

Item No. 8.1	Classification: OPEN	Date: 11 March 2014	Meeting Name: Planning Sub-Committee A
Report title:	Development Management planning application: Application 13/AP/0058 for: Full Planning Permission Address: CAR PARK, 5-11 POPE STREET, LONDON SE1 Proposal: Change of use from a car park (Sui Generis) to residential (Use Class C3) involving the demolition of the existing 3 metre high fence and the erection of a four storey terrace comprising 5 single dwellings.		
Ward(s) or groups affected:	Grange		
From:	Head of Development Management		
Application Start Date 19/02/2013		Application Expiry Date 16/04/2013	
Earliest Decision Date 30/03/2013			

RECOMMENDATION

- 1 To grant planning permission subject to condition.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Site location and description

- 2 The site lies within an historic industrial area which is becoming increasingly residential. It is mainly an area of four and occasionally five storey buildings and narrow streets. The application site is occupied by a single storey building, which is significantly lower in the local townscape on Pope Street.
- 3 The site is designated as falling within an air quality management area, urban density zone, archaeological priority zone and the Bermondsey Street conservation area.

Details of proposal

- 4 It is proposed to demolish the existing three-metre high fence for the secured car park and to construct a four storey terrace consisting of 5 dwellings.
- 5 In the nineteenth century the site itself was a terrace of 12 houses. In the early twentieth century 4 of these were replaced by the warehouse building at the back of 54 Tanner Street. The proposed 5 houses would therefore be located where 8 houses were sited until the 1950's.

Planning history

- 6 92/00137: A planning application for the erection of a 3m high fence around the private car park together with the construction of light weight security cage was approved in 1992.

Planning history of adjoining sites

- 7 64 Tanner Street:
11-AP-3322: Planning permission granted in December 2011 for an additional bedroom at first floor level together with an additional new dormer. This has not been implemented.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Summary of main issues

- 8 The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:
- a) the impact on amenity of neighbouring properties and future occupiers
 - b) scale and design of the proposed building
 - c) the impact on the character and appearance of the Bermondsey Street Conservation Area;
 - d) the impact on highway and pedestrian safety

Planning policy

- 9 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
- 6. Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes
 - 7. Requiring good design
 - 10. Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- 10 London Plan 2011
- Policy 3.3 - Increasing housing supply
 - Policy 3.4 - Optimising housing potential
 - Policy 3.5 - Quality and design of housing developments
 - Policy 3.8 - Housing choice
 - Policy 5.2 - Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
 - Policy 5.3 - Sustainable design and construction
 - Policy 5.7 - Renewable energy
 - Policy 5.12 - Flood risk management
 - Policy 6.5 - Funding Crossrail and other strategically important transport infrastructure
 - Policy 6.9 - Cycling
 - Policy 6.10 - Walking
 - Policy 6.11 - Smoothing traffic flow and tackling congestion
 - Policy 8.3 - Community infrastructure levy
- 11 Core Strategy 2011
- 2 Sustainable Development
 - 5 Providing New Homes
 - 7 Family Homes
 - 12 Design and Conservation
 - 13 High Environmental Standards
- 12 Southwark Plan 2007 (July) - saved policies

The Council's cabinet on 19 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.

- 3.2 Protection of amenity
- 3.4 Energy Efficiency
- 3.6 Air Quality
- 3.7 Waste reduction
- 3.9 Water
- 3.11 Efficient Use of Land
- 3.12 Quality in design
- 3.13 Urban Design
- 3.14 Designing out Crime
- 3.16 Conservation areas
- 3.19 Archaeology
- 4.2 Quality of residential accommodation
- 5.2 Transport Impacts
- 5.3 Walking and cycling
- 5.6 Car Parking
- 5.7 Parking Standards for Disabled People

- 13 Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)
Residential Design Standards 2011
Design and Access Statements SPD (2007) adopted
Sustainable Transport SPD (2008) adopted
Sustainability Assessment SPD (2007) adopted

Principle of development

- 14 The principle of replacing a car park with residential is acceptable in this location as there are no policies protecting a car park in this part of the borough. The change of use to residential is considered to be acceptable in principle.

Environmental impact assessment

- 15 The proposed development lies outside the scope of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 1999 and as such will not require the submission of an environmental impact assessment.

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

- 16 Saved policy 3.2 Protection of Amenity and strategic policy 13 High Environmental Standards states that the Council will not allow development where it leads to a loss of amenity for neighbours.
- 17 Given the close relationship with neighbouring properties, issues such as loss of light, overshadowing and loss of privacy have been considered. Historic maps show there was previously terraced housing on the site, although its height is not known.
- 18 Section 2.7 of the council's residential design standards SPD recommends a 25 degree loss of light test be undertaken for properties facing each other; where proposals would fail this test, a full daylight and sunlight study is required. The applicant has submitted the latter.

