufficient distance to ensure that

no unacceptable loss of outlook or sense of enclosure would occur. The Residential Design Standards SPD recommends a window-to-window separation distance of 12m where properties face each other across a highway in order to maintain privacy, and this distance would be significantly exceeded in this instance.

- 104 Twenty-four windows in Giverny House have been assessed against the BRE guidance. 17 of the 24 would retain a VSC of at least 27% or would not experience a reduction to less than 0.8 times their former value. Of the remaining windows, 6 are overhung by balconies and have existing VSC values of between 17-22%. For these windows, the VSC would be between 0.66-0.78 of its former value. Whilst not complying with the guidance, this is not considered to be a significant reduction that would warrant the refusal of planning permission.
- 105 With regard to NSL, all of the windows would comply with the BRE guidance. In relation to ADF, one window would fail. This window serves a living room which currently has an ADF of 0.56 which would be reduced to 0.47. This window would also fail on VSC, but only by a very small degree. This is a ground floor window which would directly face the 8-storey element of block A facing Canada Street and which has no other windows serving that room. All of the windows tested in relation to sunlight would comply with the BRE guidance.
- 106 In relation to permanent overshadowing, the BRE report concludes that all of the existing gardens and amenity spaces surrounding the site would comply with the guidance and would maintain at least two hours of direct sunlight to over 50% of their area on 21 March.
- 107 With regard to transient overshadowing, the results for all the blocks within the Water Gardens are largely the same. On 21 June these blocks would experience some overshadowing from the proposed development from 07:00-09:00 which is not considered to be significant. On 21 March shadow would be present from 08:00-10:00 and on 21st December until 11:00. These results are considered to be acceptable and would be largely the same for Pavilion House and Dovecote, therefore the results have not been replicated below.

#### Pavilion House

- 108 This is a 10 storey block within the Water Gardens development and would be located approximately 24m from proposed block A. This would be sufficient separation distance to ensure an adequate level of outlook and would retain an acceptable level of privacy across the street, exceeding the 12m standard.
- 109 Fifty-six windows within this block have been tested against the BRE guidance. In relation to VSC, 38 of the windows would comply with or exceed the recommended criteria. Of the 18 which would fail, they would be reduced to between 0.51 and 0.78 of their former values (ratio reduction). The windows where they would be reduced to less than 0.6 would be W2 (living room - 0.59), W8 (bedroom - 0.51) and W15 (bedroom - 0.55).
- 110 With regard to W2, this livingroom is also served by two other windows. The other windows would experience VSCs of 0.60 and 0.71 of their former value and overall it is likely that this room would retain an acceptable level of light. Bedrooms are recognised within the BRE guidance as being less sensitive given that they are predominantly used at night.
- 111 With regard to NSL, two windows would fail, with VSCs of 0.65 times their former value (W8 - bedroom) and 0.73 (W15 - bedroom). These reductions are not considered to be significant however, particularly given their use as bedrooms.

- 112 Seven rooms would fail in relation to ADF, one is a livingroom with a single window (W0, ADF of 0.31). The target for a living room is 1.5% but this room is already below this with an ADF of 0.44 therefore it may not experience a significant reduction in daylight. The five other windows all serve livingrooms, with three windows per livingroom. Rooms 1, 2 and 3 have ADFs of 0.97 at present which would be reduced to 0.69 and W4-6 have 0.88 which would be reduced to 0.80; the latter would not be significant. These windows are all at ground floor level and as such would be more affected by any proposals on the site. There would be some impact on these windows as most of them would fail on VSC and ADF, but they would pass on NSL.
- 113 With regard to sunlight, 31 out of 32 windows assessed would comply with the BRE guidance. The one window which would fail would receive 24% of the APSH rather than 25%, but this would not be significant.

#### Dovecote House

- 114 This 8- storey residential block within the Water Gardens would be located approximately 42m from block A. This would be sufficient to maintain an adequate level of outlook and would exceed the minimum separation distance required for privacy.
- 115 Twenty out of 23 windows tested would comply with the BRE guidance in relation to VSC and those which fail would not do so by a significant amount (W173, living room, 0.78 times its former value), W154 - bedroom - 0.77, W155 - bedroom, 0.75). All of the rooms would pass in relation to NSL and one window would fail on ADF (W156, living room, 1.47 and the target is 1.5); this would not be significant. Five windows have been tested in relation to sunlight, two of which would experience a loss of 5% sunlight hours, from 25% to 20% - W173, a living room also served by two other windows, W152, a living room served by another window, and W158, a living room served by another window. W163, a living room, would fail during the winter months as it would receive 3% rather than 5% of the APSH; again, this is not considered to be significant.

#### Wolfe Crescent

- 116 This is a 3-4-storey high residential terrace located to the north-west of the site, on the opposite side of Canada Street. There would be a minimum separation distance of approximately 26m between the front elevation of this terrace and block D, and 18m to the garden boundary walls which front Canada Street
- 117 62 windows have been assessed against the BRE guidance, 48 of which would pass in relation to VSC and 14 would fail. Those which would fail would range between 0.71-0.79 times of their former value, none of which would be significantly less than the recommended 0.8. With regard to NSL and ADF, all of the windows would pass. It is noted that only the ground floor windows have been tested in relation to NSL and ADF and because they would all pass, the windows above have not been tested. All of the windows have been tested in relation to sunlight. Window 97 (use unknown) would fail on the winter hours, 4% rather than 5%, but would retain good levels of sunlight for the remainder of the year (32%).
- 118 With regard to overshadowing, on 21st June Wolfe Crescent would experience some overshadowing towards the bottom of their gardens at around 07:00 but by 09:00 this would largely have moved as the sun rises higher in the sky. On 21st March the gardens would be in shadow from 08:00-11:00 and the shadow would fall on the very edges of the rear gardens. On 21st December they would be in shadow from the development from 09:00-13:00, but it is noted that owing to lower temperatures, gardens tend to be used less during winter months.

### Alfred Salter Primary school

- 119 The primary school occupies a single-storey building located to the north of the site, on the opposite side of Quebec Way. It has a vehicular entrance leading to a staff car park close to the junction with Canada Street. There would be a separation distance of approximately 29m between the northern arm of block B and the school. The school has raised concerns regarding overlooking from this block and requested that frosted glass or angled windows be considered, but given the separation distance this is not considered to be necessary and it could compromise the quality of accommodation within the block.
- 120 The BRE guidance advises that schools have a reasonable expectation of natural light and it is understood that some of the external spaces next to the classrooms are used as outdoor teaching spaces. In light of this an assessment against the BRE guidance has been made in relation to daylight and sunlight, for those classrooms which have windows facing the site.
- 121 Four out of seven classroom windows would fail on the VSC, being reduced to between 0.63-0.79 times their former value, and one window would fail on the NSL (0.59 times its former value). The report advises that some of the windows are already affected by large, overhanging eaves and that the classrooms are around 8m deep which would affect how well lit they are. ADF has been tested even though there is no standard for classrooms. The lowest result would be 1.45% (1.5% is required for a livingroom), and the highest 3.83 (2% is the highest ADF level and is required for kitchens). All of the windows would pass in relation to sunlight.
- 122 With regard to overshadowing, on 21st June the school site would not be affected by shadow from the development. On 21st March it would experience some shadowing between 13:00-16:00 and on 21st December it would experience shadow for much of the day. However, this would be limited to the outdoor spaces fronting Quebec Way and the classrooms themselves would not be significantly affected. The use of the outdoor space for teaching is likely to be more prevalent during spring and summer months when temperatures are higher. Overall, it is not considered that the proposal would result in any unacceptable overshadowing to the southern part of the school site.

### Cumulative Impacts Assessment

- 123 The BRE report includes an assessment of the cumulative impact of the proposals for the Mulberry site and the current application proposals for sites C and E. It shows that there would be impacts predominantly to Giverny House and Pavilion House which would be in excess of the BRE guidance. Wolfe Crescent would be affected to a degree, but not significantly beyond the BRE guidance. It is noted however, that the application for sites C and E is for a much larger proposal and is still under consideration. Following an analysis of the results for the Mulberry site alone it is not considered that any significant loss of amenity would occur in relation to daylight and sunlight.
- 124 The proposal would incorporate 6 roof terraces for the student blocks, a terrace including children's playspace for the affordable housing units and a terrace for the office block. The location of the student terraces in relation to the existing neighbouring buildings would not result in any loss of privacy. However, to ensure that no undue noise or disturbance would occur, either to existing residents or future occupiers of the affordable block, a condition is recommended preventing them from being used after 10pm. This restriction is not considered necessary for the affordable housing terrace owing to the different nature of the use and lower numbers of people likely to use it. No loss of amenity would occur from the proposed office terrace which

is only likely to be used during the day and would be located approximately 95m from the nearest residential properties at the Water Gardens.

#### Potential development on site E (the 'What' store)

- 125 Saved policy 3.11 of the Southwark Plan 'Efficient use of land' states that all developments should ensure that they maximise the efficient use of land, whilst ensuring that the proposal does not unreasonably compromise the development potential of, or legitimate activities on, neighbouring sites.
- 126 At present site E is in use as a retail store. It has a servicing yard at the rear which is accessed from Canada Street. Given the commercial nature of this building it is not considered that the proposed development would impact upon its continued operation. There would be a separation distance of between 20m and 30m between the southern arm of block A and the rear elevation of the retail store; there would be a garden area in between which would act as a buffer.
- 127 The council is currently considering a planning application for the redevelopment of sites C and E and the submission indicates that there would be a separation of 20m between the student block and the proposed building for site E. The plans for site E are in outline and propose a building of up to 9 storeys high comprising a health centre and retail uses on the ground floor facing the Mulberry site with residential above, but stepping back away from the site.
- 128 The retention of a 20m gap between the two developments would be just under the required 21m window-to-window separation distance to maintain privacy, although it is noted that the route between the two buildings would effectively become a street. With regard to the impact upon levels of light to the potential adjoining development, this would be difficult to assess because the plans for site E are in outline only at this stage. However, given the 20m separation distance it should be possible to design the layout and fenestration to ensure that good living conditions can be achieved.
- 129 Concerns have been raised in relation to construction impacts and the potential for noise, disturbance and general disruption to residents, and this is considered separately in the transport section of this report.
- 130 It is noted that there would be some instances where the reduction in daylight and sunlight would exceed the recommendations in the BRE guidance but on the whole, these are not considered to be significant. There would be good separation distances between the proposed blocks and their residential neighbours in excess of that which is found in many urban areas where the streets are narrower. Overall it is considered that the proposed development would not result in a significant loss of amenity in relation to daylight and sunlight, outlook, privacy or noise and disturbance, and the development potential at sites C and E and the printworks would not be compromised.

#### **Quality of accommodation and dwelling mix**

##### Student Housing

- 131 Criterion (iv) of saved policy 4.7 of the Southwark Plan and the Residential Design Standards SPD require proposals for student accommodation to provide a satisfactory standard of accommodation, including shared facilities. There are no policy standards for the size of units within student accommodation.
- 132 The development would provide 770 bedspaces comprising 384 single ensuite study bedrooms and 12 studios in block A, and 396 single rooms and 5 studios in block B. They would be laid out in a cluster type arrangement of between 6-12 ensuite study

bedrooms with shared kitchen and dining facilities for the ensuite rooms. The student ensuite rooms would predominantly be around 14sqm with the studio units ranging from 19-33sqm. There would be 6 lifts per block and the proposal would include 38 wheelchair accessible units which would equate to 5% provision.

- 133 With regard to levels of light to the proposed bedrooms, the ADF has been tested and 96.3% of the windows would comply with ADF values for bedrooms (1%); if the proposed scheme for sites C and E were implemented this would reduce to 92%. Whilst the rooms are to be used as study bedrooms and a higher ADF would be preferable, on balance this is considered to be acceptable.
- 134 With regard to privacy, this would generally be acceptable. There would be separation distances of between 13-15m for those rooms facing each other across the central street which would be sufficient to maintain privacy. A ground floor studio unit in the south-west corner of block A would be located next to a gated entrance and shared garden and as such could experience a lack of privacy. However, the primary entrance to the student accommodation would be from the central street and the gated entrance is unlikely to be used very frequently. Depending on the way in which site E is eventually developed, the College may need to consider this area again and to look at ways in which to ensure adequate privacy to this unit.
- 135 As stated, each student cluster would have its own kitchen / dining space. There would also be a large student recreation room in each of the blocks together with dedicated management and facilities offices. There would be a range of amenity spaces available to the students comprising terraces and courtyard gardens, measuring 3,682sqm in total. The BRE report considers the quality of the external amenity spaces for the student blocks and concludes that whilst the courtyard gardens would not comply with the guidance, this would not be unusual given their formation and the proposal also includes 6 roof terraces that the students could use which would receive good levels of sunlight. Overall it is considered that the proposed student accommodation would provide a good standard of accommodation for future occupiers.

136 Affordable Housing (block D)

Unit	No. repeat units	Areas (sqm)	SPD (sqm)	requirement
1B2P	6	51	50	
1B2P	6	58	50	
1B2P WA	1	65	50	
2B3P WA	1	75	61	
2B4P	4	70	70	
2B4P	4	70	70	
B4P duplex	4	89	70	
3B4P WA	1	105	74	
3B5P	6	92	86	

- 137 All of the units would comply with the council's minimum sizes in terms of the overall unit and individual room sizes. 26 of the units would be dual aspect, equating to 78.8% provision.

Wheelchair housing

- 138 Saved policy 4.3 of the Southwark Plan states that at least 10% of all new major residential developments should be suitable for wheelchair users, except where this is not possible due to site constraints.

- 139 The affordable housing block would provide three wheelchair accessible units, comprising a 1B/2P flat, a 2B/3P flat and a 3B/4P flat. This would equate to 9%, just below the 10% target. This is not considered to be significant however, and the provision of two family sized wheelchair accessible units is welcomed.

#### Amenity space

- 140 All of the units would have access to private amenity space, although for 22 of the units this would be less than the 10sqm recommended in the Residential Design Standards SPD, ranging from 6 to 7 sqm. In these instances additional amenity space has been added to the communal provision to make up the shortfall.
- 141 A total of 270sqm of communal amenity space would be provided, at first floor level at the rear of the block and in the form of a roof terrace. The first floor provision would measure 62.8sqm and that at roof level would measure 65.2sqm, with 142.8sqm of children's play space. This would accord with the Council's SPD and no objections are raised. In the event that any screening would be required for safety reasons, a condition for details is recommended to ensure that it would be of an acceptable appearance. It is noted that the nearest public open space is at Russia Dock Woodland which is approximately 250m from the site.

#### Secure by Design

- 142 The application has been reviewed by the Metropolitan Police 'Secure by Design' advisor who has raised no objections, and has advised that Secure by Design certification should be achieved; an informative to this effect is recommended. In terms of the layout, the public spaces and communal gardens would have high levels of natural surveillance and a condition for details of lighting and any security cameras would further improve the safety of the development.

#### Dwelling mix

- 143 Strategic policy 7 of the Core Strategy sets the required dwelling mix that new residential developments must achieve. Policy 23 of the CWAAP sets out the requirement for developments of 10 or more dwellings in Canada Water which is as follows:
- 144 - a minimum of 60% of units with two or more bedrooms;  
- a maximum of 5% of the units as studio flats;  
- a minimum of 20% of the units with 3, 4 or 5 bedrooms with directly accessible amenity space in the core area.
- 145 The proposal would provide the following mix of dwellings within the affordable housing block:
- 146 13 x 1-bed units (40%)  
13 x 2-bed units (40%)  
7 x 3-bed units (20%)
- 147 The proposal would therefore comply with policy 23 of the CWAAP by providing 60% of units with two or more bedrooms, 20% of units with three or more bedrooms and all of the units would have direct access to amenity space. No studios are proposed for the affordable housing.

#### Noise

- 148 The applicant has submitted a Noise Assessment with the application which considers



the noise environment across the site and its suitability for residential use.

