

Item No. 7.2	Classification: Open	Date: 1 October 2014	Meeting Name: Planning Sub-Committee B
Report title:	Development Management planning application: Application 14/AP/0764 for: Full Planning Permission Address: 184 to 188 SOUTHAMPTON WAY/ 5a HAVIL STREET SE5 7EU Proposal: Erection two new buildings, the first fronting on Havil Street being up to five storeys in height, with the second fronting onto Southampton Way and being up to four storeys in height together comprising 24 residential units (1 ten x 1 bed, eleven x 2 bed and three x 3 bed) with associated balconies and terraces, wider landscaping and cycle / refuse stores.		
Ward(s) or groups affected:	Brunswick Park		
From:	Head of Development Management		
Application Start Date 01/04/2014		Application Expiry Date 01/07/2014	
Earliest Decision Date 17/05/2014			

RECOMMENDATION

- 1 That planning permission is granted subject to conditions and the applicant and owner first entering into an appropriate legal agreement by no later than 30 October 2014.
- 2 In the event that the legal agreement is not entered into by 30 October 2014, that the Head of Development Management is authorised to refuse planning permission, if appropriate, for the reasons set out in paragraph 95 of this report.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Site location and description

- 3 There are two applications on this agenda the committee is asked to consider and determine concurrently. Together, application 14-AP-0764 for site 1 and application 14-AP-0669 for site 2 provide a total of 41 residential units. The application site under this ref 14-AP-0764 is comprised of an 'L' shaped vacant plot of land fronting both Southampton Way and Havil Street. The site address is 184-188 Southampton Way/5a Havil Street and for the purposes of this application is known as "site 1" as the applicant has concurrently submitted a full application (14-AP-0669) for a site in very close proximity on Southampton Way that is inextricably linked to this application (14-AP-0764), which is known as "site 2" and reported elsewhere in this agenda. The applicant is Family Mosaic Housing Association and owns site 2 with a site address of 2 Havil Street, adjacent to 160 Southampton Way. The council owns site 1, but a cabinet meeting held on 14/05/13 agreed to approve the disposal of the council's freehold interest in 184-188 Southampton Way, 5a Havil Street and part of Beacon House Estate for residential purposes to Family Mosaic housing association. The two sites are physically separated, but are in close proximity with each other and it is important to recognise that they are inextricably linked and are therefore necessary to consider them together. The schemes would also need to be delivered together and

one combined legal agreement will secure the planning obligations across the two linked development sites, which is discussed in more detail below.

- 4 This application site (site 1) adjoins the east side of an existing four storey residential block (Beacon House) fronting Southampton Way and continues along the rear of this property to Havil Street. To the east side of the site is a group of Grade II listed buildings (Nos. 190, 192 and 194 Southampton Way), with the Nicki Day Nursery being located immediately adjoining the boundary of the site. To the south is a further four storey residential block which fronts Havil Street (known as the Orange Tree Court). A Victorian terrace is situated on the opposite side (north) of Southampton Way with accommodation at ground to third floor level.
- 5 Prior to the site being cleared, this site was previously used for light industrial, however this has long since ceased.
- 6 The area is within a predominantly residential area with some commercial units on the ground floor on Southampton Way and educational uses to the west of the site.
- 7 The site is within the following core strategy designations: air quality management area (AQMA) and the urban density zone.
- 8 It is also within flood risk zone 3 and is within a controlled parking zone (CPZ). It has a public transport accessibility level rating of 3.

Details of proposal – the wider scheme

- 9 As explained above, there are two applications on this agenda that the committee is asked to consider and determine concurrently. Together, application 14-AP-0764 for site 1 and application 14-AP-0669 for site 2 provide a total of 41 residential units. The applications have been submitted separately as the sites are separate planning units, but it is clear that they are interlinked and inter-reliant and cannot be supported on their own. Given the policy requirement for the minimum provision of affordable and private housing, the individual applications for both sites would not satisfy policy were they not linked. It is the same applicant for both sites, and the applicant has indicated that the intention is to deliver the developments together with the affordable housing delivered first (secured by legal agreement). Site 2 under ref 14-AP-0669 would provide a building (Block A) comprised of 17 private residential units. The applicant has significant interest in site 1 and the owns site 2 and the delivery of the schemes together can be secured by the combined s106 agreement.
- 10 The applicant proposes to erect two new buildings on this site (site 1) to provide a total of 24 residential units.

Block B

The first building (Block B) fronts Havil Street and is up to five storeys in height and provides a total of 13 flats with the following mix:

- six x 1 bed
- seven x 2 bed.

- 11 The scheme was originally to be all affordable, but following some amendments to the scheme all units would be affordable bar one. The tenure for Block B would be for intermediate except plot 30 (a two bed flat), which would be private sale.
- 12 Block B would have its primary residential entrance from Havil Street. Following amendments from the applicant the building is reduced in overall size and bulk. It has

a maximum height of 5 storeys immediately adjoining Beacon House and the existing vacant plot to the north and then steps down to 4 and then 3 storeys to the south adjoining Orange Tree Court.

Block C

- 13 The second building (known here as Block C) fronts Southampton Way (between Beacon House and No. 190 Southampton Way) and would be up to four (4) storeys in height and provides a total of 11 flats with the following mix:

- four x 1 bed
- four x 2 bed
- three x 3 bed

The tenure for Block C would be entirely affordable rent (but at rental levels equivalent to target rents).

- 14 Block C would have a maximum of four storeys adjoining Beacon House (east side of the site) and then steps down to three and then two storeys adjacent to the listed buildings No. 190 Southampton Way. The primary residential entrance to Block C would be from Southampton Way.
- 15 Blocks B and C are separated by a rear parking yard and communal open space. 4 No. wheelchair parking spaces are located at the rear with access from Melbury Drive, which is a public highway. There is also access to the residential units from the rear communal amenity space. A dedicated play space is provided to the rear of Block B.

Planning history

- 16 There is no relevant planning history on this site.

Planning history of adjoining sites

- 17 A planning application has been submitted at 2 Havil Street, adjacent to 160 Southampton Way and described as "site 2" as explained above. This application [14-AP-0669](#) is pending a decision and is reported elsewhere in this agenda. This proposed development is described as follows:

Erection of a part three, part four and part five storey building at the junction of Havil Street and Southampton Way comprising 17 residential units (five x 1 bed, seven x 2 bed and five x 3 bed) with associated balconies and terraces, wider landscaping and cycle / refuse stores.

The other most relevant planning history to this case is the Orange Tree Court on Havil Street:

[99-AP-1668](#) - planning permission granted in December 1999 for: Demolition of existing public house. Construction of 4 storey development involving 6 x 2 bed flats and 6 x 1 bed flats. Twelve car parking spaces and landscaping.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Summary of main issues

- 18 The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:
- a) Principle of the proposed development in terms of land use and conformity with

- strategic policies;
- b) Density and dwelling mix;
- c) Affordable housing;
- d) Impact on the amenities of occupiers of adjoining properties and future occupiers;
- e) Impact of adjoining uses on occupiers of proposed development;
- f) Transport issues;
- g) Design and impact on setting of adjacent listed buildings;
- h) Environmental impacts, air quality and site contamination;
- i) Flood risk;
- j) Planning obligations; and
- k) Energy and sustainability.

