

Item No:	Classification: Open	Date: 1 July 2014	Meeting Name: Planning Committee
Report title:		Addendum Late observations, consultation responses, and further information.	
Ward(s) or groups affected:			
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, OCTAVIA HOUSE, 235 UNION STREET, LONDON, SE1 0LR.**
 - 3.2 Late representations

A letter sent on behalf of residents of La Gare Apartments, Pakeman House, Rowland Hill House, Applegarth House and Blackfriars Action for Responsible Development was received after the report was completed. The letter expressed objections to the scheme which were reported in the officer's report. This letter however updates those objections by updating a massing study originally submitted on behalf of the La Gare Residents. It also summarises the position of the group identified above who had previously submitted individual letters.

The main points raised are summarised below:

- The scheme will create an overbearing sense of enclosure to detriment of residential amenity.
- A key concern is that the vantage points submitted by the applicant are not sufficient to assess the impact of the scheme on local residents. A massing study has been submitted by a group of objectors (who commissioned their own study) which they consider to be more

important in terms of assessing the sense of enclosure that would be created by this scheme.

- That the scheme should be redrawn to be more sensitive to the local context and stepped back in line with a planning consent granted in 2009 which was renewed in 2011.
- That determination of the application is deferred to allow every member of the Planning Committee an opportunity to visit the site.

3.3 Amendments to the officer report

The following is a list of corrections and/or points of clarification arising from the report.

Paragraph / Section	Officer Comment
<u>Description of development and Paragraph 65</u> The height of the building is 44.2 metres	The inclusion of 'AOD' (Above Ordnance Datum) in the report is an error. The height of the building is 44.2 metres. Any reference to AOD is incorrect and has been omitted.
<u>Paragraph 177</u> The Strategic Transport contribution is £29,839 and the Site specific contribution is £27,500	The level of contributions stated in the published report are incorrect and have been updated in the section 106 table below.
<u>Paragraph 177</u> The admin fee for the S106 contributions is 9,039. The total SPD S106 requirement is £2,151,976 and (including admin fee) is £2,161,015 The total offer from the applicant is £1,551,976 and (including admin fee) is £1,561,015.	The admin fee has been amended to reflect the correct level of transport contributions referred to above and to take account of the affordable housing contribution which does not typically attract an admin fee. The total level of contribution has been amended to reflect the council's requirements and is reported in the table below.

Topic Area	SPD Requirement	Applicant's Offer
Affordable housing	£1,700,000	£1,100,000
Education	£67,765	£67,765
Employment during construction	£42,361	£42,361
Employment during construction management fee	£3,206	£3,206
Public open space, children's play space	£73,255	£153,255

Topic Area	SPD Requirement	Applicant's Offer
and sports development		
Transport Strategic	£29,839	£29,839
Transport specific	£27, 500	£27, 500
Public realm	£41,250	£41,250
Health	£64,138	£64,138
Community facilities	£9,662	£9,662
Wheelchair accessible units	£90,000	£90,000
Travel Plan Monitoring	£3,000	£3000
Total	£2,151, 976	£,1,551,976
Admin fee (2%)	£9,039	£9,039
Total (including admin fee)	£2, 161,015	£1,561,015

3.4 Proposed amendments to conditions

Condition	Officer Comment
<p><u>Condition 34</u> The applicant has requested that members consider extending the LCCM hours of operation until 23:00.</p> <p>They would also like the proposed hours of operation (07:00 – 23:00) to extend to Sundays and Bank Holidays.</p>	<p>Officers are satisfied that the extended hours of operation would be acceptable in this town centre location. Notwithstanding this, officers recommended restricting the hours of operation to 07:00-22:00 on Sundays and Bank Holidays.</p>

3.5 Conclusion of the Head of Development Management

Although the additional consultation responses contain updated and more detailed information, including visualisations produced on behalf of the objectors, they do not contain and new issues not already addressed in the officers report. The corrections and updates to the officer's report do not raise any new matters of substance which would affect the conclusions or recommendation. The recommendation therefore remains that planning permission be GRANTED subject to completion of the s106 agreement, and referral to the GLA

3.6 Item 6.2 – FORMER SURREY DOCKS STADIUM, SALTER ROAD, ROTHERHITHE, SE16

3.7 Corrections/amendments to the officer report

Paragraph 7 of the officer report:

Correct text to read as follows:

Fairview homes have sought full planning permission ~~is sought~~ for redevelopment of the site....

