

Item No. 7.4	Classification: OPEN	Date: 21 July 2015	Meeting Name: Planning Sub-Committee A
Report title:	Development Management planning application: Application 15/AP/0988 for: Outline Planning Permission Address: SATI, THE TANNERY, BERMONDSEY STREET, LONDON SE1 3XN Proposal: Erection of a two-storey terrace comprising of 4no. live/work studios.		
Ward(s) or groups affected:	Grange		
From:	Director of Planning		
Application Start Date 30/04/2015		Application Expiry Date 25/06/2015	
Earliest Decision Date 28/05/2015			

RECOMMENDATION

1. a. That this application is referred to members for decision;
b. That members grant outline planning permission subject to conditions.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Site location and description

2. The application site forms part of a larger backland site situated between Crucifix Lane and Bermondsey Street known as 'The Tanneries'. It is currently possible to gain access to the site from three points; from Crucifix Lane to the north (via a manually-operated gated vehicular access on the east side of Champion House; from Black Swan Yard – a narrow side thoroughfare leading off of Bermondsey Street and 60m to the north of this through a gated 'stagecoach entrance' through No. 49-55 Bermondsey Street, which is a Grade II Listed Building also known as the Shiva Building.
3. Whilst the north and western part of the larger Tanneries site is situated within Bermondsey Street Conservation Area, the application site lies outside, approximately 40m to the east.
4. The nearest Listed Buildings to the application site are at No.s 59, 61 and 63 (and attached railings) Bermondsey Street (east side) and the railway viaduct arches on the approach into London Bridge Station on the north side of Crucifix Lane. Both are Grade II Listed.
5. The eastern boundary of the site is currently lined with a row of Poplar trees. These sit inside the existing 2.7m high brick wall which separates The Tanneries from White's Grounds Estate further to the east. These trees are not subject to a Tree Preservation Order.

Details of proposal

6. The application is submitted in outline form with all matters reserved (i.e., the details of access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale have been reserved for later determination).
7. It seeks outline permission for the erection of a two-storey terrace comprising of 4no. live/work studios. The terrace is aligned to face westwards with its east facing rear elevation abutting the existing brick boundary wall between the site and White's Grounds Estate (a residential development).
8. The building would be approx. 33.5m long and 6.7m wide. It would have a maximum height of 7.54m to the top of its arched roof-lights and otherwise its rear parapet wall would be 5.73m high while its taller front parapet wall would be 6.43m high.
9. Although outline (all matters reserved) some indicative details of its external appearance (design) and its internal layout have been provided.

Planning history

10. 14/AP/3064
Outline Planning Permission: Construction of six residential dwellinghouses within a three-storey terrace.
REFUSED:

Reason for refusal:

1. The proposed development, by reason of the combination of the height, length and siting of the rear wall in such close proximity to the communal courtyard and west-facing habitable room windows of flats within the adjacent block at No.s 67-91 Whites Grounds Estate would create an overbearing sense of enclosure to these dwellings as well as resulting in an unacceptable loss of outlook, daylight and sunlight to them. The amenities of the occupiers of these adjacent dwellings would therefore suffer significant adverse impacts, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), policy 7.6 (Architecture) of The London Plan (2011), saved policy 3.2 (Protection of Amenity) of the Southwark Unitary Development Plan (2007) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document - Residential Design Standards (October, 2011).

12/EN/0572

Enforcement type: Unauthorised building works (UBW)

Built three apartments

Sign-off date 16/01/2013 Sign-off reason: Final closure - no breach of control (FCNB)

Planning history of adjoining sites

11. None relevant

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Summary of main issues

12. The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:
 - a) Principle of the development
 - b) Impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers
 - c) Impact of adjoining and nearby uses on occupiers and users of proposed development

- d) Design issues
- e) Quality of residential accommodation provided
- f) Traffic issues

Planning policy

13. National Planning Policy Framework (Published 27 March 2012)
Section 7: Requiring good design.

The London Plan (2015)