Planning policy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

- 19 Para 12 Core planning principles
- Part 4 Promoting sustainable transport
- Part 7 Requiring good design
- Part 8 Promoting healthy communities
- Part 10 Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- Part 11 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment in particular paragraphs 118, 123, 121 and 124 (biodiversity, noise, contamination, air quality)
- Para 173 – 177 – Ensuring viability and deliverability
- Para 203-206 Planning obligations and conditions

London Plan July 2011 consolidated with revised early minor alterations October 2013

- 20 Policy 3.1 Ensuring equal life chances for all
- Policy 3.3 Increasing housing supply
- Policy 3.8 Housing choice
- Policy 3.9 Mixed and balanced communities
- Policy 3.10 Definition of affordable housing
- Policy 3.11 Affordable housing targets
- Policy 3.12 Negotiating affordable housing on individual private residential and mixed use schemes
- Policy 3.13 Affordable housing thresholds
- Policy 5.1 Climate change mitigation
- Policy 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
- Policy 5.3 Sustainable design and construction
- Policy 5.5 Decentralised energy networks
- Policy 5.6 Decentralised energy in development proposals
- Policy 5.7 Renewable energy
- Policy 5.9 Overheating and cooling
- Policy 5.10 Urban greening
- Policy 5.11 Green roofs and development site environs
- Policy 5.12 Flood risk management
- Policy 5.13 Sustainable drainage
- Policy 5.15 Water use and supplies
- Policy 5.17 Waste capacity
- Policy 5.21 Contaminated land
- Policy 6.1 Strategic approach
- Policy 6.3 Assessing effects of development on transport capacity
- Policy 6.9 Cycling
- Policy 6.10 Walking
- Policy 6.11 Smoothing traffic flow and tackling congestion
- Policy 6.13 Parking
- Policy 7.1 Building London's neighbourhoods and communities
- Policy 7.2 An inclusive environment
- Policy 7.3 Designing out crime

Policy 7.4 Local character
Policy 7.5 Public realm
Policy 7.6 Architecture
Policy 7.14 Improving air quality
Policy 7.15 Reducing noise and enhancing soundscapes
Policy 8.2 Planning obligations

Core Strategy 2011

- 21 Strategic Policy 1 - Sustainable development
Strategic Policy 2 - Sustainable transport
Strategic Policy 5 – Providing new homes
Strategic Policy 6 – Homes for people on different Incomes
Strategic Policy 7 – Family homes
Strategic Policy 12 - Design and conservation
Strategic Policy 13 - High environmental standards
Strategic Policy 14 - Implementation

Southwark Plan 2007 (July) - saved policies

- 22 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.

Policy 2.5: Planning Obligations
Policy 3.1: Environmental Effects
Policy 3.2: Protection of Amenity
Policy 3.3: Sustainability Assessment
Policy 3.4: Energy Efficiency
Policy 3.6: Air Quality
Policy 3.7: Waste Reduction
Policy 3.9: Water
Policy 3.11: Efficient use of Land
Policy 3.12: Quality in Design
Policy 3.13: Urban Design
Policy 3.14: Designing out Crime
Policy 3.18 Setting of Listed buildings, Conservation Areas and world heritage sites
Policy 3.28: Biodiversity
Policy 4.2 Quality of Residential Accommodation
Policy 4.3 Mix of dwellings
Policy 4.4 Affordable housing
Policy 5.1: Locating Developments
Policy 5.2: Transport Impacts
Policy 5.3: Walking and Cycling
Policy 5.6: Car Parking
Policy 5.7: Parking Standards for Disabled People and the mobility impaired

Supplementary Planning Documents

Section 106 Planning Obligations SPD (2007)
Sustainable Transport SPD (2010)
Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (2009)
Residential Design Standards SPD (2011)

Principle of development

Land use – residential accommodation (principle, need, affordable housing)

- 23 The site is currently vacant and whilst it was previously used for light industrial purposes (likely B1(c) or B2 Class uses) the buildings have been cleared for many years and the vacant land has never been used since for industrial/employment uses. It is therefore considered that the uses have been abandoned. The site is not designated for a particular purpose under the development plan. The site is within a predominantly residential area with some commercial units on the ground floor on Southampton Way and educational uses to the west of the site. The proposal for a residential scheme would contribute to the provision of much needed housing in Southwark and in this case would be appropriate in this location.

Affordable housing

- 24 The site is within the Brunswick Park ward and is within the urban density zone. The proposal to provide approximately 95 per cent affordable habitable rooms across the site would be policy compliant in respect of affordable housing policy (which seeks a minimum of 35 per cent provision). Nevertheless, the same policy requires a minimum of 35 per cent private provision in this part of the borough and only one unit (Plot 30) is to be for private sale in this scheme. The applicant owns site 2 and the proposal is to provide the necessary private units on site 2 to meet this policy. Site 2 under application 14-AP-0669 would accommodate 17 residential units with only one of the units (Plot 1, a ground floor level maisonette) to be affordable rented. This equates to 91 per cent of private sale habitable rooms.
- 25 When the two sites are combined (41 residential units and 133 habitable rooms) there would be 61 per cent affordable habitable rooms and 39 per cent private habitable rooms. In this instance, two applications for the two sites have been lodged because they are considered to be two separate planning units, separated by the road and Beacon House. However, officers acknowledge that the applicant is the same for both sites and Family Mosaic (one of the registered social landlords in Southwark) would bring the developments forward. Whilst the applicant do not currently own site 1, the council has agreed to approve the disposal of the council's freehold interest to Family Mosaic housing association and therefore has significant interest in the land. It is apparent that they will be inextricably linked and inter-reliant and cannot be supported on their own. The applicant indicated that the intention is to deliver the developments together and the affordable is to be delivered first. A combined s106 agreement would need to be used to link the two applications together and non-occupation clauses to ensure that both the affordable and private are delivered.
- 26 Officers also acknowledge that in theory the two individual sites should provide a mix of affordable and private dwellings within their own red line site boundary, but in terms of management this proposal and layout would be easier and more efficient. Each tenure generally sits within a single building, which makes the development easier to manage and assists with keeping service charge levels lower for the affordable units. The sites are in very close proximity to each other and it is still considered to be contributing to mixed and balanced communities in this part of Southwark. It is clear that the applicant's primary intention is to deliver high levels of affordable housing. The combined 61 per cent provision significantly exceeds the core strategy's policy requirement and this is welcomed. There is a shortage of affordable homes, in Southwark, across London and the whole of the UK. So a key objective of the government, the Greater London Authority and Southwark is to provide more affordable housing. The approach taken here for the provision of private and affordable on the two sites is considered to be justifiable in this special circumstance and is therefore considered to be acceptable provided an overarching robust s106

agreement link these applications together.

Tenure split

- 27 It should be noted that saved Policy 4.4 'Affordable Housing' of the Southwark Plan 2007 requires a tenure split of 70:30 social rented/intermediate. The proposal currently provides a ratio of 55:45 between affordable rented and intermediate homes.
- 28 The split is closer to the Mayor's target of 60:40 and whilst the proposal does not meet the policy requirement it is not a significant deviation. Furthermore, the overall level of affordable housing is much higher than those schemes proposed by private developers and it also significantly exceeds the council's minimum 35 per cent affordable housing target for developments. In this instance the tenure split is considered to be acceptable.
- 29 The NPPF and now the London Plan both include affordable rent as a type of affordable housing. The product Affordable Rent is one of three types of affordable housing (alongside social rented and intermediate affordable rent). The key point about affordable rent let by local authorities or registered providers (RP) is that it is subject to rent controls that require a rent of no more than 80 per cent of the local market rent (including services charges). This effectively means that RPs can charge up to 80 per cent of market rent for affordable rent housing. The applicant has discussed this with Officers and the Housing Team and the intention is to offer these equivalent to social rent rate levels (target rents), although they would remain termed as 'affordable rent' units. In effect, Family Mosaic would not propose the 80 per cent of market rent permitted, but would reduce the level, with a greater reduction being proposed for the larger units. The Housing team have confirmed that on the basis that the rents are equivalent to target rents, which will be secured through the s106, then this arrangement is acceptable.