- 19 Neighbouring residents have raised concerns that the development will significantly impact on surrounding occupiers daylight and sunlight, particularly in 166 Tower Bridge Road and properties immediately to the east with Tanner Street house numbers. A daylight and sunlight report has been prepared for the application site, which assesses the proposed development against the building research establishments (BRE) guide 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight & Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice'. The report assesses the possible impacts upon windows at the following addresses: 166 and 168 Tower Bridge Road, 37 to 80 Purbrook Estate, 12 Pope Street and 60 to 68 Tanner Street.
- 20 In terms of daylight, the vertical sky component (VSC) method was used. The VSC calculates the amount of daylight reaching the outside face of the window. In considering the impact upon sunlight, the test is based upon a calculation of annual probable sunlight hours (APSH) which is an annual average based upon probability.
- 21 The BRE guidance explains that a property should retain a VSC level of at least 27%, in order to confirm that diffused daylighting remains satisfactory. Should a property receive a VSC level of less than 27% following construction of a new development, then the proposed VSC should not be less than 0.8 times its former (existing) value, if the reduction in daylight is to remain unnoticeable.
- 22 Nine windows at 166 and 168 Tower Bridge Road achieve a VSC score of both less than 27% and less than 0.8 times the former value. The BRE guide however acknowledges that if an existing building stands close to the common boundary a higher degree of obstruction may be unavoidable and that alternative targets may be applied. Such alternative VSC targets are derived by calculating the level of light that the window would achieve if obstructed by a hypothetical 'mirror-image' of the existing neighbouring building, an equal distance away from the boundary. In this case, the centre line of Pope Street is taken as the boundary line. The study shows that all windows which do not satisfy the conventional 27% and 0.8 criteria surpass the alternative VSC target.
- 23 Some windows at 37 to 80 Purbrook Estate also do not pass the VSC test. As these windows are obstructed by overhanging balconies even a modest obstruction opposite may result in a large relative impact on the VSC. The BRE guide explains that in such cases an additional calculation may be carried out assuming that the balconies do not exist. If the windows meet the targets on this basis then this confirms that it is the balcony that prevents the targets from being met as opposed to an unreasonable level of obstruction caused by the development. The windows at 37 to 80 Purbrook Estate pass the VSC test without the overhanging balconies in place.
- 24 All windows at the other properties pass the standard VSC criteria. The proposed development therefore satisfies the BRE daylight requirements.
- 25 The sunlight test only needs to be carried out if the window faces affected within 90 degrees of due south. All such windows pass both the total annual sunlight hours test and the winter sunlight hours test.
- 26 Number 12 Pope Street is in residential use and does not have any windows in its flank wall facing the site. It does have a garden at the side which adjoins the rear of the site, although the orientation of the site is such that shadow would be cast away from this garden throughout most of the day. The daylight and sunlight study concludes that the proposed development satisfies the BRE overshadowing to gardens and open spaces requirements.
- 27 A number of residents have raised concerns regarding the impact upon their privacy

as a result of the proposed development. Southwark's residential design standards SPD states that developments should retain a distance of at least 12 metres across highways and 21 metres to the rear between residential blocks.

- 28 Opposite the development across Pope Street there are the mixed use developments of 166 and 168 Tower Bridge Road. Both these buildings are five storeys. The area around the site is characterised by a narrow historical street layout, with Tanner Street, Riley Road, Purbrook Street, Stevens Street, Newhams Row and Brunswick Court all exhibiting street widths less than 12m. One of the narrowest of these streets is Pope Street, with distances between facades on the street being between approximately between 6.2 and 6.9 metres.
- 29 Where there are any habitable room windows that appear in opposite facades, these have been arranged to minimise instances of conflict, and as far as possible, habitable windows do not appear directly opposite neighbouring windows. In light of the existing character to streets in this area, the distance across the street is considered to be acceptable.
- 30 The ground floor of 166 Tower Bridge Road is in commercial use and only has two windows on the eastern elevation. This floor has planning permission to be used as A1/A2/B1 and it is not considered that the proposed development would have a detrimental impact on such uses.
- 31 The windows on the upper floors on the eastern elevation of 166 Tower Bridge Road provide openings to eight single aspect flats, four in either side of a central staircase facing the site.
- 32 The proposed development would lead to the greatest feeling of enclosure to the flats on the first floor and second floors of both 166 and 168 Tower Bridge Road. The roof of the proposed building, being a saw tooth shape, would only obscure part of the third floor flats and views from the fourth floor flats would be above the proposed development.
- 33 It is concluded that even if the proposed building were to be one floor lower the impact on the first floor flats at 166 and 168 Tower Bridge Road would be very similar to the proposed scheme. On balance, it is considered that the height of the proposed scheme is appropriate in this urban context.
- 34 The proposed first floors of the new houses would comprise open plan kitchen / living / dining areas whilst the lower floors would comprise hallways, garages, and WCs. The second and third floors would comprise bedrooms. The first floors would therefore have the most potential to impact on the amenity of the flats on the opposite / east side of Pope Street. The floor level of the proposed first floors would however be below the floor level of the flats on the first floor of 166 Tower Bridge Road. This would minimise mutual overlooking. In addition to this the windows between these properties are off-set and not located directly opposite each other. The proposed timber slats at first and second floors would also prohibit overlooking and the box window design would only allow oblique views from within the development along the street.
- 35 Objectors raised concerns that in the event of a dwelling being used as house in multiple occupation (HMO) the above would not be adequate to prevent mutual overlooking and requested that all windows on the west elevation be obscured glazed. Officers however do not consider that this is necessary and that the scheme in its current form would not lead to mutual overlooking between the proposed dwellings and the existing flats directly opposite.

- 36 Given the limited width of Pope Street the development will naturally have a closer proximity to neighbouring properties on the other side of the street, if it is to follow the established urban grain of development in the area, with the building set on the back of pavement line. The applicant has however sought to address possible overlooking concerns, through a sensitive window arrangement, that responds to the location of windows on the opposite side of Pope Street. Although windows will have a closer proximity than 12 metres to neighbouring properties it is not considered that there is any significant adverse impact upon the privacy of adjoining occupiers as a result of the development, which follows the established street character and urban grain of the area.
- 37 Nos. 60-68 Tanner Street comprise five properties which adjoin the site at the rear (east) and have kitchen / dining rooms right up against the boundary. The existing 4.57m high parapet wall on the western boundary would not be altered by the proposed development. This wall would safeguard 60-68 Tanner Street, which have glazed roofs to part of their rear elevations, from being overlooked from the proposed rear terraces at first floor level of the proposed houses A, B, C and D.
- 38 Number 12 Pope Street is in residential use and does not have any windows in its flank wall facing the site. It does however have a garden at the side which adjoins the rear of the site. House E, the proposed end house closest to number 12 would have terraces at first and third floor. Any potential of overlooking of the adjoining gardens from these terraces can be addressed by a privacy screen and secured by condition.
- 39 Nos.160-164 Tower Bridge Road is a six storey building located to the south west of the site. The upper floors of this building are in residential use and are understood to serve bedrooms and bathrooms. Given that the east facing windows faces the site at an oblique angle it is considered that no significant loss of privacy would occur. The proximity of this building and the separation distance from the site would also ensure that occupiers would not be affected by a feeling of enclosure.
- 40 There are no concerns regarding the impact upon the three storey building at 1-4 Pope Street which is located directly to the north as it is in office use. The rear of the proposed building would align with the two lower rear floors of this property therefore limited loss of light and overshadowing would occur. As the north elevation of the proposed building would be a blank facade with no windows the balcony to the rear elevation of 1-4 Pope Street would not experience any loss of privacy through overlooking.
- 41 The third storey of 1-4 Pope Street also has a small set back on the front elevation, but the projection of the proposed building beyond this point would not have a significant impact on users of this office building.
- 42 Nos. 37-80 Purbrook Estate is a four storey block of flats located to the south of the site. The side elevation of house E, on the southern end of the new terrace of houses, would be approximately 12m from the front facade of this block of flats. Given the relationship between the side elevation of house E and the facade of 37-80 Purbrook Estate 12m is considered an adequate separation distance in this instance and no loss of privacy through overlooking would occur.
- 43 Air quality issues and mitigation measures with regards to construction dust will be dealt with by a construction environmental management plan condition.
- 44 Strategic Policy 7 of the Core Strategy highlights the importance of ensuring that all new development is of a high quality with good living conditions. Minimum floor area standards ensure an adequate amount of space is provided in residential development to achieve a pleasant and healthy living environment.