- 149 Noise recorded at the site came from a variety of sources including distant road traffic noise, local traffic and playground activity at Alfred Salter Primary School. No noise was recorded from the printworks and it is noted that it is scheduled to close this year. Some noise was recorded on the southern boundary from activities associated with the 'What!' retail store, the rear yard for which is used for storage and deliveries and forklift trucks were observed in operation. The noise report states that the store manager confirmed that these activities take place during the store opening hours of 09:00-18:00 hours with no night time activities taking place.
- 150 The former PPG24 'Planning and Noise' established four noise exposure categories ranging from A-D, with A experiencing the least noise and D the most. PPG24 has since been superseded by the NPPF which does not set out these categories but they are often still used as a basis for assessment. The survey categorises the noise environment at the site as category B during both daytime and night time periods, which means that noise should be taken into account when determining planning applications and where appropriate, conditions should be imposed to ensure an adequate level of protection against noise.
- 151 The report concludes that there would be no noise issues relating to the proposed health centre and retail units. If the printworks building was retained in some form of industrial use, the proposed office building would provide an adequate noise buffer along the south-eastern boundary. It notes however, that the student rooms in this location may still be affected by noise and a higher specification of window glazing would be required. With regard to the affordable housing block, internal noise levels may exceed the 'good' criteria set out in BS 8233 which establishes internal noise levels for different types of accommodation, but this would be limited to periods only when the windows are open when noise levels would be expected to be higher.
- 152 The report has been reviewed by the council's environmental protection team which agrees with its findings and a number of conditions are recommended, including limiting noise output from any plant associated with the development.
- 153 Overall it is considered that both the student housing and the affordable housing would provide a good standard of accommodation for future occupiers.

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

- 154 The adjacent printworks is understood to be closing in autumn this year and relocating to a new premises. It is considered to be unlikely that the site will be used as a printworks again. The CWAAP requires a non-residential buffer to be maintained between the site and the printworks and along the eastern boundary would be the office block, health centre and student flats. The AAP is currently being reviewed and uses other than a printworks are likely to come forward which makes the requirement for a non-residential buffer less of an issue. However, conditions would be required to ensure that internal noise levels within the student and affordable accommodation would remain within acceptable limits.

#### **Transport Issues**

- 155 Saved policy 5.1 of the Southwark Plan requires major developments to be located near transport nodes. Saved policy 5.2 states that planning permission will be granted for development unless there is an adverse impact on the transport network or if adequate provision for servicing is not made. Saved policy 5.3 requires provision to be made for pedestrian and cyclists and saved policies 5.6 and 5.7 relate to car

parking. Core Strategy policy 2 'Sustainable transport' re-asserts the commitment to encourage walking, cycling and the use of public transport rather than travel by car and requiring transport assessments with applications to show that schemes minimise their impacts, minimise car parking and maximise cycle parking to provide as many sustainable transport options as possible. A Transport Assessment, Framework Travel Plan, Residential Travel Plan, Delivery and Servicing Plan and Construction Management Plan have been submitted in support of the application.

#### Access

- 156 Saved policy 4.7 of the Southwark Plan requires non-self-contained housing developments to be located in areas where there is adequate infrastructure to support any increase in residents.
- 157 The site has a PTAL ranging from 4 (medium) to 6a (high). It is located approximately 500m (a 6 minute walk) from Canada Water underground station and bus terminus. Rotherhithe and Surrey Quays overground stations are also within close proximity, and there are five bus services within 300m (a four minute walk) from the site; the Surrey Quays Shopping Centre is within 500m of the site, approximately a 6 minute walk.
- 158 The proposed development would be well connected to the College's central London campuses via the Jubilee line. There would also be good connections to its Denmark Hill campus via the overground from Canada Water. The planning statement advises that the Kings campuses can all be accessed within 30 minutes via public transport and 45 minutes on a bike.

#### Site Layout

- 159 This is considered to be acceptable with regard to transport and movement and the submission demonstrates how the proposal could connect to a future development on the printworks site. Given the low level of car use that would be associated with the development it is not considered that there would be any harm arising to the school on the grounds of highway safety.

#### Trip Generation, Modal Split, Distribution and Assignment

- 160 The trip generation information contained within the Transport Assessment has been reviewed and is found to be acceptable. Cycling is likely to represent a higher modal share than predicted in the TA (5%) and in order to mitigate this, part of the transport site specific contribution could go towards improving conditions for cyclists in the area. This is considered further in the planning obligations section of this report.

#### Car parking

- 161 The site is not located in a CPZ and concerns have been raised by a neighbouring resident regarding how overspill parking would be managed and whether students would park on the surrounding streets. There are two on-street loading bays on Canada Street, one between Surrey Quays Road and Wolfe Crescent and another between Wolfe Crescent and Quebec Way. There is on-street parking along Canada Street.
- 162 The development would be car-free aside from disabled parking spaces as follows:
- 163 - Three accessible spaces are proposed for the three wheelchair accessible units within the affordable housing block. These would be provided within the building and

accessed from Quebec Way. A further two accessible spaces in this location would be for students.

- 164 - A further four accessible spaces and a car club space would be provided on the access road in front of the health centre. One would be a student space and the other three for the health centre, office space and retail units. The proposal would include active electric charging infrastructure for electric vehicles.
- 165 It is not intended that the areas for public access would be adopted by the council therefore the enforceability of the parking spaces in front of the health centre would need to be managed privately. This could be particularly important at school drop-off and pick-up times and a condition requiring details of how this would be enforced is recommended.
- 166 As the site is not located with a CPZ there is no opportunity to control overspill parking from the development. Students would be prevented from bringing cars to the site within their Residence Agreements, although further details are required in the event that the student blocks are not occupied by Kings students and a condition to secure this is recommended.
- 167 The council is currently considering extending an existing CPZ to cover this part of the borough including the application site. The toolkit contribution for site specific transport measures could contribute towards this in order to mitigate its impact. It is also recommended that 3 years car club membership be secured for each eligible adult within the affordable housing block. It is noted that the car club space shown near the eastern boundary of the site can be secured through the s106 agreement.

#### Cycle parking

- 168 The London Plan sets more onerous targets for cycle parking and is a more recent document than the saved 2007 Southwark Plan, therefore the London Plan standards have been considered.

#### Student housing

- 169 The London Plan requires one space for every two students (or bedspaces) and in this case a minimum of 385 cycle parking spaces would be required. The development would provide 412 cycle parking spaces for the students plus 6 visitor spaces and this provision is welcomed. These would be provided below the raised courtyard gardens and would be weatherproof, secure and conveniently located.
- 170 Some of the cycle parking would be in the form of stacking racks but with a good proportion of Sheffield stands, and whilst Sheffield stands would be preferable given their ease of use, the likely demographic of users and the good proportion of accessible stands is generally considered to be acceptable. However, while the spacing and layout is indicated on the submitted plans, it is recommended that the submission of detailed plans at a larger scale be secured by condition to ensure that the spacing and layout would be acceptable.

#### Affordable housing

- 171 Under the London Plan 40 spaces would be required to serve the affordable housing block and the proposal would provide 40 spaces plus a visitor space at the rear of the block, accessed from the central street.

### Office block

- 172 The London Plan requires one cycle parking space per 150sqm for office space, equating to 31 spaces for the proposed development. This would be provided plus two visitor spaces. Lockers and showers for office staff would be provided and this is welcomed. All of the communal stores would benefit from lockers, together with the provision of pumps and simple tools for basic cycle maintenance.

### Retail

- 173 One space per 125sqm of retail floorspace is required under the London Plan, with a requirement for 15 spaces within the development. The proposal would provide 16 spaces which would be acceptable.

### Cycle Hire Scheme

- 174 TfL aims to expand the existing cycle hire scheme across London and as such is seeking to ensure that development proposals safeguard land within sites for future cycle hire docking stations.
- 175 Amended plans have been submitted which show a potential location for a docking station outside the proposed corner retail unit at the junction of Canada Street with Quebec Way and it is recommended that this be secured by way of a condition. It is noted however, that separate planning permission would be required for a docking station therefore the condition should be worded flexibly.

### Impact on public transport

#### Buses

- 176 The Transport Assessment indicates that the development would add 114 bus trips in the morning peak hour, the equivalent to the planning capacity of around two buses. Whilst this would be dispersed across a number of bus services, the additional passengers could lead to some crowding on some services at certain points along their route. However, this would be a matter for Transport for London (TfL) and separate discussions are taking place.

#### Underground and Rail Services

- 177 The Transport Assessment indicates that the development could lead to a relatively small increase in passengers at Canada Water station on Jubilee and Overground lines, with a largely negligible increase in passengers per train on average (a maximum of a 0.5% increase east-bound (PM) and a maximum of a 0.6% increase westbound (AM). Again, the applicant is understood to be holding separate discussions with TfL regarding potential mitigation.
- 178 The applicant has advised that the timetables for the various courses vary during the day and into the evenings owing to the nature of the different courses and the mix of graduate and post-graduate students. This is particularly prevalent at present owing to limited space at The Stand campus, therefore the college has had to adopt a flexible approach in relation to the timing of lectures. In light of this it is considered likely that student use of the Jubilee line arising from the proposed development would be spread more evenly throughout the day rather than being concentrated at peak commuter times.

## Pedestrians

- 179 No analysis has been provided of road safety in the area. In light of this it is recommended that part of the transport site specific contribution be put towards measures to improve pedestrian safety in the area and this is considered further in the planning obligations section of this report. It is considered that the attractive pedestrian street through the centre of the site would be a significant benefit of the scheme and would form an attractive pedestrian environment.

## Construction Impacts

- 180 A draft Construction Management Plan (CMP) has been submitted with the application but it does not meet the required standard. It should specifically include measures to mitigate the increased risk to pedestrians and cyclists arising from construction vehicle operation, through provision of equipment on vehicles, driver training, licence checks, etc. following best practice established by the CrossRail project. It should also secure good quality cycle parking for workers on site, at an initial level of one space for ten workers with monthly reviews to be undertaken.
- 181 The construction vehicle access routes should be defined more closely, and measures put in place to monitor and deal with any deviation from those routes. Details of entrances to the site should be provided, together with assurance that no reversing will be undertaken on the highway (except if necessary for abnormal loads only) and no loading/unloading should be undertaken to/from the highway. It is recommended that a revised CMP be secured through a condition. It is noted that the CMP proposes construction hours of 08:00-18:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00-13:00 on Saturdays and these hours should be secured by way of a condition.

## Servicing and Waste Management

- 182 A Delivery and Servicing Plan has been submitted with the application which advises that there would be approximately 30 delivery trips per day for the whole development. These would mainly be smaller vehicles and the majority would use a proposed service area at the southern corner of the site, detailed below. Of these, 5 would be larger service or refuse vehicles which would be allowed to use the central street during certain times.
- 183 All delivery and refuse vehicles would enter the site from Quebec Way, and servicing would take place from within the site thereby limiting the impact on the local highway network. Larger vehicles including refuse lorries would exit the site onto Canada Street, and only the larger vehicles would be permitted to access the central street and only between the hours of 0800-1100. This would be managed by a booking system to ensure that vehicles only arrive during the permitted hours, and demountable bollards or similar would prevent access to the central street outside of these hours.
- 184 The largest vehicle that would be accommodated would be a 10m rigid lorry and no articulated lorries could be accommodated. In the event that council refuse lorries arrive at the site after 11am to collect refuse from the affordable housing block, the site management would ensure that they could have access for collection. Deliveries by smaller vehicles such as cars and vans would use a delivery area (large enough for 2 vehicles) in the south-eastern corner of the site before turning and exiting back onto Quebec Way.
- 185 Five separate refuse storage areas are proposed within the development, all of which would be within 10m of the central street. Commercial waste would be collected every two days by a private contractor, residential waste associated with the student

accommodation twice a week by a private contractor and the residential waste from the affordable housing units would be collected by the council once a week. The amount of refuse storage to be provided for the affordable housing has been calculated in accordance with the council's guidance. For the student housing it would equate to 75l per student room per week for general waste and recycling, which would be as per a Kings College student housing scheme in Champion Hill which was granted permission in 2009.

- 186 The Servicing and Management Plan has been reviewed and is found to be acceptable, and a condition to ensure compliance with the plan is recommended.

#### Travel Plans

- 187 A Travel Plan Framework and Residential Travel Plan have been submitted with the application which seek to promote more sustainable travel choices such as walking, cycling and public transport. The Travel Plans have been reviewed and are found to be acceptable, but would need to be secured through the s106 agreement.

#### Student Arrival and Departure

- 188 The submission advises that students would generally move into the accommodation in September and move out in June and that this process would be managed by the College, with most pick-ups / drop-offs taking place during the weekend out of peak times. This would have the potential to cause disruption to neighbouring residents and the surrounding highway network and would need to be carefully managed, most likely with phased move-in / move-out times and allocated time slots. Submission of a detailed strategy should be secured by condition, setting out measures to manage the impact and in particular its impact on the school, although this should be limited if this process predominantly takes place at weekends. It is also noted that there would be a mix of undergraduate and postgraduate students with 40 and 52 week contracts respectively, which would result in a more dispersed process.

#### **Design issues**

- 189 Strategic policy 12 of the Core strategy 'Design and conservation' states that 'Development will achieve the highest possible standards of design for buildings and public spaces to help create attractive and distinctive places which are safe, easy to get around and a pleasure to be in'. Saved policy 3.12 of the Southwark Plan asserts that developments 'should achieve a high quality of both architectural and urban design, enhancing the quality of the built environment in order to create attractive, high amenity environments people will choose to live in, work in and visit' and saved policy 13 requires the principles of good urban design to be taken into account in all developments. This includes height, scale and massing of buildings, consideration of the local context, its character and townscape as well as the local views and resultant streetscape.
- 190 Policy 17 of the CWAAP establishes building heights for sites in or adjacent to the core area, and identifies the site as being suitable for buildings of between 4-6 storeys high; it is not a site identified as being suitable for a tall building. The supporting text to the site designation, CWAAP9, states that the building heights for the site should be towards the lower end of the range on the eastern side of the site in order to provide a transition to the lower density development in the suburban zone. It states that new pedestrian and cycle links through the site should be provided and existing landscaping to the north-west and north-eastern boundaries softened through any new development, to help maintain a sense of greenness which is a key part of the character of the area. The supporting figure to the designation indicates a north-south and east-west route through the site.

- 191 The extant permission for the site shows the residential development laid out as a series of buildings extending from west to east into the site, with public and private landscaped courtyards in between. Fronting Quebec Way the accommodation would be provided at ground to third floor levels and fronting Canada Street at ground to fourth floor levels with an additional storey on the block closest to the 'What!' store. The proposed office building is shown running north to south next to the boundary with the printworks and 8-storeys high (25m high above ground level).
- 192 The proposed development would range from 4 to 9 storeys in height and would include a building in the southern-most corner that would exceed 30m in height, which would therefore be defined as a tall building. Although not identified in the adopted AAP as a suitable site for a tall building, the change in circumstances in relation to the closure of the printworks has led to the APP being revisited, with the town centre boundary likely to be revised to include approximately half of the printworks site. Policy 17 of the draft revised CWAAP advises that prevailing building heights should be between 4-8 storeys in the core area, two storeys higher than the adopted CWAAP, and states that tall buildings will be appropriate in important locations in the town centre.
- 193 In order to understand the proposal for the site it is necessary to consider the nature and character of the wider town centre and how it would affect the sites around Harmsworth Quays. The application site is located at the fringes of the town centre and would have to articulate the transition between the civic scale of the town centre and the smaller scale of the school and the residential properties to the north.
- 194 In terms of its form, the proposal would vary from the earlier consented scheme in two main respects: firstly it is planned as an urban block in its own right and would be set back from the boundaries to allow for the creation of a new street along the south-west and south-east buildings which currently back onto the adjacent industrial and commercial properties. Secondly, the arrangement would allow a new, permeable route and pedestrian street that would split the site in two and offer access to the Albion Channel to the north. These two changes fundamentally alter the approach to the site and would give the development a more urban character. It would pre-empt the development of the wider area in the longer term and respond to the 'edge' of town centre character of the site.