Density

- 30 The density of the development on this site alone equals approximately 496 habitable rooms per hectare (HR/Ha) and falls within the permitted range of 200-700 HR/Ha for the urban density zone.

Mix of dwellings

- 31 Strategic Policy 7 'Family Homes' of the Core Strategy requires major developments to provide at least 60 per cent of the total units to have two or more bedrooms and in the urban density zone to have a minimum of 20 per cent of three or more bedrooms. Officers consider that the overall mix is acceptable. The proportion of units that have two or more bedrooms equates to 58.3 per cent and whilst it fails to meet the minimum target of 60 per cent this is a very marginal shortfall. In terms of three bedroom units, the scheme on this site only provides 13.6 per cent, which falls short of the minimum 20 per cent. When the two sites are combined however, the total proportion of three bedroom units would be approximately 19.5 per cent, which is only a very marginal shortfall. Furthermore, when the two applications are considered as a whole with the significant proportion of affordable housing provided, this deviation is considered on balance acceptable.
- 32 Saved Policy 4.3 'Mix of Dwellings' require a minimum of 10 per cent of the units to be wheelchair accessible. The proposal would provide a total of 4 No. wheelchair units, which far exceeds the required minimum for this site alone. It does mean that the building proposed at site 2 under ref 14-AP-0669 would contain no wheelchair units. In theory, this does not meet the policy requirement as each development on each site should ideally be providing the appropriate amount of wheelchair units. However, it is

noted that the development proposed on site 2 does not provide any off-street parking spaces due to the size and physical constraints of the site. This scheme under this application 14-AP-0764 for site 1 would have adequate off-street disabled parking, which would be easily accessible from the residential flats. The reason for this allocation and configuration stems from the fact that there is appropriate access from Melbury Drive and the site layout which allows for 4 No. disabled parking spaces easily located to the rear of the buildings. In this instance, given that the s106 agreement would tie the two schemes together and ensure that they are both delivered no objections are raised. The Residential Design Standards SPD also states that the greatest need is for more affordable wheelchair housing, which is proposed here.

Environmental impact assessment

- 33 An Environmental Statement would not be required with this application as the development does not fall within Schedule 1 or 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 1999. The site falls well below the 0.5ha threshold (being 0.159ha) for classification as a Schedule 2 'Urban Development Project'. Even if the proposed development was of a size to be considered as an 'Urban Development Project', officers consider that the development is unlikely to have a significant effect upon the environment by virtue of its nature, size, and location based upon a review of the selection criteria set out in Schedule 3 of the Regulations which are used to screen Schedule 2 Development. Furthermore, the site is outside a designated 'sensitive area' as per Regulation 2(1). On this basis it is considered an environmental impact assessment is not likely to be required.

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

- 34 Main issues are likely to be effects on sunlight and daylight as well as sense of outlook and privacy, and noise and disturbance.

Block B

- 35 In terms of site 1 the main impact would be on the occupants of Beacon House and Orange Tree Court on Havil Street. Block B is to the south of Beacon House and is 5 storeys in height and would sit on the boundary, although the proposed block is set back on the upper floors at the north east corner adjacent to Beacon House. The distance between the rear facade of Beacon House (which comprises habitable room windows and an access walkway) and Block B is approximately 6 to 7m.

Natural light

- 36 The applicant has carried out a daylight and sunlight assessment for the impact on existing neighbouring residents and the future occupants. It is noted that the lowest level of retained Vertical Sky Component (VSC) on the main front facade of Beacon House is typically 18 per cent, which is below the BRE guideline of 27 per cent. However, the results of the average daylight factor (ADF) indicates that there would be adequate daylight into the rooms affected at Beacon House. This is considered appropriate since this is in an urban location and the No-Sky Line test shows that there would generally be very small impacts.
- 37 The applicant has also carried out an assessment on the adjacent Orange Tree Court. As the application site is currently empty, inevitably the fractional VSC reductions will be significantly in excess of the 0.8 (i.e. 20 per cent loss) reduction suggested in the BRE guidelines. When the ADF value was considered it is noted that two of the bedrooms to Orange Tree Court would be below the BRE guidelines, but these

bedrooms are already within a semi-enclosed U-shaped building (similar to a lightwell within the development) and it is inevitable that there would be a loss of daylight to this room.

- 38 The sunlight levels for all principal living room windows that face within 90 degrees of south are good and comply with the BRE guidelines.

Officers are satisfied that on balance the scheme would not significantly impact on neighbours' access to natural light.

Outlook

- 39 In terms of outlook, it is noted that Block B would be in very close proximity to Beacon House, but only a small area of the building itself is actually directly opposite the rear of Beacon House. The windows that serve the rooms of Beacon House are therefore still afforded with views out and Block B would not unreasonably block all outlook from the existing residents' flats.
- 40 There are no flank windows proposed on the northern facade of Block B since this is immediately adjoining Beacon House. No direct overlooking would arise. It is noted that there would be rear private balconies to the rear eastern elevation of the building, but these are at a more oblique angle and privacy screens would limit any significant overlooking. These screens would be conditioned.
- 41 It is noted that there are windows to the north within the 'lightwell' of the adjoining 4 storey Orange Tree Court building on Havil Street. Block B would sit on the boundary adjoining this neighbouring building, but would not extend beyond the building line and would not enclose the windows at Orange Tree Court.
- 42 The windows to the rear of Building B would be positioned to avoid any direct overlooking into occupants of Orange Tree Court.

Block C

- 43 The proposed Block C would be located between No. 190 Southampton Way and Beacon House. The proposed building does not protrude beyond the rear building line of No. 190 and therefore no impact on natural light or neighbour's outlook. There are no flank windows at Beacon House and therefore there is no loss of outlook or natural light.
- 44 There are no flank windows proposed at Block C on the ground or first floor levels. Those second floor flank windows on the eastern elevation would be set in from the side boundary adjoining number 190 and would not lead to direct overlooking since this would only have a view over the roof of No. 190.
- 45 The habitable rooms at Block C overlooking Southampton Way are opposite a row of houses, but would achieve the minimum 12m distance across a highway as stipulated in the residential design standards SPD.

General disturbance

- 46 In relation to potential noise impacts during the construction phase of the development, officers consider that this will have to be managed carefully to ensure that any associated potential adverse impacts are minimised. It is recommended that an outline construction management plan be submitted. It is understood that the two schemes may come forward at the same time/simultaneously and the impacts of the construction works combined may have an impact on the neighbouring occupiers. However, with the submission of a detailed construction management plan (secured by a condition) for approval prior to commencement of works it is considered that any significant adverse impact would be minimised.
- 47 In summary, there are no significant amenity impacts on neighbouring residents envisaged from the development on this site and would comply with saved policies 3.2, 3.11 of the Southwark Plan and Strategic Policy 13 of the Core Strategy.