- Policy 3.3 Increasing housing supply
- Policy 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments
- Policy 3.8 Housing choice
- Policy 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
- Policy 5.3 Sustainable design and construction
- Policy 5.11 Green roofs and development site environs

Policy 5.12 Flood risk management

- Policy 5.13 Sustainable drainage
- Policy 5.17 Waste capacity
- Policy 6.3 Assessing effects of development on transport capacity
- Policy 6.9 Cycling
- 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 7.6 Architecture
- Policy 7.14 Air quality
- Policy 7.15 Reducing and managing noise, etc
- Policy 8.3 Community infrastructure levy

Supplementary Planning Guidance

- Housing (2012)
- Sustainable Design and Construction (2006)
- Accessible London – Achieving an Inclusive Environment (2014)

Southwark Core Strategy (Adopted 6 April 2011)

- Strategic Policy 1 - Sustainable development
- Strategic Policy 2 - Sustainable transport
- Strategic Policy 5 - Providing new homes
- Strategic Policy 10 - Jobs and businesses
- Strategic Policy 12 - Design and conservation
- Strategic Policy 13 - High environmental standards

14. Southwark Unitary Development Plan (Adopted 28 July 2007) (Saved Policies)

The council's cabinet on 19 March 2013, as required by para 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 1.6 (Live/work units)
Policy 3.2 (Protection of Amenity)
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 4.2 (Quality of residential accommodation)
Policy 5.2 (Transport impacts)
Policy 5.3 (Walking and cycling)
Policy 5.6 (Car parking)

Residential Design Standards SPD (2011)
Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (2009)
Bankside, Borough and London Bridge SPD (Draft, 2010)

Principle of development

15. The draft Bankside, Borough and London Bridge Supplementary Planning Document (2010) contains information from a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment that was undertaken by the Greater London Authority with the purpose of identifying sites having some potential to provide new housing as part of a process of assessing the future housing capacity of the borough. It reaffirms a long-standing policy position that the wider Tanneries site (including the application site) has some potential to provide new housing.
16. There are no other conflicting proposals in the current development plan for the borough so there is no objection to the principle of providing live/work units within the wider Tanneries site of which the application site forms a part.

Environmental impact assessment

17. The proposal lies outside the scope of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations) 2011 and as such there is no requirement for an EIA.

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

18. Saved Policy 3.2 (Protection of Amenity) of the Southwark UDP (2007), Strategic Policy 13 (High Environmental Standards) of the Southwark Core Strategy (2011) and policy 7.6 (Architecture) of the London Plan (2011) seek to ensure that new development does not adversely impact upon the standard of residential amenity for occupiers nearby.

At section 2.7, the Residential Design Standards SPD (2011) states that,

19. 'Residential developments should maximise sunlight and daylight, both within the new development and to neighbouring properties. Development should seek to minimise overshadowing or blocking of light to adjoining properties. A lack of daylight can have negative impacts on health as well as making the development gloomy and uninviting.

Maximising sunlight and daylight also helps to make a building energy efficient by reducing the need for electric light and meeting some of the heating requirements

through solar gain. The orientation of buildings can maximise passive solar gain to keep buildings warm in winter and cool in summer. See the Design and Access Statements Supplementary Planning Document and the Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document for further information.

Developments should meet site layout requirements set out in the Building Research Establishment (BRE) Site Layout for Daylight and Sunlight – A Guide to Good Practice (2011). In particular the following minimum tests need to be applied to avoid the unacceptable loss of daylight and/or sunlight resulting from a development, including new build, extensions and conversions.

Daylight and sunlight tests on the impact of the new development on neighbouring properties

Daylight tests

This test should be used where the proposed development faces the affected window of the neighbouring property

1. Draw a line at 25 degrees upwards from the centre of the affected window;
2. If the proposed development is higher than this 25 degree line, there may be an unacceptable loss of daylight to the affected window.'

