Item No:	Classification:	Date:	Meeting Name:		
7	Open	17 September 2013	Planning Committee		
Report title:		Addendum	concultation recogness and		
		Late observations, further information.	consultation responses, and		
Ward(s) or groups affected:		Cathedrals			
From:		Head of Development Management			

PURPOSE

1 To advise Members of observations, consultation responses and further information received in respect of the following planning applications on the main agenda. These were received after the preparation of the report and the matters raised may not therefore have been taken in to account in reaching the recommendation stated.

RECOMMENDATION

2 That Members note and consider the late observations, consultation responses and information received in respect this item in reaching their decision.

FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION

- **3** Late observations, consultation responses, information and revisions have been received in respect of the following planning applications on the main agenda:
- 3.1 Item 6.1 SAMPSON HOUSE 64 HOPTON STREET SE1 9JH & LUDGATE HOUSE 245 BLACKFRIARS ROAD SE1 & RAILWAY ARCHES.
- 3.2 Following completion of the Case Officer Report, three further objections have been received. The main points of objection are summarised below.
- 3.3 Flat 8 Falcon Point The original toilets were closed due to anti-social behaviour. The re-provision of the public toilets will result in an adverse impact in terms of odour both from the toilets and from the cleaning products that will be used; this will be particularly relevant during the summer months when residents have their windows open. If developers are proposing shops and cafes along the street they will incorporate toilets of their own and the newly built station should have their own toilet if they don't already and the Tate Modern also has these facilities on each floor.

Officer Response – The development incorporates the re-provision of the toilet facilities which are a much needed facility in an area frequented by large numbers of tourists. The toilets will be provided and operated by the estate management company of the development and as such issues with regards to anti-social behaviour and odours can be effectively managed.

3.4 Jenny Jones AM, Green Party Member for London Assembly - Strongly oppose the application's proposal to fell the two mature plane trees (T16 & T17) at the top of Blackfriars Road. Both have a high amenity value and are protected by Tree Preservation Orders. The reasons given do not adequately justify the removal of these mature, large canopy trees which not only provide cooling during the summer and combat air pollution in this highly congested area, but they are cherished by commuters and local residents and play an important part in the character of this area. Also oppose the decision to accept cash in lieu of on-site affordable housing. Support the council's plans to build more council housing, but allowing 489 fully private luxury flats to be built in the north of the borough while building council housing elsewhere contravenes London Plan policy 3.9, which states that "communities mixed and balanced by tenure and household income should be promoted across London through incremental small scale as well as larger scale developments, which foster social diversity, redress social exclusion and strengthen communities". With the loss of existing social housing in the SE1 area due to Right to Buy and other reasons, this application and the council's wider approach to development risks worsening social divides and social exclusion in Southwark.

Officer Response - Trees T16 and T17 (London Plane) have a high amenity value and are protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). These trees are growing in steep planting beds at the top of Blackfriars Road. These are proposed for removal due to the re-grading of the steps to the Thames Path, to improve the pedestrian connection. Work was undertaken to consider whether they could be kept, however allowing their removal enables significantly improved access to the Thames Path. Their removal could therefore be justified provided that replacement planting is proposed to compensate. The scheme does include a significant number of new trees as part of the overall development. In terms of the applicant providing a commuted sum for the affordable housing provision, the Council recognises the importance of providing mixed and balanced communities, however point 2 of paragraph 3.74 of the London Plan sets out that a commuted sum may be acceptable if it would "better address priority needs, especially for affordable family housing". The acceptance of a commuted sum is likely to ensure more affordable family homes are built. The minimum commuted sum payment of £65m is very substantial and could deliver approximately 260 new homes, including land cost, which is considerably in excess of what could be provided on site. Accordingly, the acceptability of a commuted sum payment is based on the specific merits of this proposal taking account of all the material considerations highlighted above. This issue is addressed in the main report at paragraphs 97-141.

3.5 Cllr James Barber

Report makes no reference to the Bankside, Borough and London Bridge SPD objective to reconnect Upper Ground to Hopton Street/Holland Street as part of the redevelopment of opportunity sites.

Most of the Thames Path was funded by cycling budgets including Blackfriars and Westminster underpasses. But the Thames riverside Path is no longer suitable for cycling due to the very high pedestrian volume.

The alternative around this particular site for cyclists is extremely sub standard. Diversion along Southwark Street and Blackfriars Road to link Hopton Street with Upper Ground. A route so substandard few use it but instead stick to main roads or the riverside now pedestrian route causing significant angst and issues.

Ignoring the BBLB draft SPD desire to properly relink Hopton Street with Upper Ground is a once in a 200 year opportunity that would be lost to improve the lot of cyclists and pedestrians. Relinking for pedestrians and cyclists the Southbank and Tate would also make the site much more desirable for visitors and residents.

Without this direct link would hope the recommendation would be to refuse permission.

Officer response - The report does make a number of references to the BBLB SPD, although noting that it could be given limited weight due to its draft status, but also because it is unlikely to be adopted in its current form due to the later work on the Neighbourhood Plan and the Blackfriars Road SPD. There is no specific reference in the draft BBLB SPD to the Sampson and Ludgate site, and the indicative links across from the 1 Blackfriars site are described as pedestrian links.

The potential for a cycle route linking to Upper Ground has been discussed with the applicant and options considered. However, there is a significant level difference ebtween Blackfriars Road and the ground level below the railway viaduct which makes it difficult to accommodate a reasonable gradient across the site. Any design also needs to take into account the Listed wall coming off the bridgehead, and particularly the protected Plane trees. However, there would be clear benefits in providing access for cyclists from Upper Ground to Sumner Street/Park Street, and the applicant has been asked to carry out further work to view all reasonable options. This issue will remain under discussion with TfL and the Mayors Cycling Advisor during Stage 2.

3.6 It is therefore recommended that an additional condition be imposed as follows:

The development shall not commence until the developer has carried out a further appraisal of all options to create an east-west cycle route across the site, linking Upper Ground to Hopton Street/Sumner Street, and submitted an appraisal of the options to the Council. Any agreed cycle route scheme shall thereafter be carried out and made available to users prior to the occupation of any residential units within buildings Sampson B or Sampson C.

Reason

In order that the development provides improved facilities to encourage cycling as a sustainable form of transport, in accordance with Policy 6.9 'Cycling' of the London Plan 2011, and saved policy 5.3 'Cycling' of the Southwark Plan 2007.

3.7 <u>Conclusion of the Director of Planning</u>

The issues raised in the objections have been considered by officers and are addressed in the main report. Subject to the imposition of the additional condition relating to the cycle route, no new matters have been raised which would affect the recommendation, which remains that planning permission be granted subject to referral to the Mayor and completion of a S106 agreement.

REASON FOR LATENESS

4. The comments reported above have all been received since the agenda was printed. They all relate to an item on the agenda and Members should be aware of the objections and comments made.

REASON FOR URGENCY

5. Applications are required by statute to be considered as speedily as possible. The application has been publicised as being on the agenda for consideration at this meeting of the sub-committee and applicants and objectors have been invited to attend the meeting to make their views known. Deferral would delay the processing of the applications/enforcements and would inconvenience all those who attend the meeting

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Individual files	Chief Executive's Department 160 Tooley Street	Planning enquiries telephone: 020 7525 5403
	London SE1 2QH	

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Simon Bevan, Director of Planning					
Report Author	Terence McLellan, Team Leader					
Version	Final					
Dated	8 October 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 of Environment and Leisure		No	No			
Strategic Director of Housing and Community Services		No	No			
Director of Regeneration		No	No			
Date final report	sent to Constitu	utional Team	8 October 2013			