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

- 48 The area is a mix of residential and commercial and retail uses and the proposed development would therefore not impact on the nearby uses. There are no existing uses in the vicinity of the site that would be likely to be detrimental to future users of the residential accommodation.

Quality of accommodation

- 49 The proposed residential units all comply with the minimum room standards set out in the residential design standards SPD. The majority of the units would have dual aspect, with only 2 units that have single aspect. Plot 18 and Plot 32 are ground floor one bedroom units that do not have dual aspect, but these are wheelchair accessible units that would have a larger ground level private amenity space. These units do not solely look north and given that this is a very small proportion of units that are single aspect it is considered to be acceptable in this instance.
- 50 All units would have adequate outlook with good access to natural light as demonstrated in the submitted daylight and sunlight report.

Amenity space

- 51 In regards to amenity space, the Southwark's Residential Design Standards SPD states the following:

All flat developments must meet the following minimum standards and seek to exceed these where possible

- *50 sqm communal amenity space per development*
- *For units containing three or more bedrooms, 10 sqm of private amenity space*
- *For units containing two or less bedrooms, 10 sqm of private amenity space should ideally be provided. Where it is not possible to provide 10 sqm of private amenity space, as much space as possible should be provided as private amenity space, with the remaining amount added towards the communal amenity space requirement. For example, if a private balcony of 3 sqm can be provided, 7 sqm should be added onto the communal amenity space*
- *Balconies, terraces and roof gardens must be a minimum of 3 sqm to count towards private amenity space.*

All units are provided with private amenity space either in the form of a ground floor

rear garden/terrace or private balconies.

- 52 All of the three bedroom units would have a minimum 10sqm of private amenity space. Where those units that do not meet the minimum private amenity space standards (one and two bedrooms units), the communal amenity space would make up for this which the Residential Design SPD allows for such deviation.
- 53 Communal amenity space would be provided to the rear of buildings B and C, which comprises a ground level space of 155.3sqm and a play space area of 100sqm. The level of communal amenity space is considered acceptable. It is noted that there should ideally be 120sqm of playspace for site 1 since the child yield is 16 children, but it is noted that Brunswick Park is approximately 400m walk from the site and therefore the shortfall is considered acceptable in this instance. The designated children's play space would be conditioned so that details would be submitted prior to commencement.

Noise exposure

- 54 The applicant has submitted a noise impact assessment, which confirms that noise levels are dictated by road traffic noise emissions from Southampton Way (which is used by buses) and to a lesser extent Havil Street. The report concludes that acceptable internal noise levels are predicted to be achieved in habitable rooms of the development subject to the adoption of acoustically upgraded glazing and ventilation in the development design. The council's Environmental Protection team (EPT) was consulted on this and has recommended conditions to ensure that the appropriate internal noise levels are not exceeded due to environmental noise.

Air quality

- 55 Saved Policy 3.6 of the Southwark Plan states that permission will not be granted for a development that would lead to a reduction in air quality. The site falls within an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) where an air quality assessment is required to be submitted.
- 56 The applicant has submitted an air quality assessment, which concludes that the air quality conditions for future residents within the proposed development would be acceptable. The applicant has looked at the air quality impacts from traffic-related nitrogen dioxide concentrations since the site faces onto a bus route and has concluded that the air quality impacts would be insignificant.

Transport issues

- 57 The site has a PTAL rating of 3 which means it has moderate access to public transport. The site is also located in the East Camberwell Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ).

Car parking and impact on highway

- 58 The scheme proposes to be car-free with the exception of the 4 disabled spaces to the rear. The site is immediately opposite a bus stop that serves one bus route (No. 343) which runs north to City Hall and south to New Cross Gate. Denmark Hill rail station is just over 1km south of the development and it is considered that a car-free development would be acceptable in this instance.
- 59 The trip generation is not considered to be significant to impact on the local highway network. When considered together, the two schemes on site 1 and site 2 would provide a total of 41 residential units and the cumulative impacts on the local highway

network is not considered to be significant. Since this is within a controlled parking zone (CPZ), it is recommended that future residents should be prevented from being able to apply for parking permits and this can be secured by condition. There is an existing car club bay on Rainbow Street near its junction with Southampton Way. The applicant has also agreed to make contributions to 3-year's subscription to Zipcar for each eligible adult for the proposed development. Measures to reduce car use has also been included in the travel plan.

- 60 Vehicular access to the 4 disabled spaces is via Melbury Drive, which is gated. The end of Melbury Drive is currently used for parking and is a no-through public road. The current parking arrangements on Melbury Drive are predominantly unrestricted, with a typical capacity of 10 spaces. Parking vehicles are aligned along the southern kerb line as well as in the designated turning head (affecting the ability of all vehicles, including servicing vehicles) to turn.
- 61 This is an adopted public highway and therefore the current parking at the end of Melbury Drive is done unlawfully. The Transport Planning team had wanted to see what measures would be carried out to ensure that access to the development via Melbury Drive stays clear. The applicant has confirmed that since the access to the rear disabled parking spaces would be gated and sign-posted it would naturally stop any vehicles from parking outside the gate (which could block entry).
- 62 The applicant subsequently submitted a parking survey following Transport's comments. The current parking arrangements on Sedgemoor Place are essentially unrestricted and throughout the survey period Sedgemoor Place demonstrates spare capacity. It was concluded that Sedgemoor Place would provide more than adequate space to accommodate potential displaced parking from Melbury Drive.
- 63 The council's Transport Planning team noted that although the development itself is in a CPZ, it is right on the boundary of the CPZ. The Transport Planning team considered that the parking stress levels in the area adjacent to the development should be considered through a parking survey to establish if there is space to accommodate the predicted number of vehicles associated with the development.
- 64 The applicant responded to this and submitted a parking survey and clarifies the existing parking situation and that there is the capacity on the surrounding streets to accommodate any displaced parking from the creation of an access to the development and any vehicular parking from the development itself. Whilst this is the case, vehicle ownership by residents will be discouraged through the travel plan and its measures such as exemption from the CPZ, cycle parking, measures to encourage active travel etc. When the two schemes are considered together, the parking survey demonstrates that the overall impact of the two developments would not significantly impact on the parking capacity of the surrounding streets.

Cycle parking

- 65 The scheme provides 16 internal cycle spaces for Building B and 14 spaces for Building C, with two spaces in a secured covered external store. The provision is considered to meet the minimum cycle space standards.

Servicing

- 66 Servicing and deliveries are proposed to take place via the off street parking area and the refuse stores are located conveniently for the waste contractors and residents. The Transport Planning Team has however requested further details regarding the expected number, frequency and type of vehicles expected and swept paths for the largest vehicle, which could be conditioned in the form of a delivery and servicing

management plan.

Construction

- 67 The Transport Planning team has recommended a construction management plan be submitted prior to any demolition or construction works and this can be secured by condition.
- 68 In summary, the scheme would not cause significant harm on the local highway network and would be a form of sustainable development complying with saved policy 5.2 of the Southwark Plan and Strategic Policy 2 of the Core Strategy.