- 45 All units must incorporate design features to meet lifetime homes standards. The residential design SPD sets out minimum floor areas for different sized dwellings, including minimum room sizes. All proposed units meet the minimum standard with regard to the internal room sizes proposed and are considered to provide a good standard of accommodation. The overall unit sizes vary between 137 and 155m², which exceeds the minimum standards.
- 46 In terms of amenity space for new flats the residential design standards SPD requires this development to provide an adequate amount of useable outdoor amenity space. Site restrictions mean that the houses will only have an average of 16.7m² of amenity space in the form of balconies and terraces. On balance this is considered acceptable in this urban context close to central London.
- 47 With regards to protecting the future residents from possible poor air quality, no mitigation measures are deemed necessary as the predicted air quality contaminants in the locality are below the air quality objectives.
- 48 The noise environment in this location is relatively high and therefore mitigation measures/acoustic glazing will be required in order to ensure acceptable internal noise levels are achieved within the new dwellings. To ensure that adequate sound insulation is provided between the party wall elements of adjoining flats and neighbouring existing premises, these are to be designed and constructed to provide reasonable resistance to the transmission of sound sufficient to ensure that the party wall is constructed to meet a minimum of 5dB improvement compared with the Building Regulations standard. This will be secured by condition.

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

- 49 The surrounding area comprises a mix of uses and it is considered that the adjoining and nearby uses would not have a detrimental impact on the proposed development.

Transport issues

- 50 Strategic policy 2 sustainable transport of the core strategy and saved policies 5.2 Transport impacts and 5.3 Walking of the Southwark Plan aim to ensure that development do not have harmful traffic impacts and makes provision for sustainable forms of movement.
- 51 The transports impacts that could potentially arise from this development are increased pressure on-street parking, impact on the highway network and pedestrian safety.
- 52 The site has a public transport accessibility level (PTAL) of 3 and is located in the Grange controlled parking zone (CPZ).
- 53 Existing and proposed vehicular and pedestrian access to the site is from Pope Street. The proposal would alter vehicular access to the site from the highway by introducing 4 new dropped curbs to serve the proposed developments.
- 54 The footways on the relevant section of Pope Street are very narrow and there is no possibility of widening the footways as the physical distances between the opposite properties are minimal.
- 55 In this context the proposed development is not able to provide adequate driver visibility and pedestrian visibility. Drivers must be able to see 25 metres to the left and

right from a point 2.4 metres back from the carriageway which in all cases would be a point inside the garages and therefore obscured by walls. The access points to the garages have been amended by moving it forward, flush with the facade and increased in width to 2.5 metres. To generally manoeuvre into a garage of that size would require at least six metres of carriageway width (in this case from opposite the kerb), which is not achievable on the very narrow Pope Street.

- 56 Vehicles speeds on this section of highway are however very slow and both pedestrians and vehicle drivers will be aware of the narrow widths of the roads and the pavement. Highway users will also be aware of the possible hazards which may arise from the existing highway conditions. In this case, it is considered that on balance, notwithstanding the identified danger to highway and pedestrian safety users, it would not justify refusing the application on this issue alone.
- 57 Developments in areas with a medium TfL PTAL rating (3) are required to provide on site car parking in order to minimise overspill parking on the road network. In this instance a maximum of five off-street parking spaces are required. There is no objection to the provision of four off-street parking spaces.
- 58 Given that the site is located in a CPZ a restriction will be imposed by condition preventing any occupiers of this development being eligible for on-street parking permits. This would be required in order to prevent possible overspill parking from the development.
- 59 It is considered that vehicular trip generation by the proposed development is unlikely to have a significant impact on the surrounding highway network. The trip generation by the existing garage use is likely to be higher on a daily/ weekly level than the proposed residential use.
- 60 For this development provision for five cycles is required. Each house would provide 1 cycle parking space on the ground floor, which would be acceptable.
- 61 Two wheelie bins for each house, one for standard refuse and one for recycling, has been provided. This is acceptable and would meet the volumes required by Southwark's guidance.
- 62 An off street turning facility large enough to accommodate a refuse vehicle would not be able to be accommodated within the footprint of the development. Given the site constraints it is accepted that no off street serving facilities can be provided and that servicing and refuse collection will be undertaken from Pope Street. Given the nature of the proposed development and the central location of the bin stores it is unlikely that there will be many service vehicle movements associated with the proposed development or that refuse vehicles will be stationary in the highway for an extended period.

Design issues

- 63 The Council's saved design policies from the Southwark Plan and strategic policy 12 of the Core Strategy requires a good standard of design that is appropriate for its location. The key design issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the townscape and visual amenity.
- 64 In the context of the height, scale and massing of local buildings the principle of a four storey residential terrace is acceptable. Five dwellings would be an appropriate number in the context of this relatively short street and it is considered that the proposed development is a good opportunity to introduce a new terrace along this part of Pope Street. It is considered that on balance the development would be of a

good standard of design and that it would preserve the townscape.