Paragraph 30 of the officer report:

Correct paragraph 30 which refers to a linked planning application as item XX X on the committee agenda to item 6.3 on the committee agenda.

Paragraph 49 of the officer report:

Correct the text to read as follows:

...Fisher is a ~~player~~ supporter owned club which does not pay its players and currently attracts around 100 ~~players~~ spectators to a game....

Paragraph 72 of the officer report:

Correct text to read as follows:

...The affordable units would be located in plots C, E and F.

Paragraph 78 of the officer report:

This paragraph advises that 10 wheelchair accessible units would be provided within the development and the applicant has subsequently advised that the 7 wheelchair units within the private tenure would be wheelchair adaptable units and the 3 units within the affordable tenure would be accessible units, i.e. already fitted out. It is consequently recommended that condition 23 relating to the wheelchair units be amended as set out below to include a marketing strategy, and this is an approach which is often used:

~~Prior to their occupation~~ Revised details of the wheelchair accessible units showing their bathrooms laid out as wet rooms shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of above grade works. The wheelchair accessible units shall be constructed in accordance with the details thereby approved and retained as such thereafter. The wheelchair adaptable units shall be marketed as such, in accordance with a wheelchair housing marketing and adaption strategy to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of above grade works.

Paragraph 148 of the officer report:

Amend the text to read as follows:

As stated terms to secure the agreed affordable housing would need to be included in the s106 agreement, including a clause to the effect that no more than ~~50%~~ 60% of the private units could be occupied until and unless the affordable housing has been completed and setting the rent levels for the affordable rented units.

3.8 Appendix 2 - Further response received from Sport England:

Sport England is satisfied that there is due intent to deliver the agreed mitigation in the form of the agreed Phase 1 and 2 works at the St Paul's

Recreation Ground. Moreover Sport England is satisfied that there are robust mechanisms in place, via the planning system (s106 legal agreement) to ensure that the Phase 1 and 2 works at St Paul's Recreation Ground will be delivered within the defined period of time. Phase 2 of the work rests largely with the London Borough of Southwark and the FA to deliver. As such Sport England is now fully satisfied that the proposed development and that set out in linked application 14-AP-0310 as a whole offer an overriding benefit to the development of sport such that the development as a whole is considered acceptable in sporting terms. This being the case, Sport England raises no objection to this application and withdraws its earlier holding objection.

3.9 **Appendix 2 - Further representations received in support of the application:**

Somerford Way - Support the application which looks to address most of the previously failed applications with the added benefit of keeping the former football pitch (MOL) in the public domain. Note some objections refer to false concerns of losing the public pathway between Lagado Mews and Salter Road but the drawings show it as retained. Would object if the pathway is removed. Note the developer has produced a town house effect with pitched roofs closest to the woodland, which is to be complemented. The existing, unsightly and run down buildings have deteriorated and bring a bad feel to a clean and green area. Some buildings on the site are burnt down and dangerous. The new park is welcomed but could be more inspiring. A SUDs scheme for the housing site could allow a wetland habitat to be created in the park which has recently been achieved at another site. The MOL should have some depth, with rolling hills incorporated into at least a third of the total space provided.

Albermarle Road, Beckenham (support for items 6.2 and 6.3) - Have examined the plans and know the site well and wish to offer support to the proposal. As a fan of Fisher FC, very much looking forward to the club returning home. Believe that at the proposed new facility at the St Paul's playing field, can start to really rebuild our club as a force for good in Rotherhithe and Bermondsey. Want a new home for the club, but one that can be shared by the community and which will increase the opportunities for local young people to participate in football. Believe that the proposals for the St Paul's site, and the derelict former home at the Surrey Docks Stadium, will benefit local people. Sadly the former ground is now an eyesore, attracting anti-social behaviour, while the St Paul's football pitch has fallen into disrepair. If the plans get the go ahead, the development at the Surrey Docks Stadium will include a new park that is open to the public, while the St Paul's site will get a comprehensive upgrade including a state-of-the-art 3G pitch, changing rooms and spectator facilities. The 3G all-weather surface will allow Fisher to play first team games back in Rotherhithe while youth and community football activity takes place at other times. The development means Fisher can finally come home after 10 years of exile – it is difficult to put into words what this means to the fans who have stuck by their club through some difficult years. The fans are now the owners, as Fisher are democratically-controlled by its members.