Design issues

- 69 Saved Policy 3.12 'Quality in design' of the Southwark Plan, requires that developments should achieve a high quality of both architectural and urban design, enhancing the quality of the built environment; new buildings should embody a creative and high quality appropriate design solution, specific to their site's shape, size, location and development opportunities and where applicable, preserving or enhancing the historic environment.
- 70 The overall approach is for a contemporary design concept. The area to the north on Southampton Way is mainly Victorian in character, but there are the occasional modern developments in the vicinity that has given this area more of a mixed design character. The site is not within a conservation area and the contemporary design would be acceptable in this instance. As discussed below in this section, the overall design of the scheme is considered to be acceptable. When the two schemes are considered together, it is noted that there will be a change in the overall local streetscape on this part of Southampton Way and Havil Street. When the development is viewed from the junction of Southampton Way and Havil Street, the visual impact is considered to be a positive one. The two sites are currently vacant, which leaves a noticeable gap in the streetscene and the delivery of the two schemes that have consistent architectural form, quality, height and massing would contribute to a sense of place.

Block B

- 71 A number of objections from local residents relate to the general height, mass and bulk and it was considered that this would be excessive and the design was not appropriate to the local surrounding area. One letter of support from the Camberwell Society was received however.
- 72 This building on Havil Street goes from 3 storeys adjoining Orange Tree Court to 4 storeys and then 5 storeys. This greater height is more acceptable on the Havil Street frontage. Its height and massing is more appropriate to this frontage as the buildings in this street are greater in bulk and massing in comparison to the finer grain frontages that are on this part of Southampton Way.
- 73 Havil Street is a street with stepped or sloped roof forms and the parapet flat roof of this proposal increases its apparent bulk. A set back top floor would help break up the sky line as well as reduce the bulk. Following negotiations with the applicant, the applicant has amended the plans to show an overall reduction in the fifth floor element. There is a greater set back from the Havil Street frontage, which would help to reduce the overall mass and bulk when seen against the streetscape.
- 74 This Havil Road building (Block B) has the issue of facing onto the corner site which is a vacant plot that may be developed in the future. The elevation immediately

adjoining this vacant plot is the tallest five storey element and would need to be a predominantly blank wall so as to avoid prejudicing any potential development of that site.

- 75 The applicant has revised the elevation to provide recessed brick panels (as dummy windows) along with protruding brick headers from first floor level to the top floor and would be in random diagonal patterns. At the rear, the building line has been pulled back in, and replaced with glass screens to the rear balconies. This reduces the scale of the elevation, whilst still preventing overlooking. It is considered that with the set back of the fifth floor, the set back at the rear, the recessed brick panels and the header patterns on this northern facade the elevation would no longer be so blank or uninteresting. It would also avoid prejudicing any future development on the vacant plot.
- 76 The building line of Block B is appropriate and lines up with the adjoining building Orange Tree Court before it steps out.

Block C

- 77 Paragraph 129 of the NPPF "local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise." The proposed development consists of two blocks of 4 and 5 storeys with the taller block facing onto Havil Street. The development is not in a conservation area but Block C is adjacent to Grade II Listed buildings at 190 and 192 Southampton Way. The setting of these listed buildings and the local townscape are a principal consideration for this application.
- 78 These listed houses are early 19 century listed 2 storey villas and the proposed building facing onto Southampton Way is adjacent to these. The design originally submitted was for a taller building immediately adjacent to No. 190, which rose up too rapidly to reach the 4 storey element. Following discussions and negotiations with the applicant and the council's Design and Conservation team, amendments have been submitted, which reduces the overall bulk on the eastern end of Building C. As shown on drawing PL-130, the proposal has been pushed away from the adjoining listed building at second and third floors, to increase the set back. This aids the gradual 'stepping-up' of the building and is considered to relate appropriately to the adjoining Listed Building in terms of mass and bulk. It is considered that the scheme would satisfy saved policy 3.18 of the Southwark Plan and would preserve the setting of the nearby listed buildings.
- 79 It is considered that the form of the buildings and the design of the elevations now reflects more effectively the finer grain of the neighbouring buildings by reducing the massing progressively from west to east.
- 80 As with Block B, the treatment for the top floor has also been amended to give visual distinction. Further, the apparent ground floor level of both blocks have been raised to make it look higher and increase its prominence.

Materials

- 81 The use of bricks is considered acceptable given the predominant use in the surrounding area. The applicant has indicated the use of London stock and a dark multi stock brick. A stock brick will give a texture, softness and play in differing light conditions, is robust and maintenance free. Windows will be set back in the brickwork to give a reveal of approximately 215mm - this detail, along with the specification of a stock brick will ensure that the facade has depth.

- 82 Composite windows will be light grey or silver polyester powder coated finish. A Velfac window or similar with narrow frame detail will ensure a lightness within the brick surround. Clear glazing will be specified to the landings on Blocks B and C. Reglit glazing panels are proposed to the stair of Block B, which would make this more inviting and light.
- 83 Conditions are recommended to assure the quality of material finish, which would require samples and mock-ups prepared on site of the brickwork providing evidence of good quality brick finish, pointing and bond. Further drawings showing the details of reveal depths and window section, especially where the panels of brickwork is recessed next to the windows is also recommended.
- 84 Strategic Policy 12 'Design and conservation' of core strategy, requires that development will achieve the highest possible standards of design for buildings and public spaces to help create attractive and distinctive places which are safe, easy to get around and a pleasure to be in. The council will do this by expecting development to conserve or enhance the significance of Southwark's heritage assets and their settings. Viewed within the general context of regenerating empty sites within Camberwell/Peckham, this proposal should have a positive impact on this context.

Impact on trees

- 85 There are very few large trees on the site. There will be the retention of the two mature trees fronting Southampton Way, but there will be the loss of one tree on site.
- 86 The tree concerned is referenced in the submitted Ecology Appraisal, as Target Note 6 (TN6). It is described as an ornamental goat willow (*Salix Caprea*) in the ecology report, which is a fairly common species. Upon site visit, it was evident that its amenity value was fairly limited. It can also be seen from the submitted survey drawings that it is located within a junction of three walls, which will have impacted on it. The plans propose two trees in front of Building B located within the site, but closer to the pavement edge. As such, the amenity value would improve.
- 87 The scheme would provide soft and hard landscaping to the front which would provide an adequate buffer zone to the ground floor units and would make this an attractive entrance area. A series of new trees will be planted across site 1. New trees will be planted to the front of each building on Southampton Way and Havil Street, continuing the language of greenery that already exists. New trees will also be planted within the communal garden and parking areas to the rear of the site.
- 88 It is still considered reasonable to impose a condition requiring a full arboricultural report for the trees on the site so that those trees to be retained would not be damaged by the development as these represent an important visual amenity in the area.
- 89 The council's Ecology officer had looked at the ecological appraisal prepared by the applicant and has not made any objections subject to conditions.

Planning obligations (S.106 undertaking or agreement)

- 90 Saved policy 2.5 'Planning Obligations' of the Southwark Plan, Strategic Policy 14 'Implementation and Delivery' of the Core Strategy and Policy 6A.5 of the London Plan advise that planning obligations should be secured to overcome the negative impacts of a generally acceptable proposal. Saved Policy 2.5 of the Southwark Plan is reinforced by the supplementary planning document (SPD) on Section 106 Planning Obligations.

- 91 The amount of contributions is in accordance with the toolkit. A single combined s106 agreement for this application and 14-AP-0669 is to be secured. The contributions elements are calculated using the s106 SPD toolkit and are proposed by the applicant, which are outlined below for this application.