20. In comparison to the previous three-storey scheme (application ref. 14/AP/3064) the current proposal is only two-storeys. The key issue in the previous application and so also in this current application is the height and proximity of the rear elevation (abutting the boundary) to the existing block of flats within White's Grounds Estate immediately to the east. With the loss of a storey the rear elevation of the current scheme would represent a reduction in height of between 4.57m and 5.47m. The submitted plans for the current proposal show cross-sections at two different points along the building and these demonstrate that this new lower two-storey building would substantially comply with the above test. As such, it is now accepted that any loss of daylight and sunlight to the nearest habitable ground-floor windows that would face the proposal's rear wall would be within reasonable tolerances and would not be significant in planning terms.
21. Similarly, and also with regard to the communal courtyard and west-facing habitable room windows of flats within the adjacent block at No.s 67-91 Whites Grounds Estate (particularly those at ground-floor level), it is considered that the development's 5.73m high rear wall would not result in any undue restriction of outlook and would not create an overbearing sense of enclosure on the boundary, particularly as its height would represent a relatively modest increase of only 2.13m over and above the existing 3.6m high brick boundary wall.
22. A query has been raised in one of the neighbor consultation responses received asking whether officers are satisfied that it would not be possible for existing residents with balconies on the upper floors of the adjacent block in Whites Grounds Estate to overlook the first-floor residential accommodation within the proposed live/work units.
23. Having had regard to the indicative perspective drawings of the scheme which show the roof articulated with a row of shell-shaped north-facing clerestory windows, it is considered that notwithstanding their size and proximity to the adjacent residential block at Whites Grounds Estates, their northward orientation would ensure that they would not result in a loss of privacy either to the neighbouring residents in White Grounds Estate or (in the reverse direction) to future occupiers of the proposed accommodation.

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

development

24. The area immediately surrounding the site comprises a mixture of offices and light industrial uses. These uses are not especially noisy and so adequate noise attenuation from external sources could be achieved through the imposition of an appropriate condition.

Design issues

25. Saved policies 3.12 and 3.13 seek to ensure that all new development is designed to a high standard.
26. There is no objection to the indicative design or architectural style of the proposal. This matter will be considered within a subsequent application or applications for the reserved matters of 'appearance' and 'landscaping' in any event.

Quality of residential accommodation

27. Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012), policy 3.5 of the London Plan (2015), strategic policy 12 (Design and conservation) of the Southwark Core Strategy and saved policies 1.6 (Live/work units) and 4.2 (Quality of residential accommodation) all require new residential developments to not only be of a high quality aesthetically but also of a high quality architecturally (or functionally), providing good internal living conditions for their future occupiers.

28. Saved policy 1.6 (Live/work units) of the Southwark UDP (2007) states that,

'Live/work units will be permitted on sites where both employment and residential uses are acceptable. Live/work units will only be permitted if they meet the following criteria:

i. At least 40sqm of useable work space (B1 Use Class) must be separately defined within the unit. This must be capable of accommodating a range of business activities and a number of staff in isolation from the living space; and

ii. Taking into account the need to provide a useable workspace, the living space (C3 Use Class) should provide a satisfactory standard of residential accommodation (see Policy 4.2).

A condition will be attached to any planning permission to protect the employment and residential floorspace.'

29. The schedule of the proposed accommodation is set out in the table below. With the exception the ground-floor workshop for Unit 2 (38sqm) all the units are compliant with saved policy 1.6 in terms of their gross internal floorspace as well as the other aspects of the policy. They are also all compliant with saved policy 4.2 and the Residential Design Standards SPD in their size and indicative layout of the first-floor residential studio elements.