#### Urban design

- 195 The proposed development would build upon the urban approach referred to above, with the development arranged in two perimeter blocks of around 45m in width and 85m in length. In order to break up the mass of the buildings, the perimeter blocks, three key devices would be employed:
- 196 - The first is the creation of two 'anchor' buildings at either end of the pedestrian street with two distinctive buildings, the office building and the residential block.
- 197 - The second is the gentle cranking of separate blocks devised around the 'cluster' design of the student accommodation to give each block its own identity and proportion.
- 198 - The third is a stepped arrangement of the separate blocks which would vary from 4 to 8 storeys in height. The lowest blocks would be arranged on the north-south axis which cuts diagonally across the site and each block would step up in height culminating at the pedestrian street and the anchor buildings.
- 199 These three architectural devices would establish a sound urban response to the site and organise the student accommodation around two mirrored blocks accessed

predominantly from the central street. The stepped arrangement would allow for a varied and articulated townscape and help to mask the uniform character of the development, and the two anchor buildings would introduce an element of variety to the site. Furthermore, effort has been made to activate the edges of the site to create an engaging streetscene. The two anchor buildings would have lobbies and front doors to duplex residential units at ground floor level, while the student blocks would have outward-looking studios and retail/community uses at their bases accessed from the surrounding public streets.

- 200 The urban design would respond to the immediate context by stepping down to four storeys at the northern-most extremities of the site where the existing Canada Street context ranges from the 3 and 4 storey scale of the Wolfe Crescent development to the 8 and 10 storey scale of the Water Gardens development; to the north-east of the site across Quebec Way is the smaller scale of the Alfred Salter School.
- 201 The gently cranked arrangement would give the scheme visual interest and would introduce the perception of breaks within the massing of the development, to avoid it appearing as long, monolithic blocks. The cranked, stepped arrangement would have the effect of breaking up and modulating the perimeter blocks that would enclose the landscaped courtyards. The carefully modulated blocks would enclose the courtyards with the lowest blocks arranged on the diagonal north-south axis to maximise solar penetration into them.

#### Architectural design

- 202 The proposal seeks to give interest and variety to the proposed cellular accommodation. The design would revolve around a communal model of student accommodation arranged in clusters, accessed from a singular entrance for all students at the centre which would be the main communal spaces at the heart of the site – the communal rooms and landscaped communal garden – all accessed from the pedestrian street.
- 203 Within the urban framework for the site the design approach can be broken down into four component parts:
- The student blocks
  - The office block
  - The residential block
  - The public realm

#### The student accommodation (blocks A and B)

- 204 These would vary in height from 4 to 8 storeys and are designed as a series of linked 'buildings', each articulated by a slight crank in the plan and a change in architectural expression. Internally all the buildings would be part of one continuous whole, and a corridor would link the continuous group around each courtyard. The architecture would be controlled and geometric in character, with a strong overarching brick grid, deep window reveals and infill panels in glass and metal.
- 205 Subtle variations have been introduced in the height and detailed design of each building, either through a change in the colour of the brick work, a reconstituted stone band or the detailed design of windows and natural ventilation grilles. These subtle changes in the design would be expressed with alternating deep recesses or glazing in the narrow spaces between each 'building'. Each building would be characterised by a regular grid which would define the module of the block, with full-height in-fill panels making up the windows.



- 206 The glass and metal cladding infill panels are designed to vary across the site and across each block with student rooms expressed differently to common rooms and student lounges. Each in-fill panel would typically contain the window and a natural ventilation grille to each room. The sizes of windows would vary to ensure that rooms would have adequate sunlight/daylight, with the rooms at the lower floors having large windows and those on the upper floors having smaller openings. The student common rooms would be expressed with large, full-width openings, still within the confines of the brick grid, and would be located at prominent corners to ensure that they would be attractive and engaging. The result would be a complex and subtle design, with a level of variation and depth within a confident geometric grid.
- 207 Following concerns that the main entrances to the student blocks would be rather understated, revisions have been made to the plans to increase the prominence of these spaces, which would be an improvement both to the occupiers and users of the development and in terms of the appearance of the central street. The amended design would include a double-width panel and a stone feature at the flank of the entrances which would make them more prominent and offer a glimpse of the landscaped courtyard gardens beyond.

The office building (block C)

- 208 The proposed office building would be the only 'tall' building on the site as defined by the Southwark Plan. This would make it more visible in wider townscape views and a townscape and visual impact assessment has been submitted with the application. In assessing this officers have taken particular care over :
- how the taller element would relate to the skyline;
  - the impact of the development in the local streetscene.
- 209 The key urban and architectural design policy in relation to the office building is Saved Policy 3.20 which requires all tall buildings to:
- 210 i. Make a positive contribution to the landscape; and  
ii. Be located at a point of landmark significance; and  
iii. Be of the highest architectural standard; and  
iv. Relate well to its surroundings, particularly at street level; and  
v. Contribute positively to the London skyline as a whole consolidating a cluster within that skyline or providing key focus within views.
- 211 This policy places an emphasis on the built form relative to its context and the quality and nature of the public realm. Taking each of these in turn:
- i. Makes a positive contribution to the landscape:
- 212 The landscape element of the proposal is noted above and would include a new publicly accessible pedestrian street. In these instances the intention of the policy is to match a private gain from the intensification of the site with a public gain. In addition, tall buildings require a public 'setting' of their own and a generous space around them. The proposal would include a well developed public realm which subject to conditions for details, would make a positive contribution to the landscape. Although the building would be located away from the existing street frontages, it would be accessed from the new pedestrian street, near to the point where it would turn north, linking to Quebec Way.
- 213 ii. Is located at a point of landmark significance:

A point of landmark significance is defined in the Southwark Plan as: "*where a number*

*of important routes converge, where there is a concentration of activity and which is or will be the focus of views from several directions.”*

214 In the wider town centre, the tall building would be located equidistant from the main town centre at the Canada Water Basin and Russia Dock Woodlands on what could become an important local link between the basin and the wood. The views demonstrate that the building would appear as part of a group of buildings in the area and, whilst it would technically be a tall building, it would appear as a natural addition to local views.

215 iii. Is of the highest architectural standard:

216 The architecture of the tall building would be elegant and controlled. Brick, stone and glass have been combined at a narrower spacing to provide a simple, rectangular building a strong vertical emphasis. The building would be a simple office block with open-plan spaces and a consistent window pattern, and the narrow faces would be articulated differently from the wider face. The depth of reveals and the subtle change in the design of the narrow end from the broad face of the building would add visual interest. In addition, the top-most floor would be distinguished by its taller expression and a prominent roof terrace which would offer views through it. Whilst the building may appear repetitive and rigorous, the design would be carefully articulated and confident. In the wider scheme the tower would be visually separated from the perimeter blocks with clear gaps between it and the student accommodation. This would allow it to ‘land’ appropriately and take its place in the composition.

217 iv. Relates well to its surroundings, particularly at street level:

218 The tall building would be separated from the main street frontages and be located at the rear of the site. Its main entrance would be from the new pedestrian street where it would form a focus with its double-height entrance space. In the future, and when the Harmsworth Quays site is developed, it is likely that there would be an important new street running along this eastern boundary of the site and this may become a more important frontage in time.

219 The views from Quebec Way and Albatross Way demonstrate how the wider proposal would relate to its streetscene. The tower would relate well to the important frontages with active frontages on its two important public faces.

220 v. Contributes positively to the London skyline as a whole consolidating a cluster within that skyline or providing key focus within views:

221 A Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment has been submitted with the application in which the local and wider views were tested with accurate visual renderings including the junction of Archangel Street and Timber Pond Road, Stave Hill Quebec Way and Surrey Quays Road. In most views the unmistakable form of the Harmsworth Quays plant would be prominent. Notably, where the tall building would be visible, it would also be prominent and comparable to the scale of the existing Harmsworth Quays building. Its scale however, is not considered to be such that would be harmful to the site or its wider setting.

222 The affordable housing (block D)

The architecture of the residential block at the north-west corner of the site would follow a similar design to the student housing with a gridded brick design, metal infill window panels and large projecting balconies. The block would be 8-storeys at the pedestrian street and would drop to 7 storeys to the north which is considered to be an

appropriate response to its context.

- 223 The building would have a strong, double-height base expressing the duplex units spanning ground and first floor levels. Following concerns that the main body of the building would lack the subtlety and variation of the student blocks, amended plans have been submitted, with alterations comprising the introduction of balconies at first floor level, providing the balcony balustrades as part-solid, part-railing rather than fully solid and reducing the quantity of metal surround cladding and introducing a second, set-back layer of contrasting brickwork. The most significant change has been to the appearance of the duplex units where the front garden has been separated from the access route and the amenity of these family units enhanced by the provision of first floor balconies. It is considered that the result would be a well-ordered and characterful building which would distinguish itself from the student housing block and step down towards the north at the corner of Quebec Way with Canada Street.

#### Public realm

- 224 Policy 14 of the CWAAP requires development in the core area to create clearly defined streets and spaces and sets out what these should achieve, including making connections into the surrounding street network, providing convenient, safe, direct and attractive pedestrian and cycle links, creating strong links to the Canada Water basin, shopping centre and Lower Road, and providing high quality, safe and inclusive public realm. The site designation within the CWAAP requires a north-south and east-west route with axis point through the site.
- 225 The proposed public realm would be designed to respond to the existing context and give the new public spaces a sense of place. On Canada Street and Quebec Way the building line would be set back to retain a number of the existing trees and compliment it with additional tree planting to give the student housing and residential properties a wider landscaped forecourt. It is noted however, that 33 trees would be felled as a result of the proposal and this is considered further in the tree section of this report.
- 226 Although not public realm, the communal courtyard gardens at the centre of the each of the student blocks would be an important element of the development. They would offer communal and visual amenity and would be split into a ground-based portion which would include mature planting, and an elevated courtyard over the student recreation rooms and service spaces. The submission advises that there could be some managed public use of these spaces, for events for example.
- 227 With regard to routes through the site, the east-west route would be in the form of the central street, arguably the most important piece of the public realm within the proposed development. It would establish a managed pedestrian space at the heart of the development which would be complimented by planting and fixtures that are intended to animate this important thoroughfare away from the streets. At present it would terminate at the boundary with the printworks site, although this is likely to be developed in the future and the central street could potentially link with a north-south route broadly connecting the town centre with Russia Dock Woodlands. The north-south route within the application site would be less developed, connecting the central street with Quebec Way. However, in the longer term it is considered that this could sit well alongside a development on the printworks site and enable strong routes to be created.
- 228 On the south-east and south-west boundaries, the landscaping would be less developed because these currently back onto adjacent sites with limited access. However, the building line would be set-back to allow for the creation of a new roadway to the town centre in the future. A current access off Quebec Way would be retained and would extend to the central street allowing for pedestrian permeability

across the site.

#### Comments of the Design Review Panel

- 229 The scheme was reviewed by the Design Review Panel in February 2013. The Panel raised questions over the north-south permeability of the site and wanted these important access points reinforced; they questioned the expected density and felt the scheme significantly overshadowed the courtyard spaces; they felt the design could be improved by taking on a more residential quality and they encouraged the designers to find out more about what was proposed on the adjacent sites – most significantly Canada Water Site E. In the view of officers, the significant improvements and recent changes to the scheme address many of the detailed points raised by the Panel.

#### Design conclusions

- 230 In conclusion, the scheme would contain a number of positive aspects including its arrangement on the site, the landscaped edges and the creation of a new pedestrianised street at its heart. The design is carefully articulated and refined with the cranked and stepped blocks forming a strong perimeter and well designed feature buildings at either end of the pedestrianised street.

#### **Impact on trees and landscaping**

- 231 Policy 18 of the CWAAP requires developments in the core area to improve the overall greenness of the area, through planting street trees, creating living roofs and walls and providing habitats for wildlife and biodiversity. The site designation notes the landscaped north-western and north-eastern boundaries and that this should be softened in any new development to help retain a sense of greenness which is a key part of the character of the area. The layout of the proposed development would include landscaped areas to the Canada Street and Quebec Way frontages which would be publically accessible and allow for a number of the trees on the site to be retained.
- 232 There are approximately 55 trees on the application site, predominantly located along the Canada Street and Quebec Way frontages; most of the trees are semi-mature sycamores. Although they are not protected by way of a Tree Preservation Order, collectively they make a valuable contribution to the streetscene.
- 233 An assessment of the impact of the proposed development on the existing trees was made at a site visit by the council's Urban Forester prior to the submission of the application, who has advised that a number of established medium sized specimens may be able to be retained on Quebec Way and Canada Street, but that it may be that replacement planting of some of the trees would be a better option.
- 234 An Arboricultural Impacts Assessment (AIA) submitted with the application categorises the trees on the site; none are classified as category A trees (high value), 28 or 51% are classed as category B trees (moderate) and 27 or 49% are classed as category C trees (low). As a result of the proposal 33 trees would be removed, 9 category B trees and 24 category C trees. A total of 30 new trees would be planted on the site, representing a shortfall of three trees. This loss of trees and canopy would not be acceptable and it is recommended that this be addressed through a landscaping condition.
- 235 The council's Urban Forester has advised that the category B trees with the highest amenity value would be retained, and the stem girth lost as a result of the proposal could be replaced through new tree planting. Replanting would also present an

opportunity to replace the trees with more appropriate species of better quality within a design that would provide greater overall benefits to amenity. Given that 68% of the category B trees would be retained and, subject to replanting there would be no net loss of canopy cover, the Urban Forester has advised that effect of the development would on balance be positive in relation to trees.

- 236 The proposed site layout would provide welcome greening of the boundary and internal streets together with large courtyards, green roofs and terrace planting. The proposed hedging along the Canada Street frontage would provide a degree of enclosure but with openings through so that it would be clearly expressed as publicly accessible. Grassed areas would provide a usable space for sitting and flexible play along the north, west and eastern corners and additional shrub and herbaceous planting would enhance the health centre frontage and elsewhere in front of the affordable housing block. The design of hardwood seating, permeable surfacing and other hardscape features would similarly appropriate, and although lacking in fuller detail, this could be secured by the landscaping condition.
- 237 In order to ensure that the type and quality of landscaping aspired to would be sustainable, it would need to achieve a reasonable level of maturity and longevity. This would require ample soil, water and exploitable rooting volumes which, in turn, would rely on sufficient weight loading, maintenance and other engineering tolerances to be considered at an early stage within the design process.
- 238 Species choice should refer to the use of the palette of types which already define the area, including Turkish Hazel, Lime and evergreens, together with signature North American species. Although the submitted outline landscape plan features acceptable species, amendments are required in order to ensure a more appropriate design and this could be secured through conditions. In addition, although it provides acceptable survey results and constraints considerations, it does not provide sufficient information to ensure that the retained trees would be protected and conditions would be required to ensure this.

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

- 239 Saved policy 2.5 'Planning obligations' of the Southwark Plan and policy 8.2 of the London Plan advise that Local Planning Authorities should seek to enter into planning obligations to avoid or mitigate the adverse impacts of developments which cannot otherwise be adequately addressed through conditions, to secure or contribute towards the infrastructure, environment or site management necessary to support the development, or to secure an appropriate mix of uses within the development. Further information is contained within the council's Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document. Policy 33 of the CWAAP requires developments to contribution towards strategic transport improvements in the area corresponding to the expected trip generation of the scheme. It states that contributions towards improvements to the surface transport network will be the council's priority in negotiating s106 obligations.
- 240 Kings have yet to acquire the freehold of the site but have been granted an option to purchase, and as such have an interest in the land which would enable them to enter into a s106 agreement. Kings are not proposing that that the current owner would be a party to the agreement.
- 241 The applicant has submitted a proposed Heads of Terms based on the councils Planning Obligations SPD and this has been subject to negotiations during the course of the application. The following table sets out the contributions required based on the s106 SPD and accompanying toolkit compared to what the applicant has offered:

242	Topic Area	SPD Requirement	Applicant's Offer
	Education	£106,937-Affordable Hsg only	£106,937
	Employment development	£68,898	Work Place Co-ordinator (WPC) to be provided.
	Employment construction	£671, 356	WPC to be provided
	Employment construction management fee	£52,614	£52,614
	Public open space, children's play, sports development	£547,434	£400,000
	Transport strategic	£281,550	£281,550
	Transport strategic CW supplement	£104,187	£104,187
	Transport site specific	£214,595	£214,595
	Public realm	£672,345	£550,602 (in-kind works) and a contribution of £50,000
	Health	£464,606	Health centre to be provided in lieu, full payment if not provided or £37,254 if for students only
	Community facilities	£25,054	£25,054
	Total	£3,209,576	£1,234,937 plus in-kind works to public realm, employment and health centre
	Admin fee (2%)	£64,191.52	Final figure to be confirmed through addendum.