Employment during Construction - £18,485

Employment during Construction (management fee) - £1,399

Education - £5,957

Public Open Space, Children's play equipment and sports development - £28,047

Transport Strategic - £11,704

Transport site-specific - £12,000

Public Realm - £18,000

Health - £27,988

Community Facilities - £3,790

Admin charge £2,547

Total: £129,916

- 92 The s106 agreement will also secure the provision of the affordable units to be provided within the development (bar one private sale unit).

As previously discussed, it is considered important and necessary to link this application with that at site 2, under ref 14-AP-0669 so that both developments would be brought forward and that no more than 50 per cent of the private units on the site at 2 Havil Street can be occupied until 75 per cent of the affordable is occupied and the combined s106 would secure this.

- 93 As part of the s106 agreement the applicant will provide free car club membership to the future residents for the first 3 years.

- 94 In accordance with the recommendation, if the s106 agreement is not signed by 30 October the Head of Development Management should be authorised to refuse permission if appropriate, for the reason below:

- 95 'In the absence of a signed s106 agreement, there is no mechanism in place to avoid or mitigate the impact of the proposed development on employment, education, public open space, the transport network, the public realm, health care services, community facilities and affordable housing, and the proposal would therefore be contrary to saved policy 2.5 of the Southwark Plan (2007), strategic policy 14 of the Core Strategy (2011) and Policy 8.2 of the London Plan (2011).'

Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

- 96 Section 143 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.

The proposed development would have a total gross internal area of **2,148sqm**, which equates to **£79,226**. Since part of the site would be for affordable housing the applicant can apply for an exemption for those areas.

Sustainable development implications

- 97 Policy 5.2 of the London Plan requires major developments to provide an assessment of their energy demands and to demonstrate that they have taken steps to apply the Mayor's energy hierarchy. Strategic Policy 13 'High Environmental Standards' of the Core Strategy also stipulate that development should be designed of the highest environmental standards.
- 98 The applicant has submitted a Sustainability Statement and an Energy Statement and has made the following targets:
- residential development to achieve a code for sustainable homes level 4
 - more than 40 per cent reduction in carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions.
- 99 The scheme is in accordance with the London Plan's Energy Hierarchy and the proposed development would incorporate energy efficiency measures to reduce CO₂ emissions.
- 100 It is proposed to use enhanced thermal performance standards including other efficiency measures such as mechanical ventilation heat recovery systems.
- 101 It is also proposed to provide roof mounted photovoltaic panels (PVs) to provide further on-site carbon reductions and has been chosen to be the most suitable renewable technology for this development and has the potential to reduce CO₂ emissions by over 15 per cent.
- 102 The above measures are considered to meet the Mayor's and Southwark's planning policies on sustainability and energy savings. Conditions to ensure that the development achieves code for sustainable homes level 4 and details of the PVs are recommended.

Other matters

Water

- 103 The site is within a flood zone and the applicant has submitted a flood risk assessment. The Environment Agency was consulted on this application and raises no objection.
- 104 The applicant has also submitted options for sustainable drainage systems (SUDs) and has indicated that the following would be included: green roofs on the buildings to minimise the flows to the public sewer, the peak flow rates will be managed by two simple flow control devices and two attenuation tanks would be proposed. It is recommended that details of the SUDs should be submitted prior to commencement of development.

Contamination

- 105 The site has been vacant for a number of years, but was previously in industrial use and thus the applicant submitted a land contamination report. The council's EPT has not objected to the proposed development, but has recommended more detailed site

investigation reports (including possible remediation schemes etc) to be submitted prior to commencement of any development.

Conclusion on planning issues

- 106 On balance, the proposal is considered acceptable on its own and also when considered together with site 2. It provides an appropriate mix of dwellings when combined with site 2. The quantity of affordable units (at approximately 95 per cent affordable habitable rooms) would significantly exceed Southwark's policy. The same policy does require a minimum 35 per cent of private units and whilst only one plot would be so on this site, the applicant also plans to develop the site across the road to provide the necessary private units (on site 2). The applicant owns site 2 and the council has agreed to approve the disposal of the council's freehold interest in site 1 to Family Mosaic and the proposal is to provide the necessary private units on site 2 to meet this policy. A combined s106 agreement would be used to link the two applications together and non-occupation clauses to ensure that both the affordable and private are delivered.
- 107 The quality of living accommodation is considered acceptable and would provide for much needed housing in this part of Southwark and would bring the vacant land back into beneficial use.
- 108 Issues regarding noise, air quality and any nuisance have been addressed. The design as revised is suitable for this location and it is not considered that there would be adverse harm arising from the development to impact on neighbours' amenity or local highway network. The building is designed to incorporate measures to minimise carbon emissions and energy efficient techniques are welcomed. It is therefore recommended that conditional planning permission be granted subject to the completion of the s106 agreement to secure the above contributions.

Community impact statement

- 109 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.
- The impact on local people is set out above.
 - No issues relevant to particular communities/groups likely to be affected by the proposal have been identified.

Consultations

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

Consultation replies

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

Summary of consultation responses

- 112 A total number of three objections from residents and two support have been received for this site only.

These relate mainly to the scale, height and design of the building not being appropriate to its surroundings. The building would not preserve the setting of the nearby listed buildings. There were also concerns relating to the blank wall on Block B. The concerns also related to the lack of parking and would lead to congestion and parking problems in the surrounding area.

Further details are found in Appendix 2 of the report.

Following amendments to the plans the application was re-consulted on 15 August 2014 and any additional comments received would be reported to Members in an addendum report.

Human rights implications

- 113 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.

This application has the legitimate aim of providing residential development. The rights potentially engaged by this application, including the right to a fair trial and the right to respect for private and family life are not considered to be unlawfully interfered with by this proposal.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Site history file: TP/2229-186	Chief Executive's Department	Planning enquiries telephone: 020 7525 5403
Application file: 14/AP/0764	Southwark Council	Planning enquiries email: planning.enquiries@southwark.gov.uk
Southwark Local Development Framework and Development Plan Documents	160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH	Case officer telephone: 020 7525 5729 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	Wing Lau, Senior Planner	
Version	Final	
Dated	8 September 2014	
Key Decision?	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments Included
Director of Legal Services	No	No
Strategic Director of Finance and Corporate Services	No	No
Strategic Director, Environment and Leisure	Yes	Yes
Strategic Director, Housing and Community Services	No	No
Director of Regeneration	Yes	Yes
Cabinet Member	No	No
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team		19 September 2014

APPENDIX 1

Consultation Undertaken

Site notice date: 01.04.2014

Press notice date: 10.04.2014

Case officer site visit date: 01.04.2014

Neighbour consultation letters sent: 02.04.2014 and 24.04.2014

Internal services consulted:

Design and Conservation
Environmental Protection Team (EPT)
Transport Planning
Ecology Officer
Surface Water and Flood Management
Housing Strategy

Statutory and non-statutory organisations consulted:

Environment Agency
Transport for London (TfL)
Thames Water

Neighbours and local groups consulted:

02/04/2014	7 BONSOR STREET LONDON SE5 7TE	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	17 BONSOR STREET LONDON SE5 7TE	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	16 BONSOR STREET LONDON SE5 7TE	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	161A SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EJ	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	9 BONSOR STREET LONDON SE5 7TE	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	8 BONSOR STREET LONDON SE5 7TE	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	12 BONSOR STREET LONDON SE5 7TE	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	10 BONSOR STREET LONDON SE5 7TE	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	2 RAINBOW STREET LONDON SE5 7TD	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	15 BONSOR STREET LONDON SE5 7TE	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	14 BONSOR STREET LONDON SE5 7TE	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	13 BONSOR STREET LONDON SE5 7TE	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	161B SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EJ	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FLAT 8 BEACON HOUSE SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7ET	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FLAT 7 BEACON HOUSE SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7ET	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FLAT 6 BEACON HOUSE SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7ET	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FLAT 1 133-135 SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EW	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FLAT 9 BEACON HOUSE SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7ET	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FLAT 2 BEACON HOUSE SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7ET	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FLAT 10 BEACON HOUSE SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7ET	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FLAT 1 BEACON HOUSE SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7ET	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FLAT 5 BEACON HOUSE SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7ET	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FLAT 4 BEACON HOUSE SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7ET	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FLAT 3 BEACON HOUSE SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7ET	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	9 RAINBOW STREET LONDON SE5 7TB	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	65 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7SD	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	63 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7SD	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	61 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7SD	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	1 MELBURY DRIVE LONDON SE5 7SG	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	2 SEDGMOOR PLACE LONDON SE5 7SE	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	67 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7SD	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	53 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7SD	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	51 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7SD	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	49 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7SD	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	59 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7SD	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	57 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7SD	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	55 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7SD	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	2 MELBURY DRIVE LONDON SE5 7SG	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	11 RAINBOW STREET LONDON SE5 7TB	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	1 RAINBOW STREET LONDON SE5 7TB	01/04/2014

02/04/2014	9 MELBURY DRIVE LONDON SE5 7SG	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	7 RAINBOW STREET LONDON SE5 7TB	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	5 RAINBOW STREET LONDON SE5 7TB	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	3 RAINBOW STREET LONDON SE5 7TB	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	5 MELBURY DRIVE LONDON SE5 7SG	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	4 MELBURY DRIVE LONDON SE5 7SG	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	3 MELBURY DRIVE LONDON SE5 7SG	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	8 MELBURY DRIVE LONDON SE5 7SG	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	7 MELBURY DRIVE LONDON SE5 7SG	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	6 MELBURY DRIVE LONDON SE5 7SG	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FIRST FLOOR AND SECOND FLOOR FLAT 169 SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EJ	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FIRST FLOOR AND SECOND FLOOR FLAT 171 SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EJ	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FIRST FLOOR AND SECOND FLOOR FLAT 163 SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EJ	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FIRST FLOOR FLAT 125 SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EW	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FIRST FLOOR FLAT 181 SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EJ	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FIRST FLOOR FLAT 177A SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EJ	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	151 SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EJ	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	4 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7SD	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	179A SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EJ	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	CARETAKERS FLAT 2 SEDGMOOR PLACE LONDON SE5 7SE	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	190 SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EU	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	179B SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EJ	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FIRST FLOOR FLAT 11 BONSOR STREET LONDON SE5 7TE	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	159A SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EJ	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	159C SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EJ	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	159B SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EJ	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	SECOND FLOOR FLAT 177A SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EJ	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	SECOND FLOOR AND THIRD FLOOR FLAT 181 SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EJ	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	GROUND FLOOR FLAT 11 BONSOR STREET LONDON SE5 7TE	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	133-135 SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EW	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	SECOND FLOOR FLAT 125 SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EW	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	157B SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EJ	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	137 SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EW	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FLAT 8 133-135 SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EW	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	192 SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EU	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	179 SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EJ	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	131 SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EW	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FLAT 4 133-135 SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EW	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FLAT 3 133-135 SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EW	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FLAT 2 133-135 SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EW	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FLAT 7 133-135 SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EW	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FLAT 6 133-135 SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EW	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FLAT 5 133-135 SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EW	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FLAT 1 ORANGE TREE COURT 7 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7LS	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FLAT 10 ORANGE TREE COURT 7 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7LS	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FLAT 9 ORANGE TREE COURT 7 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7LS	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FLAT 8 ORANGE TREE COURT 7 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7LS	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	157A SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EJ	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FLAT 12 ORANGE TREE COURT 7 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7LS	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FLAT 11 ORANGE TREE COURT 7 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7LS	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FLAT 4 ORANGE TREE COURT 7 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7LS	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FLAT 3 ORANGE TREE COURT 7 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7LS	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FLAT 2 ORANGE TREE COURT 7 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7LS	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FLAT 7 ORANGE TREE COURT 7 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7LS	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FLAT 6 ORANGE TREE COURT 7 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7LS	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FLAT 5 ORANGE TREE COURT 7 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7LS	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	UNIT 11 2 SEDGMOOR PLACE LONDON SE5 7SE	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FLAT 3 155 SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EJ	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FLAT 2 155 SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EJ	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	UNIT 12 2 SEDGMOOR PLACE LONDON SE5 7SE	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	GROUND FLOOR 125 SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EW	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	UNIT 12 TO UNIT 15 2 SEDGMOOR PLACE LONDON SE5 7SE	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	UNIT 5 2 SEDGMOOR PLACE LONDON SE5 7SE	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	UNIT 4 2 SEDGMOOR PLACE LONDON SE5 7SE	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	UNIT 3 2 SEDGMOOR PLACE LONDON SE5 7SE	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FLAT 1 155 SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EJ	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	UNIT 9 2 SEDGMOOR PLACE LONDON SE5 7SE	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	UNIT 6 2 SEDGMOOR PLACE LONDON SE5 7SE	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	UNIT 13 2 SEDGMOOR PLACE LONDON SE5 7SE	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FLAT 8 32 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7RS	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FLAT 7 32 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7RS	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FLAT 6 32 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7RS	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	149A SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EW	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FLAT 3 32 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7RS	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FLAT 1 32 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7RS	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	UNIT 15 2 SEDGMOOR PLACE LONDON SE5 7SE	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	UNIT 14 2 SEDGMOOR PLACE LONDON SE5 7SE	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FLAT 5 32 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7RS	01/04/2014
02/04/2014	FLAT 4 32 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7RS	01/04/2014