Impact on character and setting of a listed building and/or conservation area

- 65 The site is situated just within the boundary of the Bermondsey Street conservation area and is historically mainly an industrial area with some areas of residential which are now increasing and beginning to dominate the area. It is mainly an area of four and occasionally five storey buildings and narrow streets. Only this site, which is one storey, is significantly lower in the local townscape on Pope Street.
- 66 Section 7 of the NPPF (2012) requires high quality design in developments. Indeed, paragraph 64 informs us that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions. Planning decisions, according to paragraph 58 should aim to ensure developments:
- will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;
 - establish a strong sense of place, using streetscapes and buildings to create attractive and comfortable places to live, work and visit;
 - optimise the potential of the site to accommodate development, create and sustain an appropriate mix of uses (including incorporation of green and other public space as part of developments) and support local facilities and transport networks;
 - respond to local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation;
 - create safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion; and
 - are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping.
- 67 No objection is raised to the proposed 4 storey building on Pope Street and the overall form with the rhythm of the gable, height (West Elevation) is acceptable. The basic material proposed for the terraces is brick, which is well suited to the conservation area.
- 68 It is considered that the proposal generally accords with the requirements of paragraphs 58 and 64 of the NPPF and complies with SP12 and saved policy 3.16 as it would preserve this part of the Bermondsey Street conservation area.

Impact on trees

- 69 None.

Planning obligations (S.106 undertaking or agreement)

- 70 Not required for a scheme of this size.

Sustainable development implications

- 71 The development proposes low energy design measures and solar thermal panels. As this is a new build the scheme would be required to achieve Level 4 of Code for Sustainable Homes. This will be covered by condition. No issues are therefore raised with regard to this element of the scheme.

Archaeology

- 72 Saved policy 3.19 of the Southwark Plan requires all applications within Archaeological Priority Zones to be accompanied by a desk-based assessment and an archaeological evaluation.
- 73 Archaeological work at the nearby Century House site has revealed remains in this area dating from the 12th century onwards, presumably associated, in some way, with Bermondsey Priory, as was. Significant features relating to post-medieval water management, presumably tanning, were also noted. This work has been undertaken too recently to be included in the desk-based assessment. However the broad conclusions of the document are still accurate.
- 74 It is recommended that a programme of archaeological evaluation works are undertaken on site prior to the commencement of development works. If any site investigation works are proposed these should be archaeologically monitored. A number of conditions are recommended if approved.

Community infrastructure levy (CIL)

- 75 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.
- 76 CIL is payable on the GIA of the new floor space created, approximately £29,428. (840.8m² x £35).

Flood risk

- 77 No issues raised and the Environment Agency has no objection as there is no sleeping accommodation on the ground floor.

Secure by design

- 78 The ground floor facade has been amended by providing timber garage doors with traditional square windows at a height of 1.5m and the front doors are now recessed by 1.78m. It is therefore considered that the scheme in its current form would improve community safety and crime prevention in accordance with saved Policy 3.14 Designing out crime of the Southwark Plan 2007.

Access

- 79 The council's policies aim to achieve access for all. In particular, saved policy 3.13 Urban design requires inclusive design. The provision of adequate access for people with disabilities is a material consideration.
- 80 The applicant states that all five houses will have wheelchair accessible level entrances and would meet building regulations part m. It is accepted that site restrictions makes it difficult for the houses to meet all Lifetime Homes standards, but it is likely that their generous sizes mean that they could be converted to suit a disabled user if necessary.

Conclusion on planning issues

- 81 In conclusion on daylight and sunlight impacts, it is clear that there are impacts on adjoining occupiers daylight as a result of the development, but that these are largely within the acceptable range of impacts set out in the BRE guidelines. The scale of the proposed development is acceptable for the area and in light of the existing site condition with a low rise single storey building, any development on this site for a more efficient use of the land, including an increased scale, will impact lighting levels to surrounding properties to some extent. Therefore it is considered that the benefits that this development scheme offers, including the provision of much needed housing at a suitable scale for the area, outweigh the minor impacts upon the lighting levels to a limited number of surrounding residential properties.
- 82 The scale of the terrace and the overall design would make a positive contribution to the street scene and to the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area. The amenity of future occupiers and neighbouring properties would not be compromised and appropriate conditions are imposed to ensure that no loss of privacy through overlooking would occur.
- 83 Although the proposed development is not able to provide adequate driver visibility and pedestrian visibility vehicles speeds on this section of highway are very slow and both pedestrians and vehicle drivers will be aware of the narrow widths of the roads and the pavement. In this case, it is considered that on balance, given the site specific factors relating to highway and pedestrian safety, it would not substantiate to refusing the application on this issue alone.
- 84 Standard conditions are imposed in terms of archaeology and no flood risk issues have been identified.

Community impact statement

- 85 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.
- a) The impact on local people is set out above.
- b) The following issues relevant to particular communities/groups likely to be affected by the proposal have been identified as none.
- c) The likely adverse or less good implications for any particular communities/groups have been also been discussed above.

Consultations

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

Consultation replies

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

Summary of consultation responses

- 88 Nine letters of objection have been received from neighbouring properties raising

concerns with regard to overdevelopment, design, impact on amenity and transport matters.

The Environment Agency has no objection.

The Environmental Protection Team has no objection subject to conditions.

The Archaeology officer has no objection subject to conditions.

The Transport Team has no objection.