#### Employment during construction and in the development

- 243 The applicant proposes to provide their own WPC to oversee the employment during construction and in the development obligations. The council's economic Development Team has advised that the following would need to be secured and this will be included in the s106 agreement. In the event that these targets cannot be met, the payment would be required:

Outputs	Targets
Jobs (26 weeks)	89
Short courses / CSCS cards	89
NVQs / Apprentices	20

- 244 Jobs (26 weeks) means workless Southwark residents accessing jobs related to the construction phase of development and remaining in work for 26 weeks. Short courses / CSCS cards means Southwark residents trained in short industry accredited construction courses and / or CSCS site health and safety cards. NVQs / Apprentices means Southwark residents accessing apprenticeships or achieving full NVQ level accreditation. Based on an estimated 350 directly employed jobs, the Economic Development Team has set a target of 29 workless Southwark residents to be employed and retain employment in the development for at least 6 months.
- 245 Officers have requested further information as to how this would be delivered but as stated, a clause is to be included in the s106 agreement requiring the contribution to be paid in the event that the above targets cannot be met.

#### Public open space, children's play equipment and sports development

- 246 The toolkit generates a figure of £547,434 which includes all of the above. The

applicant considers that the full toolkit amount should not be payable because the College provides a range of sports facilities for its students which they would use. Specifically mentioned are a fitness centre at Waterloo, a fitness centre and swimming pool at Guy's and three major sports grounds at Honor Oak Park, Dulwich and New Malden. The applicant has offered £400k but on the proviso that £50,000 would go towards the Docklands Settlement project and if Kings become involved in taking responsibility for St Paul's Fields, any subsidy or cost which Kings has to provide in respect of that project during the first five years up to the sum of £100,000 is to be repaid.

- 247 In relation to the full toolkit amount not being met, officers have reservations over this approach given how far these facilities are located from the application site. There are council owned facilities in much closer proximity including the Seven Islands Leisure Centre and Southwark Park Sports Centre, and it is considered that the students would use these facilities during their leisure time, particularly at weekends when they would be less likely to travel onto campus. Notwithstanding that, the provision of Kings sporting facilities is noted, and their offer for the student element would equate to approximately half of that required under the toolkit. This is considered to be acceptable provided the s106 includes a clause that the full contribution would be required for the student housing in the event that it is not occupied by Kings students.
- 248 In relation to the applicant's proviso that a proportion of the contribution be towards the Rotherhithe Docklands Settlement, officers consider that whilst it may be appropriate, the allocation should be determined by the Council in line with priorities at that time and in accordance with the CIL regulations (2010). In relation to St Pauls Fields, this is subject to a separate set of negotiations with the Council, and it would not be appropriate at this time to determine the future use of S106 monies in relation to a project which is not yet agreed.

#### Public realm

- 249 The proposed development would incorporate 4,616sqm of public realm, comprising the landscaped areas around the perimeter of the site which would include 'pocket parks' in front of blocks A and D fronting Canada Street, landscaped areas along the Quebec Way frontage and the central street through the development which would connect with Quebec Way.
- 250 The applicant has agreed to carry out £505,602 of in-kind works which would include hard and soft landscaping works outside of the title area around the perimeter of the site, works to the central street including drainage, paving and lighting and the provision of street furniture. There would be a shortfall of £166,743 against the toolkit amount. The applicant has offered a contribution of £50,000 towards the shortfall, and given the extent of the public realm works proposed this is considered to be acceptable in this instance.

#### Health centre

- 251 The proposed development would incorporate a health centre, and although officers have requested further information as to what facilities it would provide and whether it would serve only the students or would be available to the wider community, these details are not yet known. As such a clause would be required in the s106 agreement for full payment of the health contribution in the event that the health centre cannot be delivered. The applicant has agreed to this, but has suggested that a lower contribution of £37,254 be made in the event that a health centre is provided but only open to students and no objections are raised in this regard.

- 252 The contributions sought by officers are considered to be:
- a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
  - b) directly related to the development; and
  - c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.
- 253 The contributions would comply with the requirements of regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010) and would be in accordance with saved policy 2.5 of the Southwark Plan, SP14 of the Core Strategy and policy 8.2 of the London Plan.
- 254 Clauses are to be included in the s106 to secure the affordable units as affordable in perpetuity, including the tenure split and nomination rights for the council, provision of the wheelchair affordable units and preventing the student accommodation from being used as hotel out of term time. The submission advises that the accommodation could be used to accommodate sports and education groups and the use of executive spaces and for conferencing out of term. This is unlikely to be problematic, but would need to be defined and agreed via the s106 agreement.
- 255 Although the application has been submitted by Kings College and they have advised that they fully intend to take it forward if granted permission, the applicant has advised that for reasons linked to the potential funding of the development they cannot accept a personal permission or a condition restricting occupation of the student accommodation to Kings students only. As such, whilst it is likely that the development would be implemented by Kings and they have advised of their wider aspirations at Harmsworth Quays for which this development could form an important first step, there remains a risk that the permission could be implemented by another provider, either another educational establishment or a student housing provider not linked to a particular establishment. Members are therefore advised that in determining the application they should be mindful of the weight which they attach to the involvement of Kings in the development as a key factor in their decision making.
- 256 In accordance with the recommendation, if the Section 106 Agreement is not signed by 30th November 2013 the Head of Development Management should be authorised to refuse permission if appropriate, for the reason below:
- 257 'In the absence of a signed Section 106 Agreement, there is no mechanism in place to avoid or mitigate the impact of the proposed development on employment, public open space, the transport network, the public realm, health care services, community facilities and affordable housing, and the proposal would therefore be contrary to saved policy 2.5 of the Southwark Plan (2007), strategic policy 14 of the Core Strategy (2011) and Policy 8.2 of the London Plan (2011).

#### Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

- 258 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 as a material 'local financial consideration' in planning decisions. The requirement for Mayoral CIL is a material consideration. However, the weight to be attached to a local finance consideration remains a matter for the decision-maker. Mayoral CIL is to be used for strategic transport improvements in London, primarily Crossrail.
- 259 The proposed development would have a total gross internal area of 28,688sqm, of which 291sqm would be the health centre which would not be CIL liable. 28,397sqm would therefore be CIL liable, equating to £883,895. As a charity, Kings would be able to apply for relief.



## **Sustainable development implications**

- 260 Policy 5.2 of the London Plan requires major developments to provide an assessment of their energy demands and to demonstrate that they have taken steps to apply the Mayor's energy hierarchy. Policies 5.5 and 5.6 require consideration of decentralised energy networks and policy 5.7 requires the use of on-site renewable technologies, where feasible. A detailed energy strategy has been submitted with the application detailing how the proposal would comply with the Mayor's energy hierarchy, together with BREEAM and Code for Sustainable Homes pre-assessment indicators.
- 261 All of the proposed affordable units have been designed to achieve Code for Sustainable Homes (CSH) Level 4, and a condition to secure this is recommended. All of the non-residential elements within the scheme including the student housing would achieve BREEAM 'excellent', which would comply with the Council's standards set out in Strategic Policy 13 of the Core Strategy and again, can be secured by way of a condition.

### Be lean - use less energy

- 262 The report details how the scheme would incorporate a number of passive measures aimed at reducing the amount of energy required. These measures would include high levels of thermal insulation, low air permeability throughout the development and the use of energy efficient lighting and boilers.

### Be clean - supply energy efficiently

- 263 The proposed development seeks to supply the required energy as efficiently as possible and considers future connection to the South East London CHP (SEPCHP) energy-from-waste plant located in Lewisham; a clause is to be included in the section 106 agreement to ensure that the development could connect to this if it becomes a reality in the future as required by policy 20 of the CWAAP.
- 264 The Energy Strategy proposes the use of a Combined Heat and Power plant (CHP) to serve the development, which would be located in an energy centre beneath the office building. It would operate as the primary heat supply plant for the development, plus natural gas fired boilers for use as a top-up or stand-by. This would result in a reduction of carbon dioxide emissions of 27% relative to the baseline condition. However, the report notes that this would drop to 18% when unregulated energy sources are considered and recommends that an additional reduction from green technologies would be appropriate. When green technologies are included (considered below) the development would achieve a 33.4 % improvement over the 2010 Building Regulations, which would comply with the 25% target.

### Be green - use renewable energy

- 265 The Energy Strategy considers a range of technologies but found a number of them to be unsuitable. The proposal would incorporate solar photovoltaic panels to supply electricity to the buildings they would be attached to, and 670sqm of roofspace could potentially be available for this. If installed this would result in a CO2 reduction of 23.27 tonnes per year. This would equate to 2.90% of the development's energy requirements coming from renewables, well below the Core Strategy target of 20%. This is of concern for a new development on a large and relatively unconstrained site and a condition for a revised strategy to seek to increase this is recommended.
- 266 In light of the above, officers consider that the Mayor's hierarchy has been followed in accordance with policy. Although the renewables contribution would be low, it may be possible to increase this through a condition.

- 267 In relation to water use, it is noted that 6 out of a potential 8 credits under the water category of the BREEAM assessment for the office, commercial space and student housing would be achieved (75%). For the affordable housing, 3 out of 5 credits for the CSH water assessment would be achieved, with the strategic policy 13 requirement of equal to or less than 105 litres of water use per person per day on target to be met.

## **Ecology**

- 268 Strategic policy 11 of the Core Strategy 'Open spaces and wildlife' seeks to improve, protect and maintain a network of open spaces and green corridors and to protect important open spaces, trees and woodlands and site of importance for nature conservation. Saved policy 3.28 of the Southwark Plan 'Biodiversity' requires biodiversity to be taken into account in the assessment of all planning applications and requires the submission of ecological assessments where relevant.
- 269 There are no nationally or internationally designated wildlife sites on or within the immediate vicinity of the site. The closest statutory designated site is the Lavender Pond Local Nature Reserve (LNR) which is located approximately 810m to the north east of the site. The closest Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) is the Canada and Surrey Waters SINC which is located 70m to the north-west of the site. There are a further three SINC's within 500m of the site.
- 270 The majority of the site currently comprises areas of hardstanding from the former industrial development which occupied the site, together with areas of soil heaps, rubble and building materials. There are a number of trees along the street boundaries and some species poor hedging along the northern boundary opposite the vehicle entrance to Alfred Salter Primary School.
- 271 A phase 1 habitat survey report has been submitted with the application, with the survey having been carried out in March this year. The report concludes that the proposals are unlikely to have a significant negative effect on the SINC's or the LNR near to the site given that the site would be separated from them by roads and residential developments. The site supports a number of breeding birds including Dunnock which is a UK Post 2010 Biodiversity Framework and London Biodiversity Action Plan species and the report recommends a number of measures which should be incorporated into the development including bird boxes and native tree and shrub planting.
- 272 The habitat report recommends that a reptile survey be carried out and this has been undertaken and a report submitted. Seven survey visits were carried out and no reptiles or evidence of reptiles was found; the report concludes that no further survey work is required in this respect.
- 273 Both documents have been reviewed by the council's ecologist who has advised that they are acceptable and agrees with their findings, noting the inclusion of green and brown roofs and soft-landscaped areas. A concern is raised regarding the extent of hard landscaping to the south-eastern section of the site and a number of conditions are recommended. The recommended landscaping condition could secure greater soft-landscaping within the eastern section together with the use of porous materials and a condition regarding the timing of tree felling is also recommended to minimise any harm to birds on the site.
- 274 Natural England has been consulted on the application and commented that the ecological survey submitted with the application has not identified that there will be any significant impacts on statutory protected sites, species or on priority Biodiversity Action Plan habitats as a result of the proposal.

## **Archaeology**

- 275 Saved policy 3.19 of the Southwark Plan 'Archaeology' requires planning applications located within Archaeological Priority Zones (APZ) to be accompanied by an archaeological assessment and evaluation of the site, including the impact of the proposed development.
- 276 The site is not located in an APZ but is located over the boundary between the Centre Pond and Quebec Pond of the Surrey Docks system. The western-most part of the site was the location of a fire station for the dock, and most probably, timber stores located around the edges of the docks. There is therefore an archaeological interest in the division between the two ponds, the location of the fire station and the sides of the timber pond. In light of this an archaeological evaluation of the site has been submitted and reviewed by the council's archaeologist who recommends a number of conditions.

## **Flood Risk**

- 277 The site is located within Flood Zone 2 which is considered to be an area which has a medium risk of flooding, however the site is protected by the Thames Barrier and related defences. A detailed Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been submitted with the application which concludes that the development would not be at risk of flooding and would not increase flood risk elsewhere. In reaching this conclusion regard has been had to the vulnerability of some of the ground floor uses including affordable housing and student housing.
- 278 The FRA has been reviewed by the Environment Agency (EA). The EA find the assessment to be acceptable and have raised no objections, subject to a condition that the development be carried out in accordance with the FRA and that a full surface water drainage scheme be submitted for approval prior to the commencement of the development. This condition could help to fulfill the requirements of strategic policy 13 in relation to surface-water run-off which has also been considered within the FRA. It concludes that a number of Sustainable Urban Drainage (SUDs) techniques could be incorporated into the scheme including permeable paving and filter drains. It is noted that Thames Water has not raised any objections, although informatives are recommended.

## **Contaminated Land**

- 279 The application is supported by a Ground Investigation Report which concludes that the site has a medium risk of contamination owing to metallic deposits and ground gas, but that these can be managed by design and on completion of the development any risks are anticipated to be low. The Councils Environmental Protection Team and the EA have reviewed the report and agree with its findings, and conditions to secure a scheme of investigation and remediation are recommended. The EA also requires a condition to protect groundwaters.

## **Air Quality**

- 280 Saved policy 3.6 of the Southwark Plan states that planning permission will not be granted for development that would lead to a reduction in air quality.
- 281 An air quality assessment has been submitted with the application. It notes that there are likely to be some impacts during construction, from dust for example, but details for mitigating this have been submitted in a separate construction management plan, the adequacy of which is considered in the transport section of this report.

- 282 The development would be predominantly car-free and the assessment considers the impact of the proposed combined heat and power plant (CHP) and boiler plant to be insignificant in relation to air quality. The report has been reviewed by the Council's Environmental Protection Team which agrees with the findings, subject to conditions.

### **Wind Tunnels**

- 283 A report has been submitted with the application which assesses the potential effect of wind tunnels on the pedestrian level environment in and around the site. It also assesses the effect on the roof terraces proposed throughout the development and the internal courtyard spaces.
- 284 The assessment concludes that the development would have no significant impact upon wind conditions with regard to pedestrian safety, with conditions expected to rate as comfortable for all users. It notes that it may be slightly windy around the entrance to the office building, the tallest building proposed for the site, but that this should not be significant. It advises that the communal roof terrace and children's play space for the affordable housing block would be substantially sheltered from the prevailing south-westerly winds by the neighbouring Water Gardens development and that these areas would be suitable for outdoor seating during at least the summer months, and for recreational activities comprising short periods of sitting and standing such as children's play or viewing for the remainder of the year. The assessment concludes that the development would not have any significant impacts upon wind conditions within the surrounding area. It also concludes that when considered cumulatively with the proposals for sites C and E, there would be no adverse effects.

### **Television / radio interference**

- 285 Given that the proposal includes the provision of a tall building on the site, Arqiva has been consulted. Arqiva is responsible for providing the BBC and ITV's transmission network and is responsible for ensuring the integrity of re-broadcast links (RBLs). They have advised that the proposed development would be unlikely to affect any RBLs and that there would be no issues regarding microwave links.

### **Other matters**

#### **Statement of Community Involvement**

- 286 A statement of community involvement has been submitted with the application detailing pre-application consultation that has been carried out by the applicant. It advises that the approach taken was to provide detailed information about the proposed scheme to key stakeholders (locally elected representatives, local community groups and statutory bodies) and the local community, to answer questions about the proposals and to provide reassurance that key issues likely to affect the community have been addressed. It describes how a range of communication techniques were employed comprising one-to-one meetings with key stakeholders, presentations at public meetings arranged with local amenity groups, distribution of consultation leaflets, setting up a consultation website and holding a 3-day exhibition between 28 February - 2 March this year which was attended by 127 people.
- 287 The Statement advises that attendees at the exhibition were asked to complete a questionnaire and 79% stated support for the proposals and 21% support but with reservations (of the 127 people at the event). Positive comments related to the regeneration of the area by introducing a daytime economy. Concerns raised related to impact on local infrastructure including local roads, public transport and Alfred Salter Primary School, daylight and sunlight issues, the behaviour of students, public

access through the development and use of the retail spaces.