	Floorspace (sqm)	
	Ground floor (workshop)	First-floor studio (residential)
Unit 1	45.1	45.5
Unit 2	38	38.4
Unit 3	41.7	41.5
Unit 4	43	43

30. As such, the quality of accommodation that the proposed live/work units would offer is considered to be of an acceptable standard.
31. Notwithstanding this, it is suggested that the internal layout at first-floor level could be improved by moving the proposed WC/shower room from the rear to the niche in front of the stairwell with the two-fold benefit being, (1) the removal of a window on the boundary with Whites Ground Estate (thus ensuring a reduced perception of overlooking on the part of existing residents within the Whites Grounds Estate, notwithstanding any obscure-glass treatment and opening restrictions that might be imposed) and, (2) leaving a more usable/flexible square floorplan for the main studio room. Such matters could be explored through the assessment of a subsequent reserved matters application.

Traffic issues

32. There are no objections to the transport impacts of the development providing that adequate, secure and easily-accessible cycle storage is provided and that acceptable refuse/recycling storage facilities and collection arrangements are put in place.
33. More fundamentally, however, any reserved matters application seeking to resolve the matter of access would need to demonstrate the provision of a safe, segregated passage to the dwellings for pedestrians and cyclists given that throughout the yards of the larger Tanneries site large vehicles travel through regularly. A safe passage from the extent of the public highway to all the proposed units will therefore be required.

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

34. The scale, massing and indicative design / appearance of the proposed terrace will have an acceptable impact on the setting of Bermondsey Street Conservation Area further to the west and north-west.

Impact on trees

35. Although it is appreciated that the existing poplar trees along the inside of the east boundary of the site (i.e., they are within the application site) provide a degree of visual amenity (a point that has been raised in a neighbor consultation response), nonetheless officers do not consider the trees to be worthy of protection.
36. On the previous refused application, 14/AP/3064, the Council's Urban Forester advised that the developer should be encouraged to replace some of this lost greenery, through, for example, the provision of a living wall on the rear elevation. However, the current proposal is a storey lower than that previous scheme and hence the area of the rear wall is much reduced offering much less scope for a living wall. In any event, officers consider that this is not necessary to make the development acceptable and that by abutting the boundary as well as being east-facing a living wall here is unlikely to be properly maintained and hence is unlikely to thrive.

Planning obligations (S.106 undertaking or agreement)

37. None identified.

Sustainable development implications

38. None of any particular significance identified.

Other matters – CIL Liability

39. Section 143 of the Localism Act states that any financial contribution received in terms of community infrastructure levy (CIL) is a material "local financial consideration" in planning decisions. The requirement for payment of the Mayoral or Southwark CIL is therefore a material consideration, however the weight attached is determined by the decision maker. The Mayoral CIL is required to contribute towards strategic transport investments in London as a whole, primarily Crossrail, while Southwark's CIL will provide for infrastructure that supports growth in Southwark.
40. In Southwark the Mayoral CIL was established at a rate of £35 per sqm of new development, although this is an index linked payment. The Southwark CIL rate is based on the type and location of the development. The Mayoral CIL in Southwark currently is calculated on the basis of £40.02 per sqm.
41. The 388sqm figure stated on the applicant's CIL form has been used to calculate a Mayoral CIL liability of £15,529. However, for the Southwark CIL, the live-work units' C3 & B1 split in the form is considered to be incorrect. 24sqm of C3 exclusive floor space on the ground level has been included to give a total of 218sqm of C3 floorspace (rather than the figure of 194sqm stated on the applicant's CIL form), this results in a Southwark CIL liability of £43,600. (The rate for B1 in Zone 2 of the Southwark CIL charging schedule is nil.)

Conclusion on planning issues

42. Subject to the imposition of necessary, relevant, precise and reasonable conditions and for all the reasons stated above, the development is considered to be acceptable in principle, having demonstrated compliance with relevant policies in the Development Plan for the Borough and the Government's National Planning Policy Framework (2012) and therefore it is recommended that outline planning permission should be GRANTED.

Community impact statement

43. The impacts of this application have been assessed as part of the application process with regard to local people in respect of the "protected characteristics", as set out in the Equality Act 2010, the Council's Community Impact Statement and Southwark Council's approach to equality: delivering a fairer future for all, being age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion and belief, sex (a man or a woman), and sexual orientation.