Human rights implications

- 89 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.
- 90 This application has the legitimate aim of providing new dwellings in this location. 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

- 91 None

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Site history file: TP/79-B Application file: 13/AP/0058 Southwark Local Development Framework and Development Plan Documents	Chief executive's department 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH	Planning enquiries telephone: 020 7525 5403 Planning enquiries email: planning.enquiries@southwark.gov.uk Case officer telephone: 020 7525 5457 Council website: www.southwark.gov.uk

APPENDICES

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

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Gary Rice, Head of Development Management	
Report Author	Andre Verster, Team Leader Team East	
Version	Final	
Dated	16 January 2104	
Key Decision	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Strategic Director, Finance and Corporate Services	No	No
Strategic Director, Environment and Leisure	Yes	Yes
Strategic Director, Housing and Community Services	No	No
Director of Regeneration	No	No
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team	27 February 2014	

APPENDIX 1

Consultation undertaken

Site notice date: 5 March 2013

Press notice date: 7 March 2013

Case officer site visit date: 5 March 2013

Neighbour consultation letters sent: 6 March 2013

Internal services consulted:

Transport
Access officer
Environmental Protection
Public Realm

Statutory and non-statutory organisations consulted:

Environment Agency
English Heritage

Neighbours and local groups consulted:

FLAT 12 EXPORT HOUSE 168 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3LS
FLAT 11 EXPORT HOUSE 168 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3LS
FLAT 10 EXPORT HOUSE 168 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3LS
FLAT 13 EXPORT HOUSE 168 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3LS
FLAT 16 EXPORT HOUSE 168 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3LS
FLAT 15 EXPORT HOUSE 168 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3LS
FLAT 14 EXPORT HOUSE 168 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3LS
FLAT 5 EXPORT HOUSE 168 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3LS
FLAT 4 EXPORT HOUSE 168 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3LS
FLAT 3 EXPORT HOUSE 168 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3LS
FLAT 6 EXPORT HOUSE 168 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3LS
FLAT 9 EXPORT HOUSE 168 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3LS
FLAT 8 EXPORT HOUSE 168 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3LS
FLAT 7 EXPORT HOUSE 168 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3LS
168B TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3LS
FLAT 6 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 5 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 4 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 7 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 10 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 9 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 8 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 3 174 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3LS
FLAT 2 174 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3LS
FLAT 1 174 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3LS
FLAT 4 174 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3LS
FLAT 3 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 2 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 1 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 2 EXPORT HOUSE 168 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3LS
FLAT 2 170-172 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3LS
FLAT 1 170-172 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3LS
12 POPE STREET LONDON SE1 3PR
FLAT 3 170-172 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3LS
64 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DR

62 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DR
60 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DR
99 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DD
66 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DR
FLAT 9 51 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3PL
FLAT 8 51 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3PL
FLAT 7 51 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3PL
FLAT 10 51 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3PL
FLAT 1 EXPORT HOUSE 168 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3LS
168A TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3LS
51A TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3PL
FLAT 1 51 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3PL
68 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DR
FLAT 3 51 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3PL
FLAT 6 51 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3PL
FLAT 5 51 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3PL
FLAT 4 51 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3PL
FLAT 50 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 49 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 48 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
GROUND FLOOR 1-4 POPE STREET LONDON SE1 3PR
SECOND FLOOR 1-4 POPE STREET LONDON SE1 3PR
FIRST FLOOR 1-4 POPE STREET LONDON SE1 3PR
FLAT 43 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 42 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 41 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 44 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 47 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 46 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 45 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
1A POPE STREET LONDON SE1 3PH
FOURTH FLOOR RIGHT 54-58 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3PH
FOURTH FLOOR LEFT 54-58 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3PH
THIRD FLOOR REAR RIGHT 54-58 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3PH
BASEMENT AND GROUND FLOOR 170-172 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3LS
SECOND FLOOR FRONT RIGHT 54-58 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3PH
FIRST FLOOR RIGHT 54-58 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3PH
FIRST FLOOR LEFT 54-58 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3PH
SECOND FLOOR LEFT 54-58 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3PH
THIRD FLOOR LEFT 54-58 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3PH
THIRD FLOOR FRONT RIGHT 54-58 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3PH
SECOND FLOOR REAR RIGHT 54-58 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3PH
FLAT 40 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 20 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 19 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 18 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 21 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 24 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 23 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 22 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 13 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 12 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 11 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 14 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 17 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 16 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 15 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 25 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 35 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 34 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 33 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 36 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 39 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 38 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 37 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 28 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 27 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 26 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 29 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 32 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 31 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
FLAT 30 FLORIN COURT 70 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3DP
98 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DD
8 LUMIA LOFTS 160 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3FG
7 LUMIA LOFTS 160 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3FG
6 LUMIA LOFTS 160 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3FG
9 LUMIA LOFTS 160 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3FG
12 LUMIA LOFTS 160 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3FG
11 LUMIA LOFTS 160 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3FG

10 LUMIA LOFTS 160 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3FG
1 LUMIA LOFTS 160 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3FG
FLAT 6 166 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3LZ
FLAT 1 166 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3LZ
2 LUMIA LOFTS 160 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3FG
5 LUMIA LOFTS 160 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3FG
4 LUMIA LOFTS 160 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3FG
3 LUMIA LOFTS 160 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3FG
13 LUMIA LOFTS 160 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3FG
41 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
40 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
39 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
42 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
45 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
44 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
43 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
FLAT 2 166 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3LZ
164 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3FG
14 LUMIA LOFTS 160 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3FG
FLAT 16 166 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3LZ
38 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
37 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
51B TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3PL
FLAT 8 52 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3PH
FLAT 4 166 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD SE1 3LZ
FLAT 3 166 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD SE1 3LZ
FLAT 13 166 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD SE1 3LZ
FLAT 7 166 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD SE1 3LZ
FLAT 5 166 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD SE1 3LZ
FLAT 15 166 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD SE1 3LZ
FLAT 9 166 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD SE1 3LZ
166A TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3LZ
FLAT 8 166 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3LZ
FIRST FLOOR FLAT 174 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3LS
166B TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3LZ
FLAT 12 166 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD SE1 3LZ
FLAT 11 166 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD SE1 3LZ
FLAT 10 166 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD SE1 3LZ
1 BEVINGTON PATH LONDON SE1 3PW
FLAT 3 52 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3PH
FLAT 2 52 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3PH
FLAT 1 52 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3PH
FLAT 4 52 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3PH
FLAT 7 52 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3PH
FLAT 6 52 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3PH
FLAT 5 52 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3PH
FIRST TO SECOND FLOOR 47-49 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3PL
GROUND FLOOR 47-49 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3PL
FLAT 14 166 TOWER BRIDGE ROAD SE1 3LZ
FLAT 12 51 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3PL
50 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3XX
FLAT 11 51 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3PL
104 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DD
103 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DD
102 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DD
105 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DD
82 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DD
81 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DD
106 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DD
78 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
77 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
76 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
79 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
101 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DD
100 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DD
80 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
83 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DD
93 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DD
92 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DD
91 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DD
94 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DD
97 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DD
96 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DD
95 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DD
86 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DD
85 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DD
84 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DD
87 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DD
90 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DD