### Economic Impacts

- 288 A socio-economic report has been submitted with the application which details how the proposed development would create at least 360 full-time equivalent (FTE) construction jobs during the two year construction period, and the employment of and training for a proportion of local residents would be secured through the s106 agreement. Twenty FTE jobs would be created through the student accommodation, a benefit which would not arise from a residential scheme, and a further 30 jobs would be created through the retail units and health centre. 300 of Kings existing staff would occupy the office building, contributing to the local economy. The report details how Kings, a world class academic institution, would be investing over £100m into the development of the site and that the student population is estimated at contributing £8.8m of direct expenditure to the local economy, which could support the aspirations for the town centre.

### **Conclusion**

- 289 The application proposes the redevelopment of a vacant brownfield site. Although the provision of a student-housing led scheme would represent a departure from the adopted site designation in the CWAAP, this would not undermine the council's ability to meet the CWAAP, Core Strategy or London Plan housing targets and it is noted that student housing is classed as housing for monitoring purposes. Although a very low level of affordable housing would be provided, viability has been considered and the DVS has advised that the scheme cannot support any further provision. The imminent closure of the Harmsworth Quays printworks represents a material change in circumstances since the AAP was adopted and it is now being reviewed, with the town centre boundary likely to be expanded and the ambition for a new university campus being located on the printworks site. Notwithstanding that, there would be key benefits from the proposal arising from the provision of office space, a health centre and retail uses which would add to the vitality of the area. The student housing has the potential to support objectives to revitalise the town centre by increasing the daytime economy, and the need for the student housing has been adequately demonstrated. It is noted that the previous, implemented permission granted on the site included a significant amount of family housing and affordable housing. This would not be delivered if the Kings proposal goes forward, however, the wider potential benefits of supporting Kings locating at Canada Water are significant. On balance therefore, the principle of the proposed development and level of affordable housing is considered to be acceptable in this instance.
- 290 A satisfactory standard of student housing and residential accommodation would be provided for future occupiers. There would be some instances in which the impact upon daylight and sunlight to neighbouring properties would exceed the BRE guidance, but these are not considered to be significant and other impacts can be managed through conditions. Again, subject to conditions and planning obligations it is not considered that there would be any unacceptable impacts to the highway network. The height, bulk and massing of the development is considered to be acceptable and the quality of the materials can be secured through conditions. The site layout considers how it would work as a stand-alone development and how it could also tie in with a potentially wider development on the printworks site.
- 291 The energy strategy for the site is considered acceptable although a condition requiring additional use of renewables is recommended. The landscaping and public realm proposals are considered to be acceptable, with conditions recommended for full details and to ensure the protection of retained trees on the site. The application would not result in any harm to protected species and ecological enhancements can

be incorporated into the landscape design. Conditions are recommended in relation to archaeology, land contamination and flood risk to ensure that potential impacts would be adequately mitigated. No adverse affects in relation to air quality, wind tunnels or television and radio interference would occur, and it is noted that there is public and Ward Member support for the proposal and the GLA has raised no issues in relation to landuse. Taking all matters into consideration, the development proposal is considered to be acceptable and it is recommended that planning permission be granted.

### **Community impact statement**

292 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.

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

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

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

### **Consultation**

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

### **Consultation replies**

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

298 Summary of consultation responses

#### Objections (6)

- 299
- Increased demand for on-street parking and parking on private roads;
  - Construction impacts;
  - Loss of light;
  - Loss of privacy;
  - Noise, disturbance and anti-social behaviour from students and an influx of bars which may follow;
  - Would change the quiet, residential character of the area to a student area;
  - Increased pressure on existing infrastructure and services including the underground and shopping centre;
  - Impact on existing open spaces and wildlife;
  - The proposal would create no job prospects;
  - There is no need for additional retail in the area and no need for the area to be regenerated.

300 Supports (6)

- Increased employment and daytime economy;
- Kings will help to regenerate the area;
- Will benefit local shops and businesses;

- Suitable design;
- Tree planting welcomed;
- Increased affordable housing and community use of the gardens should be secured;
- Students are likely to be involved with volunteering which would help the community;
- The Ward Members have written in support of the proposals.

301 General support / no objection but with comments (4)

Supports as above but concerns regarding:

- Parking around the school and overlooking of the school;
- Retention of trees and existing wildlife;
- Impact on light and impact on sky view;
- Request that existing residents be able to share the secure cycle parking;
- Increased noise;
- Overcrowding and impact on local services;
- Need to invest in the community.

302 **Human rights implications**

303 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.

304 This application has the legitimate aim of providing a mixed-use development comprising student housing, affordable housing, retail, office and a health centre. The rights potentially engaged by this application, including the right to a fair trial and the right to respect for private and family life are not considered to be unlawfully interfered with by this proposal.

**SUPPLEMENTARY ADVICE FROM OTHER OFFICERS**

N/A.

**BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Site history file: TP/403-A  Application file: 13/AP/1429  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 5410 Council website: www.southwark.gov.uk

**APPENDICES**

No.	Title
Appendix 1	Consultation undertaken
Appendix 2	Consultation responses received
Appendix 3	List of neighbour consultees
Appendix 4	Images
Appendix 5	Recommendation

## AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Gary Rice, Head of Development Management		
Report Author	Victoria Lewis, Team Leader Strategic Applications		
Version	Final		
Dated	6 September 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 of Housing and Community services	No	No	
Director of Regeneration	No	No	
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team		6 September 2013	



# APPENDIX 1

## Consultation Undertaken

305 **Site notice date:** 10/06/2013

**Press notice date:** 13/06/2013

**Case officer site visit date:** 10/06/2013

**Neighbour consultation letters sent:** 10/06/13 and 12/07/2013

### **Internal services consulted:**

306 Transport Planning  
Planning Policy Team  
Environmental Protection Team  
Urban Forester  
Housing and Regeneration Initiatives  
Ecology Officer  
Archaeologist  
Public Realm (Project Design)  
Economic Development and Strategy  
Waste Management

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

307 English Heritage  
Greater London Authority  
Environment Agency  
Transport for London  
London Borough of Lewisham  
Sport England  
Arqiva  
London Fire and Emergency Planning  
Metropolitan Police  
Natural England  
London Underground  
Southwark Primary Care Trust  
Thames Water  
EDF

**Neighbours and local groups consulted:** Refer to Appendix 3.

**Re-consultation:** Not required.

## APPENDIX 2

### Consultation Responses Received

#### Internal services

#### 308 Transport Planning

- Trip Generation, Modal Split, Distribution and Assignment - All largely acceptable. It is likely that bus mode share and cycling mode share will be higher, since it is inexpensive and supported by the proposed Cycle Superhighway 4 on Lower Road/Jamaica Road/Tooley Street. The 5% predicted mode share is considerably lower than the 10% cycling to work achieved by some workplaces in the Bankside area, which should be representative of journeys between the proposed development and the Guy's, Waterloo and St Thomas' campuses with the Strand campus being a short distance north of the river.

Buses - The TA indicates that the development will add 114 bus trips in the morning peak hour, equivalent to the planning capacity of around two buses. While this is dispersed across a number of bus services, the additional passengers will inevitably lead to crowding on some services at some point along their route. Therefore it is recommended that a contribution is sought toward improvements to bus services to accommodate the additional demand, equivalent to two extra bus trips per hour.

- Underground and Rail Services - The development will lead to a relatively small increase in passengers at Canada Water station on Jubilee and Overground lines, with a largely negligible increase in passengers per train on average. This is considered acceptable.

- Road Safety - No analysis has been provided of road safety in the area. Funding should be secured for measures to improve road safety for pedestrians, cyclists and other road users, in particular the introduction of 20mph limits and measures to make such limits self-enforcing.

- Car Parking - The development will be car-free aside from disabled parking places.

- The provision of "passive" electric charging infrastructure is not acceptable. Further, the allocation of such a small number of parking places will not guarantee that a charging point will be available for users as the need arises. It is recommended that "active" charging points are installed for all spaces. The cost of this additional provision is minimal.

- The provision of motorcycle parking spaces should be discouraged through design and through the travel plan. All the reasons for, and benefits of, a car-free development would be eroded by such provision.

- The TA addresses in part the issue of car club use. No offer of free membership for new residents is proposed. Free membership for three years should be offered to all new residents of the affordable housing to support the car-free nature of the development.

- In order to ensure that the development remains car-free, funding should be secured for an extension to the nearby CPZ, together with an exclusion from eligibility for parking permits.

- Cycle Hire - A contribution should be sought and space reserved to provide a cycle hire docking station on or near the site. This would serve residents as part of a wider Cycle Hire Scheme area currently being pursued.

- Site Layout - Despite initial concerns, the site layout is now considered to be acceptable. However, details should be provided of arrangements for the southern road

in the event that the wider masterplan is developed.

- Construction - A draft Construction Environmental Management Plan is supplied but does not meet the expected standard. A revised plan should be conditioned.
- Servicing and Waste Management - servicing arrangements are acceptable. The draft Delivery & Servicing Plan is largely acceptable but the provision of a final DSP should be secured by condition or obligation.
- Travel Plans - The draft travel plans are largely acceptable but the provision of final travel plans should be secured by condition or obligation.
- Student Arrival and Departure - No mention is made of this event, the impact of which on transport networks can be significant. Submission of a strategy should be secured by condition
- Mitigation - a number of mitigation measures are proposed above. In particular, the toolkit indicative sum should be secured for general improvements to walking and cycling routes (including routes to local facilities and public transport nodes) for access to the development, for road safety measures suggested above, and for any necessary changes to/extension of the nearby CPZ in order to enforce the car-free nature of the development.

#### Planning Policy Team

- 309 The council is in the process of reviewing the adopted AAP and is currently consulting on a draft revised area action plan (pre-publication consultation stage). In all, the council is consulting on the draft revised AAP over a period of 12 weeks, which includes a formal consultation period which commenced on 18 June and which expires on 30 July 2013. Following this stage of consultation, the council will consider the representations made and any final amendments to the plan. The council anticipates reporting the publication version of the AAP to council assembly in December to gain approval to invite representations on the publication draft and subsequently submit the AAP to the Planning Inspectorate for an examination-in-public (EIP). The EIP is likely to take place in summer 2014 and the AAP would be adopted in autumn 2014.
- 310 The draft revised AAP includes Mulberry Business Park within a new site allocation, CW AAP 24) which also includes Site E, Harmsworth Quays and the Surrey Quays Leisure Park. Paragraph 7.8.53 of the reasoned justification indicates that the reason for this is that while the non-residential buffers which were included in the consented schemes at Mulberry Business Park and on the Leisure Park will no longer be required when the printworks moves, it will be important that development across CW AAP 24 is coordinated to ensure that the right combination of land uses, a network of routes and a coherent urban design is achieved.
- 311 Paragraph 7.8.54 of the draft revised AAP states that allocated uses for CWAAP 24 are seeking to help deliver the AAP vision which remains largely unchanged. The required uses in CW AAP 24 are: a mix of employment generating uses such as business use (Class B1), retail use (Class A), community use (Class D), including education and health uses and hotel use (Class C1). Proposals should maximise the amount of employment which can be generated and the contribution to the regeneration of the town centre. A list of criteria are set out against which proposals can be assessed. These criteria include demand and viability. Residential use and student accommodation are identified as other acceptable uses. In accordance with saved Southwark Plan policy SP20, the “uses required” must be included within any development. Planning permission may be granted for “other acceptable uses” provided that the development for the “uses required” is, has been, or is thereby secured.
- 312 The proposal to provide the majority of floorspace as student accommodation is a departure to the adopted AAP. In assessing the proposal, the council should consider whether the departure would undermine the vision and objectives of the Core Strategy and AAP and whether there is a need for the proposed uses. Having reviewed the

council's housing trajectory it is not considered that the ability meet our housing targets would be compromised.

- 313 The Core Strategy (and AAP vision) for Canada Water is to transform Canada water from an out of centre style development into a new town centre which combines shopping, civic and leisure, business and residential uses. The vision notes that existing facilities in the centre are separated and poorly linked and that development in the town centre should create a street based environment with high quality public realm and open spaces. Alongside the target for new homes, the vision also notes that around 2,000 jobs will be generated. The built form of the proposal is appropriate for an urban setting and with new buildings fronting onto streets, permeable blocks and high quality public spaces, would help deliver the vision to transform Canada Water from an out of centre destination. The office space, retail and D Class space would generate jobs which would contribute to the target set out in the vision.
- 314 Planning obligations (s106) - The council's s106 toolkit should be applied. In addition, the application should make a contribution to strategic transport improvements in the area corresponding to the expected trip generation of the scheme. AAP policy 33 states that contributions towards improvements to the surface transport network will be the Council's priority in negotiating s106 obligations.

#### Environmental Protection Team

- 315 Air quality - I have considered the assessment carried out by Kings with regards to impact of development on current air quality management area (AQMA) The development is in an air quality management area. Construction Traffic, Noise and emission from heating can impact on existing air quality. The emission from CHP plants deemed to be insignificant, the development is car free and emission during the construction process will be control further by an environmental management plan. No exceedences were identified. As a result this department support the conclusion drawn by the report.
- 316 Noise and vibration - The report assessed noise impact from 5no locations. There was no assessment point in the vicinity of the print works, Harmsworth Quay. The report infers that the office block will contain adequate screening however this department will like the developer to consider noise impact from this location in more detail. I am also aware that there is some noise level agreement reached with planning around this establishment but I do not know the fine details. However I am satisfied that the required levels can be achieved with the suggested glazing - conditions recommended (internal noise levels and plant noise).
- 317 Land contamination - I have considered investigation carried out and reported. The report indicated that there was metallic contamination and an issue with ground gas. Since contamination is present, this department need a detailed remediation strategy to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to human health, buildings and other property. The scheme shall ensure that the site would not qualify as contaminated land under Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in relation to the intended use of the land after remediation - condition recommended. A condition for an Environmental Management Plan is required.

#### Urban Forester

- 318 An assessment of the impact of the proposed development on the existing trees was made at a site visit with the architect as part of the pre-application enquiry. A number of established medium sized specimens may be able to be retained on Quebec Way and Canada Street. However, it may that replacement planting of such trees is a better option.

- 319 As subsequently outlined in the Arboricultural impacts assessment (AIA) only those trees with the highest amenity value are retained such that the total stem girth of any tree removed in order to facilitate development is replaced as part of new landscaping. Replanting also presents an opportunity to replace with more appropriate species of better quality within a design which provides greater overall benefits to amenity. Given that no category A trees are removed, that 68% of category B trees are retained and that there is no net loss of canopy cover the effect of the development will on balance be positive.
- 320 Although it provides acceptable survey results and constraints considerations, the AIA does not provide sufficient information to ensure retained trees are protected. Should the application be recommended for approval these points will require specific wording via landscape and tree protection conditions.
- 321 The plan also anticipates the establishment of tree lined avenues and new roads connecting adjoining development sites. Decisions on the design of these major townscape features are therefore of significant importance to the future success of the public realm.
- 322 Although no detailed soft or hard landscape plans are yet available, these need to be considered at an early design stage in relation to proposed service runs, lighting and drainage. Legacy lessons learned from similar landscaping within made ground should be adopted using specifications used at the Olympic park, recognised as industry good practice.

#### Housing and Regeneration Initiatives

- 323 It is disappointing that the proposal does not provide 35% affordable housing. If the viability shows that 35% is not viable it is difficult to see where in the borough it would be.
- 324 The affordable homes appear acceptable. The split between social rent and intermediate is acceptable and there is a good spread of unit sizes in the wheelchair accommodation. Amendments should be made to the open-plan living arrangements for the family accommodation (especially the 3-beds) in accordance with the Residential Design Standards SPD. These are likely to be fully occupied from the start and it is difficult to envisage a family of five cooking, living and dining in the same room. Registered providers also resist this. The layout of the wheelchair units appear acceptable but this should be confirmed.