24/04/2014	FLAT 13 RUMBALL HOUSE DOWLAS ESTATE HARRIS STREET LONDON SE5 7SA	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	8 STACY PATH LONDON SE5 7SL	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	9 STACY PATH LONDON SE5 7SL	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	7 STACY PATH LONDON SE5 7SL	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	5 STACY PATH LONDON SE5 7SL	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	6 STACY PATH LONDON SE5 7SL	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	FLAT 11 RUMBALL HOUSE DOWLAS ESTATE HARRIS STREET LONDON SE5 7SA	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	FLAT 12 RUMBALL HOUSE DOWLAS ESTATE HARRIS STREET LONDON SE5 7SA	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	FLAT 10 RUMBALL HOUSE DOWLAS ESTATE HARRIS STREET LONDON SE5 7SA	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	THE FLYING DUTCHMAN 156 WELLS WAY LONDON SE5 7SY	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	FLAT 1 RUMBALL HOUSE DOWLAS ESTATE HARRIS STREET LONDON SE5 7SA	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	FLAT 23 RUMBALL HOUSE DOWLAS ESTATE HARRIS STREET LONDON SE5 7SA	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	FLAT 2 119 SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EW	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	FLAT 1 119 SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EW	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	FIRST FLOOR FLAT 117 SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EW	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	119 SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EW	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	FLAT 5 RUMBALL HOUSE DOWLAS ESTATE HARRIS STREET LONDON SE5 7SA	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	FLAT 6 RUMBALL HOUSE DOWLAS ESTATE HARRIS STREET LONDON SE5 7SA	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	FLAT 4 RUMBALL HOUSE DOWLAS ESTATE HARRIS STREET LONDON SE5 7SA	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	FLAT 24 RUMBALL HOUSE DOWLAS ESTATE HARRIS STREET LONDON SE5 7SA	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	FLAT 3 RUMBALL HOUSE DOWLAS ESTATE HARRIS STREET LONDON SE5 7SA	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	SOUTHWARD COLLEGE CAMBERWELL CENTRE SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EW	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	FLAT 9 RUMBALL HOUSE DOWLAS ESTATE HARRIS STREET LONDON SE5 7SA	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	FLAT 7 RUMBALL HOUSE DOWLAS ESTATE HARRIS STREET LONDON SE5 7SA	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	FLAT 8 RUMBALL HOUSE DOWLAS ESTATE HARRIS STREET LONDON SE5 7SA	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	4 STACY PATH LONDON SE5 7SL	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	12 BERNARD MYERS HOUSE 4-6 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7RU	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	13 BERNARD MYERS HOUSE 4-6 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7RU	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	11 BERNARD MYERS HOUSE 4-6 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7RU	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	9 BERNARD MYERS HOUSE 4-6 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7RU	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	10 BERNARD MYERS HOUSE 4-6 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7RU	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	17 BERNARD MYERS HOUSE 4-6 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7RU	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	18 BERNARD MYERS HOUSE 4-6 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7RU	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	16 BERNARD MYERS HOUSE 4-6 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7RU	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	14 BERNARD MYERS HOUSE 4-6 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7RU	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	15 BERNARD MYERS HOUSE 4-6 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7RU	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	8 BERNARD MYERS HOUSE 4-6 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7RU	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	1 BERNARD MYERS HOUSE 4-6 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7RU	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	2 BERNARD MYERS HOUSE 4-6 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7RU	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	6 BERNARD MYERS HOUSE 4-6 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7RU	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	7 BERNARD MYERS HOUSE 4-6 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7RU	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	5 BERNARD MYERS HOUSE 4-6 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7RU	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	3 BERNARD MYERS HOUSE 4-6 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7RU	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	4 BERNARD MYERS HOUSE 4-6 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7RU	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	19 BERNARD MYERS HOUSE 4-6 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7RU	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	1 STACY PATH LONDON SE5 7SL	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	LIVING ACCOMMODATION 156 WELLS WAY LONDON SE5 7SY	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	117 SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7EW	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	2 STACY PATH LONDON SE5 7SL	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	3 STACY PATH LONDON SE5 7SL	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	12 STACY PATH LONDON SE5 7SL	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	10 STACY PATH LONDON SE5 7SL	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	11 STACY PATH LONDON SE5 7SL	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	FLAT 8 WINDMILL COURT 121 SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7FG	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	FLAT 1 WINDMILL COURT 121 SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7FG	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	FLAT 2 WINDMILL COURT 121 SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7FG	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	22 BERNARD MYERS HOUSE 4-6 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7RU	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	20 BERNARD MYERS HOUSE 4-6 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7RU	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	21 BERNARD MYERS HOUSE 4-6 HAVIL STREET LONDON SE5 7RU	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	FLAT 6 WINDMILL COURT 121 SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7FG	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	FLAT 7 WINDMILL COURT 121 SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7FG	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	FLAT 5 WINDMILL COURT 121 SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7FG	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	FLAT 3 WINDMILL COURT 121 SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7FG	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	FLAT 4 WINDMILL COURT 121 SOUTHAMPTON WAY LONDON SE5 7FG	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	FLAT A 156 Southampton Way LONDON SE5 7EW	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	FLAT B 156 Southampton Way LONDON SE5 7EW	24/04/2014
24/04/2014	FLAT C 156 Southampton Way LONDON SE5 7EW	24/04/2014

Re-consultation: 15.08.2014

APPENDIX 2

Consultation Responses Received

Internal services

Design and Conservation - No significant objections subject to conditions, but comments are incorporated into the main body of the report.

Environmental Protection Team (EPT) - No objections subject to conditions relating to internal noise levels, land contamination and construction management.

Transport Planning - The level of parking and cycle parking are acceptable. Swept paths for the largest vehicle accessing the development should be provided. Submission of delivery and servicing plan and construction management should be provided. The travel plan should include predicted trips and modal split targets based on these until data is collected. Access for cyclists will need to be of minimum widths.

Ecology Officer - No objections subject to conditions relating to details of green roofs, bird and bat boxes, native planting and ecological management plan.

Surface Water and Flood Management - Following the submission of the amended Flood Risk Assessment this addresses the initial concerns.

Statutory and non-statutory organisations

Environment Agency - No objections.

TfL - Due to the scale and 'low car' nature of the development, there is unlikely to be an unacceptable adverse impact on either public transport capacity or strategic road capacity.

Thames Water - No objections subject to informatives on any planning permission relating to minimum water pressure and impact piling.

Neighbours and local groups

Cllr Ian Wingfield has raised an objection to the application.

The letters of objections and support from neighbours have been summarised below.

A total number of 4 objections from residents and 2 support have been received for this site only.

Objections

Design

The density of development and particularly its height is inappropriate for the street; the area comprise mainly low height buildings; five floors is one floor too high for the immediate area; maximum of four storeys would be more appropriate; the development is very dense with very little landscaping; or other amenity on the western side in particular; Havil Street and Southampton Way have several listed Georgian and Victorian buildings and terraces with interesting detail and design, but the proposed development is extremely faceless and plain; it should be more reflective of the historic buildings in the vicinity, many of which are lively detail and design; Block C with four floors occupying the whole depth of the building would result in considerably more bulky appearance and it would be more sensitive to step back the top floor a little from the front building line; the building immediately adjoining the listed buildings on Southampton Way at two storeys is welcomed, but they are still as high as the pitched roofs of the neighbours.

Parking and traffic

There are no on-site residents parking; the 4 No. disabled parking spaces for 41 No. Residential units will not deter residents from having cars in the area where there is already a problem with parking the area; the Transport Statement states it would be 'car free', but this is not possible and unlikely since residents of the area have cars and many of the streets in the area do not have any parking controls; the development's density would exacerbate the problem of using Havil Street as a rat run

Amenity

The development would close in on the residents' views in Rumball House, Harris Street.

Following re-consultation, 2 objections have been received with the following concerns:

The development still has a bulky appearance; the height of the building (Block B) would look disproportionate to the surroundings and still too high; pleased to see that note has been taken from the outcome of the previous proposal in that there would be only two storeys immediately next to the listed buildings, but these two flat roofed storeys are as high as the pitched roofs of the neighbours; lack of provision of parking.

Support

The development would be good for the community and it would stop people from fly tipping rubbish on the site;

Camberwell Society - the proposed modern blocks of flats offer a good spread of units with large glazed surfaces at rear and decent outdoor amenities; the development would fit well along Southampton Way existing streetscape; the palette of materials proposed is still modern but still retaining some of the local grain which the Camberwell Society would support.