89 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DD
88 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DD
75 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
55 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
54 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
53 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
56 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
59 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
58 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
57 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
48 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
47 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
46 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
49 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
52 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
51 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
50 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
60 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
70 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
69 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
68 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
71 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
74 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
73 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
72 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
63 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
62 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
61 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
64 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
67 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
66 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
65 PURBROOK ESTATE TOWER BRIDGE ROAD LONDON SE1 3DA
68 Tanner Street SE1
FLAT 2 51 TANNER STREET LONDON SE1 3PL

Re-consultation:

None required

APPENDIX 2

Consultation responses received

Internal services

Transport:

Developments in areas with a medium TfL PTAL rating (3) are required to provide on site car parking in order to minimise overspill parking on the road network. In this instance a maximum of 5 off street parking spaces are required.

Given that the site is located in a CPZ a restriction will be imposed by condition preventing any occupiers of this development being eligible for on-street parking permits. This would be required in order to prevent possible overspill parking from the development.

The Council's sustainable transport Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) suggest that each disabled unit should have its own disabled parking space. Should any of the units be wheelchair accessible the relevant parking space will need conform to the following dimensions and criteria:

The bays must adhere to the dimensions as stated by the DfT in *Parking for Disabled People*:

The dimensions of off-street parking bays should provide a rectangle at least 4800mm long by 2400mm wide for the vehicle, along with additional space as follows:

- (a) where the bays are marked parallel to the access aisle and access is available from the side, an extra length of at least 1800mm, or
- (b) where the bays are marked perpendicularly to the access aisle, an additional width of at least 1200mm along each side. Where bays are adjacent, space can be saved by using the 1200mm "side" area to serve the bays on both sides (Figure 4).

The applicant should be aware that loading waiting restrictions operate in the area and that any contraventions will be enforced accordingly. The parking of any motorized vehicle on the public footway/footpath is also illegal and enforceable.

It is considered that Vehicular Trip generation by the proposed development is unlikely to have a significant impact on the surrounding highway network. The trip generation by the existing garage use is likely to be higher on a daily/ weekly level than the proposed residential use.

It is unlikely that the proposed development would give rise to the requirement to have double yellow lines along the west side of Pope Street.

Any new access from the highway must have the approval of the Highways Authority and will need to be funded by the developer. Although these works are approved in principle by the Highway Authority, no permission is granted to carry out these works until all necessary and appropriate design details have been submitted and agreed. Following the approval of any subsequent planning application the applicant is required to contact the Principal Engineer, Infrastructure Group (020 7525 5509), at least 4 months prior to any works commencing on the public highway.

The site just outside the CAZ so they would be fine (although not at all encouraged) to have parking. However, there are still a few problems with the current scheme design.

Firstly, adequate visibility is not provided. Drivers must be able to see 25m to the left and right from a point 2.4m back from the carriageway which in all cases would be a point

inside the garages and therefore obscured by walls. It only just achieved pedestrian visibility requirements.

Secondly, the access points to the garages are not quite 2.5m wide and to manoeuvre into a space that size would require at least 6m of carriageway width (in this case from opposite kerb to garage doors), which is not achievable on the very narrow Pope Street.

Access officer:

No comments received.

Environmental Protection:

The CERC AQ Scoping report (FM958, dated 10/12/2012) has been reviewed.

AQ issues and mitigation measures with regards to construction dust are expected to be considered and included within the construction environmental management plan (mentioned/conditioned below).

With regards to protecting the future residents from possible poor AQ, no mitigation measures are deemed necessary as the predicted AQ in the locality is below the AQ objectives. This conclusion is deemed acceptable.

The proposed redevelopment site is set back off Tower Bridge Road behind an existing row of housing and a short distance away from the main railway line into London Bridge to the NE. It is expected that the noise environment in this location is relatively high and therefore it is expected that mitigation measures/acoustic glazing will be required in order to ensure acceptable internal noise levels are achieved within the new dwellings. A noise report is requested by the applicant which measures the current noise climate, both day and night, and subsequently outlines what level of mitigation/glazing is required in order to achieve 'good' internal levels as set out in BS8233 guidance. Relevant condition attached below.

To ensure that adequate sound insulation is provided between the party wall elements of adjoining flats and neighbouring existing premises, it is requested that these be designed and constructed to provide reasonable resistance to the transmission of sound sufficient to ensure that the party wall is constructed to meet a minimum of 5dB improvement compared with the Building Regulations standard set out in Approved Document E. Relevant condition attached below.

The applicant has provided a site-check report. While providing some valuable data, this does not constitute an acceptable phase 1 desk study report. Given the current use of the site as a garage which has been operational for many a year, there is potential for contaminants to be present within the sub-surface layers. The historical use of the site may have also provided a legacy of contamination and therefore further risk assessments need to be made which forms a conceptual site model whereby possible source-pathway-receptor linkages are identified and assessed. Possible threats from ground gas and affect on proposed underground utility pipes need to be considered. Full contaminated land condition requested.

Given the scale of the planned redevelopment and the close proximity of numerous neighbouring existing residents, a full construction environmental management plan is requested from the applicant detailing all measures to be implemented to reduce the construction impact on the local area.

Archaeologist:

Archaeological work at the nearby Century House Site has revealed remains in this area dating from the 12th century onwards, presumably associated, in some way, with

Bermondsey Priory, as was. Significant features relating to post-medieval water management, presumably tanning, were also noted. This work has been undertaken too recently to be included in the desk-based assessment. However the broad conclusions of the document are still accurate.