#### Ecology Officer

- 325 The Phase 1 habitat survey is good and I agree with its findings and recommendations. With regard to the reptile survey, this report is fine and I agree with the findings and no further surveys are required for this site.
- 326 The site could benefit from a SUD's scheme which should be incorporated into the current design by using water from the brown and green roofs to run into the tree features in the central street. There is also a lot of hard surfacing in the South East section which could be improved by more soft landscaping and more porous surfacing. I applaud the combination of brown roof and PV panels.
- 327 The Design and Access Statement, landscape and roof plans include a number of features of ecological benefit to the site. I think these features are best dealt with by condition.

### Archaeologist

- 328 The site is located over the boundary between the Centre Pond and Quebec Pond of the Surrey Docks system, at the west-most extent of the site was the location of a fire station for the dock, and most probably, the timber stores located around the edges of the docks. There is therefore an archaeological interest in the division between the two ponds, the location of the fire station and the sides of the timber pond. Should you be minded to grant consent for this application, conditions are recommended to be applied to any consent.

### Public Realm (Project Design)

- 329 The proposals have been considered from a highways perspective, that is, whether the proposals are acceptable and their impact on the surrounding network.

1. The proposed main access 'T' junction should pose no problems in terms of capacity given the development's projected low vehicle usage.

2. No controlled crossing for pedestrians (and cyclists) has been proposed on either Canada Street or Quebec Way to cater for the huge increase in these highway users.

3. The proposed egress onto Canada Street is shown at an acute angle; this would force drivers to turn their heads to an almost impossible position to check on-coming traffic. This would risk the likelihood of drivers entering the road without checking, leading to possible collision with oncoming traffic. It is preferred that vehicles approach/enter Canada Street at 90 degrees.

4. The means of preventing vehicles other than emergency, service and refuse vehicles from exiting onto Canada Street has not been provided.

### Economic Development and Strategy

- 330 In relation to the construction and employment targets (table set out in the report), jobs (26 weeks) means workless Southwark residents accessing jobs related to the construction phase of development and remaining in work for 26 weeks. Short courses / CSCS cards means Southwark residents trained in short industry accredited construction courses and / or CSCS site health and safety cards. NVQs / Apprentices means Southwark residents accessing apprenticeships or achieving full NVQ level accreditation. NB one person may be claimed against more than one output (i.e. someone may be recorded as getting a sustained job and being trained). I am also attaching the council's workplace co-ordinator methodology for guidance on how these targets should be delivered. It is not common for employment in the development to be delivered in-kind as most developers are not set up to deliver effective local employment programmes. We would seek reassurance that King's have the capability to deliver and, based on an estimated 350 directly employed jobs, we would set a target of 29 workless Southwark residents to be employed and retain employment for at least 6 months.

### Waste Management

- 331 No response received at the time of writing.

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

#### English Heritage

- 332 This application should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance, and on the basis of your specialist conservation advice.

### Greater London Authority Stage 1 Referral

- 333 The application does not fully comply with the London Plan, a summary of the report conclusions and remedies is set out below. Once Southwark Council has resolved to determine the application, it is required to refer it back to the Mayor for his decision as to whether to direct refusal, take it over for his own determination, or to allow the Council to determine it itself.
- 334 - Principle of the development - the overall mix of land uses is fully supported and compliant with the London Plan.
- Design - The form and scale of the block arrangement is supported. It is unfortunate that servicing has to be taken through the central street and on-street servicing should be considered. Careful management would be required to ensure no adverse impacts on the primary school and can be conditioned.
  - Access - 100% of the units would be lifetime homes compliant and 10% wheelchair housing would be provided. The locations of blue badge parking are shown on plan. Some would be provided on street which would serve a mix of uses. TfL has raised concern regarding the number of disabled spaces for students.
  - Student housing - The London Plan sets out that if accommodation is not robustly secured for students, it will normally be subject to the requirements of affordable housing policy and SP8 of the Core Strategy requires 35% student housing to be provided. 33 affordable units would be provided. This is generally supported and is integrated on site as part of a comprehensive design approach. Evidence to support the proportion of affordable housing will be required, and the GLA would welcome a joint approach to independent review of the evidence to inform any subsequent officer recommendation.
  - Housing choice - A mix of 1, 2 and 3 bedroom affordable accommodation has been provided which is supported.
  - Housing quality - The flat layouts meet the minimum requirements and include private amenity space and play space on the roof terrace. The applicant should confirm that the roof space meets the minimum requirements of the Mayor's guidance on Shaping Neighbourhoods: Play and informal recreation SPG.
  - Density - Whilst the density is considered to be broadly acceptable, the applicant should confirm the calculation using the guidance in the Mayor's Housing SPG.
  - Climate change mitigation - The energy strategy is fully supported and consistent with the current carbon dioxide reduction target of 25%. Adaptation measures regarding the provision of green and brown roofs, flooding, water use and overheating can be dealt with by condition and do not raise strategic issues.
  - TfL comments are referred to (set out separately in the report).
  - Financial considerations - there are no financial considerations at this stage.
  - Matters to be resolved - affordable housing offer to be verified through an independent appraisal of the applicant submission, TfL comments to be addressed.

### Environment Agency

- 335 The EA notes the quantitative environmental risk assessment that no significant concentrations have been reported in the soil or ground water, although we further note the presence of waste mounds and above ground solvent tanks. The EA has no objection to the application subject to conditions (development in accordance with the FRA, a surface water drainage scheme, contamination remediation, no piling or other penetrative foundations, no surface-water run-off into the ground).

### Transport for London

- 336 If planning permission is granted, this does not discharge any requirements under the Traffic Management Act (2004). The A200 Jamaica Road / Rotherhithe tunnel approach and the A200 Lower Road, both part of the TLRN, are 600m and 450m from the site

respectively. The site has a PTAL of 5.

- Trip generation assumptions - the approach taken to consider this would be in accordance with TfL's guidance.
- Car parking - the 'car-free' development is welcomed. TfL understands Southwark wishes to extend a CPZ and would support Southwark in making a request for a s106 contribution towards this. A s106 should include provisions whereby nearby residents cannot obtain parking permits.
- Three disabled spaces would be provided for students; this provision is low and further justification is required. The other disabled parking would comply with the London Plan.
- Electric vehicle charging equipment is welcomed, as is a car club space within the development.
- Highway impact - the scheme is unlikely to have any impact on the local road network being a car-free development. TfL supports the principle of the vehicle access strategy whereby traffic is diverted away from the primary school.
- London Underground / Overground - TfL are content that the application would have no adverse impacts on the network.
- Busses - As above.
- Cycling - the level of cycle parking is welcomed, as is shower and locker provision. Cycle parking for the retail and health centre uses should be increased.
- TfL cycle hire - land within the development should be safeguarded for a future docking station.
- Pedestrians - TfL welcomes the submission of a PERS audit which provides an audit of the pedestrian environment in the locality of the site. The proposals to improve the public realm along Canada Street and Quebec Way are noted - these should be secured through a s106 contribution, together with measures to enhance pedestrian permeability.
- TfL promotes wayfinding and the potential for this to extend in to this area should be explored.
- Servicing - the draft Delivery and Servicing Plan is welcomed, particularly the booking system for large vehicles. A full plan should be secured by way of a condition.
- Construction - the details of the construction arrangements are welcomed. A construction logistics plan should be conditioned.
- Travel Plan - this is welcomed and should be secured through a s106 agreement.

#### London Borough of Lewisham

337 No response received at the time of writing.

#### Sport England

338 No response received at the time of writing.

#### Arqiva

339 Arqiva is responsible for providing the BBC and ITV's transmission network and therefore is responsible for ensuring the integrity of re-broadcast links (RBLs). Based on the information provided, our analysis shows that the proposed development is unlikely to affect our RBLs. Regarding microwave links, Arqiva has no issues with the proposal.

#### London Fire and Emergency Planning

340 The Authority is unable to comment at the present time. The application will be considered when plans are submitted as part of the consultation process.

#### Metropolitan Police

341 I have met with the architects to discuss the site and Secured by Design (SbD). SbD or compliance with MAN4 CSH would be required.



### Natural England

342 Statutory nature conservation sites - no objection.

Protected species - A phase 1 habitat survey has been completed. NE does not object to the proposal based on the information available and the proposal would be unlikely to affect any European protected species. We have not assessed the survey for badgers, barn owls, breeding birds, water voles, white-clawed crayfish or widespread reptiles.

The NE standing advice should be used to assess the adequacy of any surveys, the impacts and required mitigation.

Green infrastructure - the site could benefit from this and would encourage it to be incorporated into the development.

Local wildlife sites - If the site is on or adjacent to a designated site the LPA should ensure it has sufficient information to determine the impacts.

Biodiversity enhancements - there may be opportunities to include these such as roosting boxes for bat and bird nest boxes.

Landscape enhancements - the proposal could provide the opportunity to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment.

### London Underground

343 No objection in principle but there are a number of constraints on the potential development of a site located close to the underground tunnels and infrastructure. It will need to be demonstrated that:

- the development will not adversely affect any of the tunnels or structures in the short or long-term;
- the design must be such that the loading imposed on our tunnels or structures is not increased or removed;
- we offer no right of support to the development of the land.

344 A condition for details is recommended.

### Southwark Primary Care Trust

345 No response received at the time of writing.

### Thames Water

346 - No objections regarding sewerage infrastructure.

- The developer must make provision for surface water drainage.

- There are public sewers crossing or close to the site and Thames Water approval would be required for development within 3m of a public sewer.

- No piling should take place until a piling method statement has been submitted for approval.

- The existing water supply infrastructure has insufficient capacity to meet the additional demands for the development therefore a condition should be imposed requiring an impact study to be carried out prior to the commencement of the development.

### EDF

347 No response received at the time of writing.

## **Neighbours and local groups**

### **Objections**

#### **Resident of Saunders House**

The proposed development is of great concern. The main issue is the obvious potential of overflow traffic into our private car park cul-de-sac, which is not gated. What reassurance can be given that the residents of the development will not be parking in our private area? Will the developer be implementing plans to prevent this from happening?

#### **Resident of the Water Gardens**

Object to the application on the grounds of noise, dust and disruption of roads and access points to the shopping centre and shops and businesses on Lower Road. These are all concerns during construction.

Concerns regarding lack of sunlight and overlooking onto balconies. An influx of almost 1,000 students into a quiet and peaceful area in close proximity to ecological parks is not permissible. The noise from residents and a likely influx of bars and clubs would increase anti-social behaviour, crime and vandalism, stretching existing services. We chose to long-term rent here with the option to buy based on the following, all of which would be decimated if the plans go through:

- The peace and quiet of the area that is close to the amenities London has to offer;
- The open spaces, wetlands, bird nesting areas and ecological parks;
- The feel of a true gem of a neighbourhood separate from the hustle and bustle of central London.

Request that the Council do the right thing and protect the people who are already living here peacefully and paying taxes.

#### **Resident of Hawke Place**

Mulberry Business Park is a commercial area and the loss of the space would provide no future job prospects for the area. The proposal would add more burden to the ailing transport system and local amenities. Considering the Council is already preparing to allow another two 45 storey towers opposite this may impact even further. There should be a meeting between officers, the developer and local residents to raise their concerns or favour for the scheme.

#### **Resident of Toronto House**

Residents have bought properties in this area because it is quiet and inhabited by young adults and people who work. Having students here would completely change the dynamics of the neighbourhood and we do not want to live in a student area.

With new residential units recently completed the number of people has already significantly increased and the current infrastructure does not sustain such an increase. i.e. Canada Water Station is already overcrowded in the morning, as is the shopping centre.

When we bought our property we were not told about the project which in our opinion has nothing to do with an area that is mainly residential and ideal for working people and not students. It is a classy and sought after area and bringing students to it would decrease its value as well as the value of our properties.

### 39 Toronto House

The council shows no consideration to the natural and precious settings of Canada Water within London. The project will destroy the current social, atmospheric, environmental fabric of the area which is rare and precious within central London. Canada Water has the right amount of residential buildings / amenities / population / natural settings. Such extensive works do not make sense and will destroy this, with no benefits to current residents.

There is no need for more retail shops and restaurants. The residents are happy with the existing level of shops, restaurants food stalls and cycle parking. It is not plausible that creating more 'retail uses' is sufficient reason for the council to argue that the plan will benefit residents.

The plan is too extensive; student dorms, affordable housing, office buildings and retail are all included . The area will be completely changed for the worse and overloaded.

The current standard of the environment is very good and valued and treasured by all. There is no need to regenerate the area and other areas are in much more need of regeneration and which would benefit more from them.

For the sake of the existing environmental and atmospheric settings in Canada Water and the zero non-monetary value of this project in regenerating the area, we do not support this extensive development plan.

### 141 Montreal House

The current area is already sufficiently populated with large numbers of council housing tenants in SE16 and the surrounding area, and vast number of private residential buildings recently built in Canada Water. The existing facilities (tube station, shopping centre) are being used to capacity already. During busy hours they are extremely congested and full to capacity.

Despite daily cleaning by the council, there is much litter on the pedestrian areas and in the river. Children and teenagers loiter / play football in the area afternoon / evenings. The influx of students and more temporary residents will overload the environment and create further annoyance to the lifestyle of permanent residents, mostly working professionals who fully follow law and order and respect the neighbourhood and environment.

Canada Water is known as a quieter neighbourhood and the environment is the unique selling point of the area. The use by currently vendors (e.g. Decathlon, printing company and retail area) has been fine and the balance between residential and retail / non-residential use is optimal; there is no need either socially or ecologically to transform the place into a busy area. The applicant has no benefit to the natural or social environment apart from social gain. The Council should consider the longer term environmental and social impact of the project on the area and consider withdrawing the plan.

### **Supports**

#### Councillors David Hubber, Lisa Rajan and Paul Noblet (Surrey Docks Ward)

We believe the proposed development is a suitable one for the site and could bring both employment and economic activity to the area.

We have had a presentation made to us and have been present when presentations have been made to, for example, the Bermondsey and Rotherhithe Community Council.

Reaction from local residents has been very positive and we are happy to support the application, subject to any appropriate conditions.

#### Rotherhithe Area Housing Forum

The forum met with a representative of the College who gave a detailed explanation and showed the forum the plans for the application. The forum delegates agreed unanimously to back the plans for the site when it goes to Planning Committee.

#### 21 Farrins Rents

Fully support the application. The use is very appropriate and Kings College will help regenerate and bring variety to the area. Local shops and businesses can only benefit and the large number of people studying on the site and employed during the day will bring renewed life and diversity to the area.

The proposed design is quite suitable and will fit in with existing nearby developments. In particular we are satisfied that the proposed height of the development will not adversely affect its neighbours. If we have one reservation it is that insufficient provision is being made for additional retail outlets from which local residents might benefit as much as staff and students on campus.

#### 20 Walker House, Odessa Street

Strongly support the application in principle, which irrespective of the wider masterplan for the printworks will bring variety and liveliness to the surrounding area. I like the concept of distinctive student houses and the care given to the design detail of external facades and tree planting on and around the site;

There are concerns however, the quantum of affordable housing is tiny - only 33 units. The scheme claims to serve the local community as well as staff and students, with much talk of public realm and public open space. It is disappointing that all four gardens on the site are to be reserved for students. Could they be open to the general public during the day? The planning committee should press on these issues.

#### 17 Bywater Place

Wholeheartedly welcome the application. The retention of the mature trees is very welcome as it gives a more settled look to the development. It would bring a boost to the daytime economy, providing jobs for local people. The improvement of the retail offer in the area is also very welcome and will hopefully bring a different type of offer including independent shops.

This area is particularly empty during the day and the development will make a very welcome addition to the public realm. The interaction with the mature students and local population will be welcome. Opportunities for local charities to tap into the students for volunteering will work both ways, making it a rewarding place to live and study. Cannot see a single downside of granting planning permission and urge the council to grant consent.

#### 26 Toronto House

Kings College have contributed to the long term vision of the borough for many years. Support the application as it may provide the opportunity for Kings to invest in a new part of the borough and provide a long-term and strategic redevelopment to our local area. There are a number of points which should be considered:

- Security for the local community;
- Lighting for the new buildings and around the site for the local community;
- That the number of people can be supported within the local community and its infrastructure, i.e. transport and local services;
- That the building heights do not diminish the existing enjoyment of the surrounding buildings, particularly the direct neighbours;
- That any environmental concerns that may arise (eg. flora and fauna) are considered and addressed;
- That a strategic solution is presented for the office space to avoid empty, boarded up units.

Support the application as it may also provide additional opportunity in the future by Kings College to invest within our community.