3.10 **Appendix 4 - Condition 38**

This condition can be deleted because it is a duplicate of condition 29.

3.11 **Appendix 4 – pre-commencement conditions**

The applicant has recently submitted details to address the requirements of pre-commencement condition 5 (Construction Environmental Management Plan) and these are currently being reviewed by officers. It is also understood that details to discharge condition 4 (Arboricultural Method Statement) are to be submitted shortly. Officers therefore request that if these details are found to be acceptable before the legal agreement has been signed, that the conditions be amended to compliance conditions requiring the works to be carried out in accordance with the details submitted.

3.12 **Conclusion of the Head of Development Management**

The recommendation remains that planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions and completion of a legal agreement.

3.12 **Item 6.3 – ST PAUL’S RECREATION GROUND, SALTER ROAD, SE16**

3.13 Appendix 5 – condition 3

Following further discussions proposed condition 3 for an archaeological watching brief is not required and can be omitted.

3.14 Appendix 5 - condition 4

This condition requires details of a scheme to eradicate Japanese knotweed at the site. However, the knotweed is not within the red line site and is therefore not within the applicant’s control. Following further discussions with the Council’s Ecology Officer it is therefore recommended that the condition be amended as set out below, which would still require a scheme to be submitted, but it would have to demonstrate that that the works proposed at the site would not cause the knotweed to spread.

Prior to the commencement of development, a Japanese Knotweed management plan conforming to the Environment Agency Japanese Knotweed Code of Practice shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The plan shall include mapping of an exclusion / disturbance zone around the knotweed and a methodology of how disturbance to the infected area will be managed. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the details thereby approved.

3.15 Appendix 5 - amend condition 8 to read as follows:

~~Prior to the commencement of development~~ No more than 6 months after commencement of development and prior to first occupation details of a community use agreement prepared in consultation with Sport England shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, including a copy of the completed approved agreement. The agreement shall apply to the artificial grass pitch and pavilion and shall include details of pricing policy, hours of use, access by non-educational establishment users / non-members, management responsibilities and a mechanism for review. The development shall not be used at any other time other than in strict compliance with the approved agreement.

3.16 Appendix 5 - amend condition 14 to read as follows:

~~Prior to commencement of above grade works~~ Prior to its installation details of the public address system to be used which shall incorporate ambient noise sensing technology shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the details thereby approved, and the public address system shall only be used during Fisher FC matches and for emergencies and shall not be used during training sessions or when the site is in use by community groups or for pay and play activities.

3.17 Conclusion of the Head of Development Management

The recommendation remains that planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions and completion of a legal agreement

3.18 ITEM 6.4 – 1, 3-5, 7-19 VALENTINE PLACE and 21, 27-31 WEBBER STREET, SE1

3.19 The drawing numbers have been updated and now read as follows;

Existing Drawings

EX099, EX100, EX101, EX102, EX103, EX200, EX201, EX202, EX810, EX811, EX812, EX815, EX816, EX817, EX818, EX819, EX820.

Site Plans and Demolition Drawings

001, 002, DX100 REV A, DX101, DX102, DX200, DX201

Block A Floorplans and Elevations

A100 REV B, A101 REV C, A102 REV B, A103 REV A, A104 REV A, A200, A201.

Block B Floorplans and Elevations

B100 REV E, B101 REV E, B102 REV D, B103 REV C, B104 REV B, B200 REV A, B201 REV A.

Block C Floorplans and Elevations

C100 REV C, C101 REV C, C102 REV C, C103 REV B, C200, C201.

Block D Floorplans and Elevations

D099 REV A, D100 REV A, D101 REV A, D102 REV A, D103 REV A, D104 REV A, D105, D106, D107, D200, D201, D202.

Block E Floorplans and Elevations

E099 REV B, E100 REV C, E101 REV D, E102 REV D, E103 REV D, E104 REV C, E105 REV B, E200, E201, E202.

Floorplans, Sections and Servicing

099 REV B, 100 REV F, 101 REV E, 102 REV F, 103 REV E, 104 REV C, 105 REV B, 106 REV B, 107 REV B, 110 REV A, 300, 301, 302, 30569/AC/017 REV A.

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 London SE1 2QH	Planning enquiries telephone: 020 7525 5403