It is recommended that a programme of archaeological evaluation works are undertaken on site prior to the commencement of development works. If any site investigation works are proposed these should be archaeologically monitored. The following conditions are recommended for any application:

Archaeological Evaluation:

Before any work hereby authorised begins, the applicant shall secure the implementation of a programme of archaeological evaluation works in accordance with a written scheme of investigation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order that the applicants supply the necessary archaeological information to ensure suitable mitigation measures and/or foundation design proposals be presented in accordance with Chapter 12, paragraph 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework, policy 12 of the Core Strategy 2011 and saved policy 3.19 of the Southwark Plan 2007

Archaeological Mitigation:

Before any work hereby authorised begins, excluding demolition, the applicant shall submit a written scheme of investigation for a programme of archaeological recording, which shall be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and implemented and shall not be carried out other than in accordance with any such approval given.

Reason: In order that the details of the programme of archaeological excavation and recording works are suitable with regard to the impacts of the proposed development and the nature and extent of archaeological remains on site in accordance with Chapter 12, paragraph 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework, policy 12 of the Core Strategy 2011 and saved policy 3.19 of the Southwark Plan 2007

Archaeological Reporting:

Within six months of the completion of archaeological site works, an assessment report detailing the proposals for post-excavation works, publication of the site and preparation of the archive shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and that the works detailed in this assessment report shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with any such approval given.

Reason: In order that the archaeological interests of the site are secured with regard to the details of the post-excavation works, publication and archiving to ensure the preservation of archaeological remains by record in accordance with Chapter 12, paragraph 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework, policy 12 of the Core Strategy 2011 and saved policy 3.19 of the Southwark Plan 2007

Archaeological Foundation Design:

Before any work hereby authorised begins, a detailed scheme showing the complete scope and arrangement of the foundation design and all ground works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with any such approval given.

Reason: In order that details of the foundations, ground works and all below ground impacts of the proposed development are detailed and accord with the programme of archaeological mitigation works to ensure the preservation of archaeological remains by record and in situ in accordance with Chapter 12, paragraph 141 of the National

Planning Policy Framework, policy 12 of the Core Strategy 2011 and saved policy 3.19 of the Southwark Plan 2007.

Public realm:

Any proposed lighting in the area should be agreed by LBS lighting department.

The developer will be required to enter into section 278 to undertake any highway works.

Statutory and non-statutory organisations

Environment Agency:

No objection.

English Heritage:

No need to be consulted.

Neighbours and local groups

Nine letters of objection have been received from flats 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 13, 166 Tower Bridge Road and 64, 66 and 68 Tanner Street raising the following concerns:

Context:

The proposed development is an infilling in a dense residential area much of which has been built in the last 12 years or so. The application refers in passing to the houses 60-68 Tanner Street part of a larger redevelopment of a London School Board property granted consent in the 1990s. Although the school itself was replaced by a 50 unit apartment building - Florin Court 70 Tanner Street - the former practical rooms on the far side of the playground were retained as part of the planning approval and were sympathetically refurbished as a terrace of 5 two storey houses with a rear single storey extension. These houses abut the east boundary of the car park site at 5-11 Pope Street. This is the context in which the present scheme should be considered.

Overdevelopment:

Object to the number of houses proposed on such a small plot.

The statement in 'Context: scale and form' that the proposed 4 storey houses step down at the back to relate to the adjoining 2 storey houses 64-68 Tanner Street is architect speak. The design is overbearing as the sections demonstrate given the extensive glazed rear roofs of the Tanner Street houses. These roofs provide the only daylight to the single storey extensions at their rear. The result would be a very serious and adversereduction to the amenity and living conditions of the Tanner Street houses.

The projecting bathroom accommodation in the design is especially intrusive and monolithic and is at least one storey too high. Overall the scheme represents a gross over-development of a very constricted plot.

Design:

Four storeys will be too high as Pope St. is a single lane road.

I think that four storeys is too high for the existing buildings directly next to it and will not enhance the area and Pope St. I think that two storey houses with character will be much better

It will tower over the Grade 1 listed single storey old school building directly backing onto this plot of land.

The top of the gables of the 5 houses should be no higher than the roof ridge of the next door building 1-4 Pope Street. The comparison made in the application with 54-58 Tanner Street ignores the stepping down of the existing roof line on the east side of Pope Street.

Street width:

I was very surprised by the application itself, simply because as far as I am aware, Southwark recommends that a distance of c. 12m has to be maintained between two housing units facing each other. However, you will see that Pope Street is very narrow and if you measure the width of the street, it is close to 7m and not 12m, which means that the east facing side of 166 Tower Bridge Road will be about 7m away only from the west facing side of these units, which means almost half the distance normally considered acceptable and recommended. Also, I was reading in some of the documentations uploaded on the website that the builder developer has already surveyed part of the neighbourhood; I would like to mention that I haven't been surveyed although every single window of my apartment will face the 2nd or 3rd floor of these houses.

The distance across Pope Street between the proposed new development and 166 TBR varies along the plan. As flat 3, 166 Tower Bridge Road are based on the north side of 166, our kitchen/living room would be situated at the narrowest point which is approximately 6m. The bedroom would be 6.5m in proximity.

The proposed plans violate the minimum recommended distance of 12m between buildings. This creates a problem of overlooking, loss of privacy, and disturbance. Both the bedroom and living areas of our flat (3, 166 Tower Bridge Road) would be impacted by this at only 6.5m and 6m distance from the windows of the terraced houses opposite.

Feeling of enclosure:

The new development is certain to create a feeling of entrapment in flat 3, 166 Tower Bridge Road given the elevation and proximity outlined above in section 1. It would likely be impossible to see any part of the sky from inside our property.

The proposed plan spans 35 meters along Pope Street. Our kitchen/living room windows would be positioned 14m from the northerly point of the site (in the approximate centre of the development, directly facing House C). Our property would be located directly in the centre of the proposed plan.