### **Supports / comments**

#### **Alfred Salter Primary School**

- The school broadly welcomes the proposal. The current width restriction or an alternative should remain to ensure that delivery and other service vehicles cannot access the development using the road adjacent to the school entrance.
- Due to the retail outlets there may be need for some controlled parking measures in Quebec Way and Canada Street next to the school entrance to prohibit parking by commuters and shoppers. Parking next to the school gates or in the vicinity presents a real hazard for young pupils. It makes it very difficult for vehicular access by ambulances collecting and delivering pupils with complex needs.
- Careful thought should be given to the location of the retail units opposite the school gates. If they attracted car users, parking in this area would jeopardise pupil safety at the start and end of the day.
- The school would like clarification as to how close the retail units would be to the pedestrian footpath opposite the entrance to the school.
- The outdoor areas of the nursery and reception classrooms are an extension of the classrooms and are next to Quebec Way. We are concerned regarding overlooking of these spaces and understand there would be no balconies in this area, but request that the use of frosted glass or angled windows be considered.

#### **14 Wolfe Crescent**

Do not object to the overall plan but request that some of the hedges and trees be left as they are havens for birds, foxes and other wildlife. There also needs to be some provision for parking as the residents will have cars and motorcycles.

#### **Flat 7, James House, Wolfe Crescent**

The proposal raises a number of questions:

- Would there be traffic problems during the works and when the development is completed, particularly in Wolfe Crescent?
- How will the development affect sunlight to my property?
- How will the development affect the view of the sky from my property?
- What will the level of noise from the development be, during building works and once completed?
- Benefits to the community - could residents of Wolfe Crescent share the secure cycle parking? There is presently none for this building and theft and vandalism is a perpetual problem. It would be a benefit to have access to this and I ask that this be raised.

### Water Gardens resident

In principle support the arrival of a prestigious university like Kings which would be good for the area in terms of regeneration and improving the daytime economy, with provision of shops and cultural activities. It would bring a fresh energy to the area and raise the aspirations of young people and improve the retail offer. Do have some concerns however:

- Noise and behaviour of students. Residents could have to deal with increased noise in close proximity to dwellings. Noise management is a particular concern and the student accommodation should be located further away from the existing residential units. It should be revised by placing offices and teacher accommodation closer to existing residents with the students further away. Some sound barriers should be created between the students and existing residential units.
- There should be high levels of insulation within the student accommodation with no opening windows or terraces;
- The influx of people to the area, including the impact of the sites C and E proposal could lead to overcrowding, impacting on transport, quality of life, wildlife, green space and current services.
- It feels as if a lot of land is being given over to Kings and Sellar but with no investment for the local community. Do not see any investment in local schools, there are no nurseries and no property sporting facilities.

In conclusion am in overall favour of Kings coming to the area, but noise impact should be considered and limited so as not to make life impossible for local residents, and new developments should correspond with investment in the local area.

## APPENDIX 3

### List of Neighbour Consultees

#### Neighbour Consultee List for Application Reg. No. 13/AP/1429

<b>TP No</b>	TP/403-A	<b>Site</b>	FORMER MULBERRY BUSINESS PARK, LAND BOUNDED BY CANADA STREET, QUEBEC WAY AND HARMSWORTH QUAYS PRINT WORKS, LONDON SE16
<b>App. Type</b>	Full Planning Permission		

Date Printed	Address
10/06/2013	FLAT 4 DURELL HOUSE WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SN
10/06/2013	FLAT 5 DURELL HOUSE WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SN
10/06/2013	FLAT 2 DURELL HOUSE WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SN
10/06/2013	FLAT 3 DURELL HOUSE WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SN
10/06/2013	FLAT 8 DURELL HOUSE WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SN
10/06/2013	FLAT 9 DURELL HOUSE WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SN
10/06/2013	FLAT 6 DURELL HOUSE WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SN
10/06/2013	FLAT 7 DURELL HOUSE WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SN
10/06/2013	FLAT 11 MONKTON HOUSE WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SS
10/06/2013	FLAT 1 GORHAM HOUSE WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SP
10/06/2013	FLAT 9 MONKTON HOUSE WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SS
10/06/2013	FLAT 10 MONKTON HOUSE WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SS
10/06/2013	FLAT 4 GORHAM HOUSE WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SP
10/06/2013	FLAT 1 DURELL HOUSE WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SN
10/06/2013	FLAT 2 GORHAM HOUSE WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SP
10/06/2013	FLAT 3 GORHAM HOUSE WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SP
10/06/2013	FLAT 1 CARLETON HOUSE WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SL
10/06/2013	FLAT 2 CARLETON HOUSE WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SL
10/06/2013	FLAT 9 JAMES HOUSE WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SR
10/06/2013	FLAT 10 JAMES HOUSE WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SR
10/06/2013	1 GARTER WAY LONDON SE16 6XA
10/06/2013	2 GARTER WAY LONDON SE16 6XA
10/06/2013	FLAT 3 CARLETON HOUSE WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SL
10/06/2013	FLAT 4 CARLETON HOUSE WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SL
10/06/2013	FLAT 3 JAMES HOUSE WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SR
10/06/2013	FLAT 4 JAMES HOUSE WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SR
10/06/2013	FLAT 1 JAMES HOUSE WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SR
10/06/2013	FLAT 2 JAMES HOUSE WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SR
10/06/2013	FLAT 7 JAMES HOUSE WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SR
10/06/2013	FLAT 8 JAMES HOUSE WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SR
10/06/2013	FLAT 5 JAMES HOUSE WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SR
10/06/2013	FLAT 6 JAMES HOUSE WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SR
10/06/2013	FLAT 3 BALTIC COURT ARCHANGEL STREET LONDON SE16 6AB
10/06/2013	FLAT 4 BALTIC COURT ARCHANGEL STREET LONDON SE16 6AB
10/06/2013	FLAT 1 BALTIC COURT ARCHANGEL STREET LONDON SE16 6AB
10/06/2013	FLAT 2 BALTIC COURT ARCHANGEL STREET LONDON SE16 6AB
10/06/2013	FLAT 7 BALTIC COURT ARCHANGEL STREET LONDON SE16 6AB
10/06/2013	FLAT 8 BALTIC COURT ARCHANGEL STREET LONDON SE16 6AB
10/06/2013	FLAT 5 BALTIC COURT ARCHANGEL STREET LONDON SE16 6AB
10/06/2013	FLAT 6 BALTIC COURT ARCHANGEL STREET LONDON SE16 6AB
10/06/2013	FLAT 30 BALTIC COURT TIMBER POND ROAD LONDON SE16 6AU
10/06/2013	FLAT 31 BALTIC COURT TIMBER POND ROAD LONDON SE16 6AU
10/06/2013	FLAT 28 BALTIC COURT TIMBER POND ROAD LONDON SE16 6AU
10/06/2013	FLAT 29 BALTIC COURT TIMBER POND ROAD LONDON SE16 6AU
10/06/2013	FLAT 34 BALTIC COURT TIMBER POND ROAD LONDON SE16 6AU
10/06/2013	CHURCH OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION OF OUR LADY 2 ST ELMOS ROAD LONDON SE16 6SJ
10/06/2013	FLAT 32 BALTIC COURT TIMBER POND ROAD LONDON SE16 6AU
10/06/2013	FLAT 33 BALTIC COURT TIMBER POND ROAD LONDON SE16 6AU
10/06/2013	FLAT 3 MONKTON HOUSE WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SS
10/06/2013	FLAT 4 MONKTON HOUSE WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SS
10/06/2013	FLAT 1 MONKTON HOUSE WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SS
10/06/2013	FLAT 2 MONKTON HOUSE WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SS
10/06/2013	FLAT 7 MONKTON HOUSE WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SS
10/06/2013	FLAT 8 MONKTON HOUSE WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SS
10/06/2013	FLAT 5 MONKTON HOUSE WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SS

[illegible]



10/06/2013 6 HARDY CLOSE LONDON SE16 6RT  
 10/06/2013 3 HARDY CLOSE LONDON SE16 6RT  
 10/06/2013 4 HARDY CLOSE LONDON SE16 6RT  
 10/06/2013 UNIT A3 TORONTO HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AJ  
 10/06/2013 100 CHANNEL HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RH  
 10/06/2013 2B QUEBEC WAY LONDON SE16 7LB  
 10/06/2013 UNIT A1 TORONTO HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AJ  
 10/06/2013 11 HARDY CLOSE LONDON SE16 6RT  
 10/06/2013 12 HARDY CLOSE LONDON SE16 6RT  
 10/06/2013 1 HARDY CLOSE LONDON SE16 6RT  
 10/06/2013 10 HARDY CLOSE LONDON SE16 6RT  
 10/06/2013 1 STANHOPE CLOSE LONDON SE16 6RX  
 10/06/2013 2 STANHOPE CLOSE LONDON SE16 6RX  
 10/06/2013 6 HAWKE PLACE LONDON SE16 6RU  
 10/06/2013 7 HAWKE PLACE LONDON SE16 6RU  
 10/06/2013 5 STANHOPE CLOSE LONDON SE16 6RX  
 10/06/2013 6 STANHOPE CLOSE LONDON SE16 6RX  
 10/06/2013 3 STANHOPE CLOSE LONDON SE16 6RX  
 10/06/2013 4 STANHOPE CLOSE LONDON SE16 6RX  
 10/06/2013 9 HARDY CLOSE LONDON SE16 6RT  
 10/06/2013 1 HAWKE PLACE LONDON SE16 6RU  
 10/06/2013 7 HARDY CLOSE LONDON SE16 6RT  
 10/06/2013 8 HARDY CLOSE LONDON SE16 6RT  
 10/06/2013 4 HAWKE PLACE LONDON SE16 6RU  
 10/06/2013 5 HAWKE PLACE LONDON SE16 6RU  
 10/06/2013 2 HAWKE PLACE LONDON SE16 6RU  
 10/06/2013 3 HAWKE PLACE LONDON SE16 6RU  
 10/06/2013 167 MONTREAL HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AQ  
 10/06/2013 168 MONTREAL HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AQ  
 10/06/2013 165 MONTREAL HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AQ  
 10/06/2013 166 MONTREAL HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AQ  
 10/06/2013 UNIT B MONTREAL HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AQ  
 10/06/2013 UNIT C MONTREAL HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AQ  
 10/06/2013 169 MONTREAL HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AQ  
 10/06/2013 UNIT A MONTREAL HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AQ  
 10/06/2013 159 MONTREAL HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AQ  
 10/06/2013 160 MONTREAL HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AQ  
 10/06/2013 157 MONTREAL HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AQ  
 10/06/2013 158 MONTREAL HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AQ  
 10/06/2013 163 MONTREAL HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AQ  
 10/06/2013 164 MONTREAL HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AQ  
 10/06/2013 161 MONTREAL HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AQ  
 10/06/2013 162 MONTREAL HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AQ  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 2 1 TEREDO STREET LONDON SE16 7LW  
 10/06/2013 CANADA WATER LIBRARY 21 SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AR  
 10/06/2013 UNIT 300 EDEN HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RH  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 1 1 TEREDO STREET LONDON SE16 7LW  
 10/06/2013 UNIT 1A QUEBEC INDUSTRIAL ESTATE QUEBEC WAY LONDON SE16 7LF  
 10/06/2013 CAFE CANADA WATER LIBRARY 21 SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AR  
 10/06/2013 555 GIVERNY HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RL  
 10/06/2013 103B CHANNEL HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RF  
 10/06/2013 UNIT C QUEBEC INDUSTRIAL ESTATE QUEBEC WAY LONDON SE16 7LF  
 10/06/2013 7 STANHOPE CLOSE LONDON SE16 6RX  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 3 AMHERST HOUSE WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SH  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 4 AMHERST HOUSE WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SH  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 1 AMHERST HOUSE WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SH  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 2 AMHERST HOUSE WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SH  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 1 SAUNDERS HOUSE CANADA STREET LONDON SE16 6SW  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 2 SAUNDERS HOUSE CANADA STREET LONDON SE16 6SW  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 5 AMHERST HOUSE WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SH  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 6 AMHERST HOUSE WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SH  
 10/06/2013 22 WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SF  
 10/06/2013 23 WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SF  
 10/06/2013 20 WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SF  
 10/06/2013 21 WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SF  
 10/06/2013 26 WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SF  
 10/06/2013 27 WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SF  
 10/06/2013 24 WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SF  
 10/06/2013 25 WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SF  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 22 BALTIC COURT TIMBER POND ROAD LONDON SE16 6AU  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 23 BALTIC COURT TIMBER POND ROAD LONDON SE16 6AU  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 20 BALTIC COURT TIMBER POND ROAD LONDON SE16 6AU  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 21 BALTIC COURT TIMBER POND ROAD LONDON SE16 6AU  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 26 BALTIC COURT TIMBER POND ROAD LONDON SE16 6AU  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 27 BALTIC COURT TIMBER POND ROAD LONDON SE16 6AU  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 24 BALTIC COURT TIMBER POND ROAD LONDON SE16 6AU  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 25 BALTIC COURT TIMBER POND ROAD LONDON SE16 6AU  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 5 SAUNDERS HOUSE CANADA STREET LONDON SE16 6SW  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 6 SAUNDERS HOUSE CANADA STREET LONDON SE16 6SW

10/06/2013	FLAT 3 SAUNDERS HOUSE CANADA STREET LONDON SE16 6SW
10/06/2013	FLAT 4 SAUNDERS HOUSE CANADA STREET LONDON SE16 6SW
10/06/2013	FLAT 18 BALTIC COURT TIMBER POND ROAD LONDON SE16 6AU
10/06/2013	FLAT 19 BALTIC COURT TIMBER POND ROAD LONDON SE16 6AU
10/06/2013	FLAT 7 SAUNDERS HOUSE CANADA STREET LONDON SE16 6SW
10/06/2013	FLAT 17 BALTIC COURT TIMBER POND ROAD LONDON SE16 6AU
10/06/2013	28 MIDDLETON DRIVE LONDON SE16 6RZ
10/06/2013	4 MIDDLETON DRIVE LONDON SE16 6RZ
10/06/2013	24 MIDDLETON DRIVE LONDON SE16 6RZ
10/06/2013	26 MIDDLETON DRIVE LONDON SE16 6RZ
10/06/2013	1 WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SF
10/06/2013	2 WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SF
10/06/2013	6 MIDDLETON DRIVE LONDON SE16 6RZ
10/06/2013	8 MIDDLETON DRIVE LONDON SE16 6RZ
10/06/2013	14 MIDDLETON DRIVE LONDON SE16 6RZ
10/06/2013	16 MIDDLETON DRIVE LONDON SE16 6RZ
10/06/2013	10 MIDDLETON DRIVE LONDON SE16 6RZ
10/06/2013	12 MIDDLETON DRIVE LONDON SE16 6RZ
10/06/2013	20 MIDDLETON DRIVE LONDON SE16 6RZ
10/06/2013	22 MIDDLETON DRIVE LONDON SE16 6RZ
10/06/2013	18 MIDDLETON DRIVE LONDON SE16 6RZ
10/06/2013	2 MIDDLETON DRIVE LONDON SE16 6RZ
10/06/2013	14 WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SF
10/06/2013	15 WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SF
10/06/2013	12 WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SF
10/06/2013	13 WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SF
10/06/2013	18 WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SF
10/06/2013	19 WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SF
10/06/2013	16 WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SF
10/06/2013	17 WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SF
10/06/2013	5 WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SF
10/06/2013	6 WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SF
10/06/2013	3 WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SF
10/06/2013	4 WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SF
10/06/2013	10 WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SF
10/06/2013	11 WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SF
10/06/2013	8 WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SF
10/06/2013	9 WOLFE CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6SF
10/06/2013	FLAT 37 BASQUE COURT GARTER WAY LONDON SE16 6XD
10/06/2013	7 CYPRESS HOUSE 5 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YQ
10/06/2013	8 CYPRESS HOUSE 5 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YQ
10/06/2013	5 CYPRESS HOUSE 5 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YQ
10/06/2013	6 CYPRESS HOUSE 5 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YQ
10/06/2013	2 POPLAR HOUSE 11 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YJ
10/06/2013	3 POPLAR HOUSE 11 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YJ
10/06/2013	9 CYPRESS HOUSE 5 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YQ
10/06/2013	1 POPLAR HOUSE 11 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YJ
10/06/2013	9 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YN
10/06/2013	10 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YN
10/06/2013	7 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YN
10/06/2013	8 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YN
10/06/2013	3 CYPRESS HOUSE 5 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YQ
10/06/2013	4 CYPRESS HOUSE 5 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YQ
10/06/2013	1 CYPRESS HOUSE 5 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YQ
10/06/2013	2 CYPRESS HOUSE 5 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YQ
10/06/2013	14 POPLAR HOUSE 11 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YJ
10/06/2013	15 POPLAR HOUSE 11 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YJ
10/06/2013	12 POPLAR HOUSE 11 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YJ
10/06/2013	13 POPLAR HOUSE 11 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YJ
10/06/2013	14 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YP
10/06/2013	15 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YP
10/06/2013	12 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YP
10/06/2013	13 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YP
10/06/2013	6 POPLAR HOUSE 11 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YJ
10/06/2013	7 POPLAR HOUSE 11 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YJ
10/06/2013	4 POPLAR HOUSE 11 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YJ
10/06/2013	5 POPLAR HOUSE 11 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YJ
10/06/2013	10 POPLAR HOUSE 11 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YJ
10/06/2013	11 POPLAR HOUSE 11 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YJ
10/06/2013	8 POPLAR HOUSE 11 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YJ
10/06/2013	9 POPLAR HOUSE 11 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YJ
10/06/2013	7 ROWAN HOUSE 3 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YF
10/06/2013	8 ROWAN HOUSE 3 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YF
10/06/2013	5 ROWAN HOUSE 3 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YF
10/06/2013	6 ROWAN HOUSE 3 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YF
10/06/2013	2 SPRUCE HOUSE 4 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YG
10/06/2013	3 SPRUCE HOUSE 4 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YG
10/06/2013	9 ROWAN HOUSE 3 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YF
10/06/2013	1 SPRUCE HOUSE 4 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YG

10/06/2013 FLAT 8 YEW HOUSE 2 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YH  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 9 YEW HOUSE 2 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YH  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 6 YEW HOUSE 2 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YH  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 7 YEW HOUSE 2 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YH  
 10/06/2013 3 ROWAN HOUSE 3 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YF  
 10/06/2013 4 ROWAN HOUSE 3 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YF  
 10/06/2013 1 ROWAN HOUSE 3 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YF  
 10/06/2013 2 ROWAN HOUSE 3 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YF  
 10/06/2013 14 SPRUCE HOUSE 4 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YG  
 10/06/2013 15 SPRUCE HOUSE 4 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YG  
 10/06/2013 12 SPRUCE HOUSE 4 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YG  
 10/06/2013 13 SPRUCE HOUSE 4 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YG  
 10/06/2013 18 SPRUCE HOUSE 4 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YG  
 10/06/2013 6 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YN  
 10/06/2013 16 SPRUCE HOUSE 4 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YG  
 10/06/2013 17 SPRUCE HOUSE 4 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YG  
 10/06/2013 6 SPRUCE HOUSE 4 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YG  
 10/06/2013 7 SPRUCE HOUSE 4 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YG  
 10/06/2013 4 SPRUCE HOUSE 4 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YG  
 10/06/2013 5 SPRUCE HOUSE 4 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YG  
 10/06/2013 10 SPRUCE HOUSE 4 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YG  
 10/06/2013 11 SPRUCE HOUSE 4 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YG  
 10/06/2013 8 SPRUCE HOUSE 4 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YG  
 10/06/2013 9 SPRUCE HOUSE 4 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YG  
 10/06/2013 16 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YP  
 10/06/2013 DAILY MAIL BUILDING SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 1PQ  
 10/06/2013 SURREY QUAYS LEISURE PARK SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 1LL  
 10/06/2013 THE MAST LEISURE PARK SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 1LL  
 10/06/2013 PIZZA HUT THE MAST LEISURE PARK SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 1LL  
 10/06/2013 6 SYCAMORE HOUSE 22 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YR  
 10/06/2013 7 SYCAMORE HOUSE 22 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YR  
 10/06/2013 4 SYCAMORE HOUSE 22 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YR  
 10/06/2013 5 SYCAMORE HOUSE 22 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YR  
 10/06/2013 10 SYCAMORE HOUSE 22 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YR  
 10/06/2013 11 SYCAMORE HOUSE 22 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YR  
 10/06/2013 8 SYCAMORE HOUSE 22 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YR  
 10/06/2013 9 SYCAMORE HOUSE 22 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YR  
 10/06/2013 19 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YP  
 10/06/2013 20 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YP  
 10/06/2013 17 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YP  
 10/06/2013 18 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YP  
 10/06/2013 2 SYCAMORE HOUSE 22 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YR  
 10/06/2013 3 SYCAMORE HOUSE 22 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YR  
 10/06/2013 21 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YP  
 10/06/2013 1 SYCAMORE HOUSE 22 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YR  
 10/06/2013 28 QUEBEC WAY LONDON SE16 7LF  
 10/06/2013 UNITS 16 TO 18 GROUND FLOOR AND FIRST FLOOR MULBERRY BUSINESS CENTRE QUEBEC WAY LONDON SE16 1LB  
 10/06/2013 1 TEREDO STREET LONDON SE16 7LW  
 10/06/2013 2 QUEBEC WAY LONDON SE16 7LQ  
 10/06/2013 UNITS 24 TO 27 MULBERRY BUSINESS CENTRE QUEBEC WAY LONDON SE16 1LB  
 10/06/2013 UNIT B QUEBEC INDUSTRIAL ESTATE QUEBEC WAY LONDON SE16 7LF  
 10/06/2013 CHRISTIAN PENTECOSTAL MISSION INTERNATIONAL UNIT 1 MULBERRY BUSINESS CENTRE QUEBEC WAY LONDON SE16 7LB  
 10/06/2013 UNIT 2A QUEBEC INDUSTRIAL ESTATE QUEBEC WAY LONDON SE16 7LQ  
 10/06/2013 12 SYCAMORE HOUSE 22 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YR  
 10/06/2013 13 SYCAMORE HOUSE 22 WOODLAND CRESCENT LONDON SE16 6YR  
 10/06/2013 ALFRED SALTER PRIMARY SCHOOL QUEBEC WAY LONDON SE16 7LP  
 10/06/2013 100 REDRIFF ROAD LONDON SE16 7LH  
 10/06/2013 24 QUEBEC WAY LONDON SE16 7LF  
 10/06/2013 26 QUEBEC WAY LONDON SE16 7LF  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 80 BASQUE COURT GARTER WAY LONDON SE16 6XE  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 81 BASQUE COURT GARTER WAY LONDON SE16 6XE  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 78 BASQUE COURT GARTER WAY LONDON SE16 6XE  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 79 BASQUE COURT GARTER WAY LONDON SE16 6XE  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 84 BASQUE COURT GARTER WAY LONDON SE16 6XE  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 85 BASQUE COURT GARTER WAY LONDON SE16 6XE  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 82 BASQUE COURT GARTER WAY LONDON SE16 6XE  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 83 BASQUE COURT GARTER WAY LONDON SE16 6XE  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 72 BASQUE COURT GARTER WAY LONDON SE16 6XE  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 73 BASQUE COURT GARTER WAY LONDON SE16 6XE  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 70 BASQUE COURT GARTER WAY LONDON SE16 6XE  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 71 BASQUE COURT GARTER WAY LONDON SE16 6XE  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 76 BASQUE COURT GARTER WAY LONDON SE16 6XE  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 77 BASQUE COURT GARTER WAY LONDON SE16 6XE  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 74 BASQUE COURT GARTER WAY LONDON SE16 6XE  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 75 BASQUE COURT GARTER WAY LONDON SE16 6XE  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 96 BASQUE COURT GARTER WAY LONDON SE16 6XE  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 97 BASQUE COURT GARTER WAY LONDON SE16 6XE  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 94 BASQUE COURT GARTER WAY LONDON SE16 6XE

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

10/06/2013 QUINCEYS THE MAST LEISURE PARK SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7LL  
10/06/2013 FATTIE ARBUCKLES THE MAST LEISURE PARK SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7LL  
10/06/2013 554 GIVERNY HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RL  
10/06/2013 562 GIVERNY HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RL  
10/06/2013 552 GIVERNY HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RL  
10/06/2013 553 GIVERNY HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RL  
10/06/2013 UNITS 14 TO 18 FIRST FLOOR MULBERRY BUSINESS CENTRE QUEBEC WAY LONDON SE16 7LB  
10/06/2013 UNITS 14 TO 18 GROUND FLOOR MULBERRY BUSINESS CENTRE QUEBEC WAY LONDON SE16 7LB  
10/06/2013 THE MAST LEISURE PARK TEREDO STREET LONDON SE16 1LW  
10/06/2013 GALA BINGO THE MAST LEISURE PARK SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 1LL  
10/06/2013 UCI CINEMA THE MAST LEISURE PARK SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7LL  
10/06/2013 UNIT 24 MULBERRY BUSINESS CENTRE QUEBEC WAY LONDON SE16 7LD  
10/06/2013 691 PAVILLION HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RN  
10/06/2013 692 PAVILLION HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RN  
10/06/2013 682 PAVILLION HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RN  
10/06/2013 683 PAVILLION HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RN  
10/06/2013 604 PAVILLION HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RN  
10/06/2013 611 PAVILLION HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RN  
10/06/2013 602 PAVILLION HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RN  
10/06/2013 603 PAVILLION HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RN  
10/06/2013 601 PAVILLION HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RN  
10/06/2013 563 GIVERNY HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RL  
10/06/2013 564 GIVERNY HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RL  
10/06/2013 665 PAVILLION HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RN  
10/06/2013 681 PAVILLION HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RN  
10/06/2013 623 PAVILLION HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RN  
10/06/2013 644 PAVILLION HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RN  
10/06/2013 8 DRAKE CLOSE LONDON SE16 6RS  
10/06/2013 9 DRAKE CLOSE LONDON SE16 6RS  
10/06/2013 6 DRAKE CLOSE LONDON SE16 6RS  
10/06/2013 7 DRAKE CLOSE LONDON SE16 6RS  
10/06/2013 12 DRAKE CLOSE LONDON SE16 6RS  
10/06/2013 13 DRAKE CLOSE LONDON SE16 6RS  
10/06/2013 10 DRAKE CLOSE LONDON SE16 6RS  
10/06/2013 11 DRAKE CLOSE LONDON SE16 6RS  
10/06/2013 SECURITY LODGE SANTANDER ATM SURREY QUAYS LEISURE PARK SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7LL  
10/06/2013 1 DRAKE CLOSE LONDON SE16 6RS  
10/06/2013 SECURITY LODGE ABBEY NATIONAL ATM SURREY QUAYS LEISURE PARK SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7LL  
10/06/2013 4 DRAKE CLOSE LONDON SE16 6RS  
10/06/2013 5 DRAKE CLOSE LONDON SE16 6RS  
10/06/2013 2 DRAKE CLOSE LONDON SE16 6RS  
10/06/2013 3 DRAKE CLOSE LONDON SE16 6RS  
10/06/2013 FIRST FLOOR FLAT CHURCH OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION OF OUR LADY 2 ST ELMOS ROAD LONDON SE16 6SJ  
10/06/2013 14 DRAKE CLOSE LONDON SE16 6RS  
10/06/2013 612 PAVILLION HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RN  
10/06/2013 111 CHANNEL HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RF  
10/06/2013 112 CHANNEL HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RF  
10/06/2013 104 CHANNEL HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RF  
10/06/2013 105 CHANNEL HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RF  
10/06/2013 115 CHANNEL HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RF  
10/06/2013 116 CHANNEL HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RF  
10/06/2013 113 CHANNEL HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RF  
10/06/2013 114 CHANNEL HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RF  
10/06/2013 153 CHANNEL HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RF  
10/06/2013 154 CHANNEL HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RF  
10/06/2013 151 CHANNEL HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RF  
10/06/2013 152 CHANNEL HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RF  
10/06/2013 102 CHANNEL HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RF  
10/06/2013 103A CHANNEL HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RF  
10/06/2013 161 CHANNEL HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RF  
10/06/2013 162 CHANNEL HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RF  
10/06/2013 141 CHANNEL HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RF  
10/06/2013 142 CHANNEL HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RF  
10/06/2013 134 CHANNEL HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RF  
10/06/2013 135 CHANNEL HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RF  
10/06/2013 145 CHANNEL HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RF  
10/06/2013 146 CHANNEL HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RF  
10/06/2013 143 CHANNEL HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RF  
10/06/2013 144 CHANNEL HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RF  
10/06/2013 124 CHANNEL HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RF  
10/06/2013 125 CHANNEL HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RF  
10/06/2013 122 CHANNEL HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RF  
10/06/2013 123 CHANNEL HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RF  
10/06/2013 132 CHANNEL HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RF  
10/06/2013 133 CHANNEL HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RF  
10/06/2013 126 CHANNEL HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RF  
10/06/2013 131 CHANNEL HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RF  
10/06/2013 634 PAVILLION HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RN  
10/06/2013 635 PAVILLION HOUSE WATER GARDENS SQUARE LONDON SE16 6RN

[illegible]



[illegible]

[illegible]

10/06/2013 22 MONTREAL HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AN  
 10/06/2013 19 MONTREAL HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AN  
 10/06/2013 20 MONTREAL HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AN  
 10/06/2013 25 MONTREAL HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AN  
 10/06/2013 26 MONTREAL HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AN  
 10/06/2013 23 MONTREAL HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AN  
 10/06/2013 24 MONTREAL HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AN  
 10/06/2013 13 MONTREAL HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AN  
 10/06/2013 14 MONTREAL HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AN  
 10/06/2013 11 MONTREAL HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AN  
 10/06/2013 12 MONTREAL HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AN  
 10/06/2013 17 MONTREAL HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AN  
 10/06/2013 18 MONTREAL HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AN  
 10/06/2013 15 MONTREAL HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AN  
 10/06/2013 16 MONTREAL HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AN  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 41 TORONTO HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AJ  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 42 TORONTO HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AJ  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 39 TORONTO HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AJ  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 40 TORONTO HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AJ  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 45 TORONTO HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AJ  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 46 TORONTO HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AJ  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 43 TORONTO HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AJ  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 44 TORONTO HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AJ  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 33 TORONTO HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AJ  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 34 TORONTO HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AJ  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 31 TORONTO HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AJ  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 32 TORONTO HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AJ  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 37 TORONTO HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AJ  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 38 TORONTO HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AJ  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 35 TORONTO HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AJ  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 36 TORONTO HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AJ  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 57 TORONTO HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AJ  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 58 TORONTO HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AJ  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 55 TORONTO HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AJ  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 56 TORONTO HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AJ  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 61 TORONTO HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AJ  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 62 TORONTO HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AJ  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 59 TORONTO HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AJ  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 60 TORONTO HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AJ  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 49 TORONTO HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AJ  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 50 TORONTO HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AJ  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 47 TORONTO HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AJ  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 48 TORONTO HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AJ  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 53 TORONTO HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AJ  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 54 TORONTO HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AJ  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 51 TORONTO HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AJ  
 10/06/2013 FLAT 52 TORONTO HOUSE SURREY QUAYS ROAD LONDON SE16 7AJ  
 10/06/2013 Time and Talents St Marychurch Street London SE16  
 10/06/2013 via email x  
 10/06/2013 26 Wolfe Crescent London SE16  
 10/06/2013  
 20/06/1837 by e-mail  
 20/06/1837 by email  
 11/07/2013 Surrey Quays Road SE16  
 12/07/2013 C/O Tibbalds Planning and Urban Design 19 Maltings Place 169 Tower Bridge Road London SE1 3JB  
 12/07/2013 Newington House 237 Southwark Bridge Road London SE1 6NP  
 12/07/2013 Canada Water Retail Park Surrey Quays Road London SE16 2XU  
 20/06/1837 Spectrum Planning, Arqiva Hill Village Road Four Oaks Sutton Coalfield B75 5JJ  
 20/06/1837 QUEBEC WAY LONDON SE16 7LP  
 20/06/1837 by email  
 20/06/1837 17 Bywater place London SE16 5ND  
 20/06/1837 20 Walker House Odessa Street London SE16 7HD  
 20/06/1837 by email  
 20/06/1837 by email