Due to the location, our view will be dominated solely by the buildings in both directions. Added to the issue of elevation, the building will dominate our property by taking up the entire view from all angles.

The proposed plan would be overly dominant causing a sense of enclosure thereby adversely affecting our standard of living.

Objection to the height of the proposed houses, given the affect it would have on 64 Tanner Street.

Loss of light and overshadowing:

A four storey terrace would take too much light from the flats in 166 Tower Bridge Road.

Taking into account the 7m distance on both side of Pope Str and taking into account that I live on the 2nd floor of 166 Tower Bridge Rd, east facing, I will basically have no more daylight anymore as not only the 5 housing units will be in front of my window but they will be actually above these windows which will block all possible light. I will then be forced to use lighting constantly in the apartment if I want to be seeing clear, not even mentioning the additional cost for me in terms of electricity bill and the cost for the

environment as well in terms of additional use of electricity.

The one-bedroom flat (flat 3, 166 Tower Bridge Road) is situated on the first floor of 166 TBR directly opposite the site. It is a single perspective residence, with two sets of easterly facing windows overlooking Pope Street. These windows are the only source of natural light for the entire property, one set supplying the bedroom and the other supplying an open-plan kitchen/living room.

Our windows are 4.5m above ground level, or 1.5 meters above the current car park building. With a proposed elevation / height of 12.5m for the new development, our flat would be 8 meters below the highest level.

The depth of the rooms at flat 3, 166 Tower Bridge Road, which depend on this natural light is of a particular concern. With a depth of 6.5m from window to kitchen wall, this room would be most severely impacted by the removal of natural light. It is a fair assumption that having no natural light in the back of the room would be detrimental to the kitchen function and potentially hazardous.

The glazed roofs of the single storey rear portion of the Tanner Street houses make up rather over half the width of each house. The drawing 'Context:overlooking' does not show the true extent of the roof glazing. The impact of the scheme would be a significant reduction in natural light.

The rear of 68 Tanner Street, closest to Pope street, has a glass roof which give the only natural light to the kitchen and living space. Having a structure of the height they propose would seem guaranteed to reduce this light. A building of 3 stories would seem to be more appropriate, both as relates the town houses as well as the other building on Pope Street in general.

Loss of privacy:

There will be no privacy for residents in 166 Tower Bridge Road or the proposed terrace as the single lane road (Pope St.) will mean that the existing flats and proposed houses will be only feet from each other and look directly into each others rooms.

Also, there will be no privacy for the Grade 1 listed single storey school building.

I think that two storey houses with character will be much better and leave light and privacy for the existing residents of the Old School Building and all of the flats at the rear of 166 Tower Bridge Rd.

Aside having no more daylight, I will also have no more privacy as every single of my windows will be exposed to these new houses, 7m from me. So basically, additionally to the fact of using lighting constantly, I will have to close my curtains even during the day if I want the slightest moment of privacy. In fairness as well, I am not sure how distressed one can become if one feels that a stranger can literally overlook any single of his/her room so easily.

It is request that the Council reject any windows facing 64 Tanner Street. Any windows should face in to Pope Street only. Otherwise, the house immediately at the back of 64 Tanner Street may be able to look directly in to the neighbouring house , which is unacceptable.

Any development should be set back away from the party wall at the rear of Tanner Street properties.

The rear of 68 Tanner Street, closest to Pope street, has a glass roof which give the only natural light to the kitchen and living space. The bathrooms immediately over looking the glass roof seems particularly inappropriate.

Noise:

It is also likely that the close proximity of the proposed plans to our flat (3, 166 Tower Bridge Road) would cause a higher level of noise and light disturbance than would be experienced if the development was kept at the recommended 12m distance.

Concerns about how the house immediately backing on to 64 Tanner Street will impact in terms of noise.

If this project go through, how long will the works, noise, etc...be lasting? Will works take place on the week ends, early morning/late evenings as what is happening around the Shard at the moment ? I have not seen any indication of that. I am just trying to figure out if as an addition to the annoyance mentioned earlier in terms of daylight and privacy, I will also not be able to sleep at night or relax at week ends if construction there is.

Noise, dust and lack of privacy during the construction period.

If the application appropriately modified is approved great care will be needed in relation to surrounding homes on account of the very tight working area. A condition of consent should require the developer to provide a copy of the building works programme to each adjoining property so that residents particularly those not out at work during the day are aware in advance of noisy periods of construction.

Efficient use of land:

64 Tanner Street have secured planning permission for an additional bedroom at first floor level together with an additional new dormer. How will the new house affect this new extension when built (construction will commence in the coming months) in terms of noise or otherwise?

Transport:

The traffic congestion in Pope Street and Tanner Street are already a serious problem, and the applicant has not thought through the implications of additional traffic and the need for parking in Pope Street as a direct result of the proposed development. Furthermore, where will visitors to the new houses park?

Although the site was used formerly as a car park the vehicles were semi-permanently stored there. It is misleading to state that there will be fewer car movements. The opposite will be the case and there will be delivery traffic as well. Taking into account traffic servicing the commercial premises on the other side of Pope Street there is likely to be congestion. There is a strong case for Pope Street to be one-way with the existing yellow lines retained. As part of the planning gain contribution an improved wider walkway should be required on the east side of Pope Street. Allowing for garage entrances the walkway would be at road level to facilitate the passage of pushchairs and wheelchairs with the pedestrian way delineated by posts[a Dockland feature]. The pavement on the west side is narrow and unusable owing to obstruction from refuse bins.

Other issues:

Concerns that the digging of the foundations for a terrace of four storeys could cause problems to neighbouring buildings.

The proposed development will directly effect the light currently enjoyed by 64 Tanner Street. Some objectors will seek advice relating to their rights to light in conjunction with Shenstone Properties Limited. Any infringement of a right to light can be protected by injunction.

If the Council do consent to the two applications, they should be restricted in terms of

life. Implementation should not be delayed beyond one year of any permission/consent being granted.

How will construction be curtailed in terms of timing and limitation in terms of the period of construction?