In assessing this application, the Council has consulted those most likely to be affected as part of the application process and considered these protected characteristics when material to this proposal.

The impact on local people is set out above.

There are no issues relevant to particular communities/groups likely to be affected by the proposal, and,

There are no likely adverse or less good implications for any particular communities/groups.

Consultations

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

Consultation replies

45. Details of consultation responses received are set out in Appendix 2.
46. Summary of consultation responses:

Flat 74, Whites Grounds Estate:

Concerned at the likely level of noise and disruption during construction works and noisy building works going on outside of reasonable hours to the detriment of residents of Whites Grounds Estate.

Concerned for loss of light and privacy.

The representations of daylight/overshadowing are incorrect in showing the estate as already existing in a state of near-permanent darkness.

18 Winchester Walk:

Object to the loss of the Poplar trees

Leathermarket Joint Management Board:

Loss of light

Loss of visual amenity (as a result of the loss of the trees)

Concern about potential for overlooking / loss of privacy

Environment Agency:

No objections subject to conditions to deal with potential contaminated land, the prevention of piling or other forms of penetrative foundation design and the prevention of infiltration of surface water run-off.

Thames Water Ltd. - No objections

Southwark Transport Policy Team:

We would expect the development to be car free, and permit free. Cycle parking should be provided in line with the more onerous London Plan standards. Pedestrians and cyclists will need a separate or segregated access as the yard has large vehicles traveling through regularly. A safe passage from the extent of the highway to all residential units will be required. This is so that pedestrians and cyclists interaction with vehicles using the yard is kept to a minimum. Conveniently located bin stores should be shown.

Archaeological Officer: - No objection subject to pre-commencement conditions requiring the undertaking of an on-site archaeological evaluation, etc and the submission of detailed drawings showing the proposed foundation design.

Urban Forester:

(Comments provided on previous refused application ref. 14/AP/3064)

No objections. These Poplars are not protected and are not worthy of protection. However, the developer should be encouraged to replace some of this lost greenery, through, for example, the provision of a 'living wall' on the rear elevation.

Human rights implications

47. 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.
48. This application has the legitimate aim of seeking to provide additional residential accommodation. 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/11-51 Application file: 15/AP/0988 Southwark Local Development Framework and Development Plan Documents	Chief Executive's Department 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH	Planning enquiries telephone: 020 7525 5403 Planning enquiries email: planning.enquiries@southwark.gov.uk Case officer telephone: 020 7525 5461 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	Simon Bevan, Director of Planning	
Report Author	Ciaran Regan, Planning Officer	
Version	Final	
Dated	10 July 2015	
Key Decision	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Strategic director, finance & corporate services	No	No
Strategic director, environment and leisure	No	No
Strategic director, housing and community services	No	No
Director of regeneration	No	No
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team	10 July 2015	

APPENDIX 1

Consultation undertaken

Site notice date: 01/05/2015

Press notice date: N/a

Case officer site visit date: 30/04/2015

Neighbour consultation letters sent: 05/05/2015

Internal services consulted:

Transport Planning Team
Archaeological Officer
Urban Forester

Statutory and non-statutory organisations consulted:

Environment Agency
Thames Water Ltd.

Neighbours and local groups consulted:

85 WHITES GROUNDS ESTATE WHITES GROUNDS LONDON SE1 3JU
84 WHITES GROUNDS ESTATE WHITES GROUNDS LONDON SE1 3JU
87 WHITES GROUNDS ESTATE WHITES GROUNDS LONDON SE1 3JU
86 WHITES GROUNDS ESTATE WHITES GROUNDS LONDON SE1 3JU
81 WHITES GROUNDS ESTATE WHITES GROUNDS LONDON SE1 3JU
80 WHITES GROUNDS ESTATE WHITES GROUNDS LONDON SE1 3JU
83 WHITES GROUNDS ESTATE WHITES GROUNDS LONDON SE1 3JU
82 WHITES GROUNDS ESTATE WHITES GROUNDS LONDON SE1 3JU
93 WHITES GROUNDS ESTATE WHITES GROUNDS LONDON SE1 3JX
92 WHITES GROUNDS ESTATE WHITES GROUNDS LONDON SE1 3JX
95 WHITES GROUNDS ESTATE WHITES GROUNDS LONDON SE1 3JX
94 WHITES GROUNDS ESTATE WHITES GROUNDS LONDON SE1 3JX
89 WHITES GROUNDS ESTATE WHITES GROUNDS LONDON SE1 3JX
88 WHITES GROUNDS ESTATE WHITES GROUNDS LONDON SE1 3JU
91 WHITES GROUNDS ESTATE WHITES GROUNDS LONDON SE1 3JX
90 WHITES GROUNDS ESTATE WHITES GROUNDS LONDON SE1 3JX
69 WHITES GROUNDS ESTATE WHITES GROUNDS LONDON SE1 3JU
68 WHITES GROUNDS ESTATE WHITES GROUNDS LONDON SE1 3JU
71 WHITES GROUNDS ESTATE WHITES GROUNDS LONDON SE1 3JU
70 WHITES GROUNDS ESTATE WHITES GROUNDS LONDON SE1 3JU
75 BERMONDSEY STREET LONDON SE1 3XF
1 BLACK SWAN YARD LONDON SE1 3XW
67 WHITES GROUNDS ESTATE WHITES GROUNDS LONDON SE1 3JU
3 BLACK SWAN YARD LONDON SE1 3XW
77 WHITES GROUNDS ESTATE WHITES GROUNDS LONDON SE1 3JU
76 WHITES GROUNDS ESTATE WHITES GROUNDS LONDON SE1 3JU
79 WHITES GROUNDS ESTATE WHITES GROUNDS LONDON SE1 3JU
78 WHITES GROUNDS ESTATE WHITES GROUNDS LONDON SE1 3JU
73 WHITES GROUNDS ESTATE WHITES GROUNDS LONDON SE1 3JU
72 WHITES GROUNDS ESTATE WHITES GROUNDS LONDON SE1 3JU
75 WHITES GROUNDS ESTATE WHITES GROUNDS LONDON SE1 3JU
74 WHITES GROUNDS ESTATE WHITES GROUNDS LONDON SE1 3JU
18 WINCHESTER WALK LONDON SE1 9AG

Re-consultation: N/a

APPENDIX 2

Consultation responses received

Internal services:

Transport Planning Team:

We would expect the development to be car free, and permit free. Cycle parking should be provided in line with the more onerous London Plan standards. Pedestrians and cyclists will need a separate or segregated access as the yard has large vehicles traveling through regularly. A safe passage from the extent of the highway to all residential units will be required. This is so that pedestrians and cyclists interaction with vehicles using the yard is kept to a minimum. Conveniently located bin stores should be shown.

Archaeological Officer: No objection subject to pre-commencement conditions requiring the undertaking of an on-site archaeological evaluation, etc and the submission of detailed drawings showing the proposed foundation design.

Urban Forester:

(Comments provided on previous refused application ref. 14/AP/3064)

No objections. These Poplars are not protected and are not worthy of protection. However, the developer should be encouraged to replace some of this lost greenery, through, for example, the provision of a 'living wall' on the rear elevation.

Statutory and non-statutory organisations:

Environment Agency:

No objections subject to conditions to deal with potential contaminated land, the prevention of piling or other forms of penetrative foundation design and the prevention of infiltration of surface water run-off.

Thames Water Ltd.:

Waste Comments - There are public sewers crossing or close to your development. In order to protect public sewers and to ensure that Thames Water can gain access to those sewers for future repair and maintenance, approval should be sought from Thames Water where the erection of a building or an extension to a building or underpinning work would be over the line of, or would come within 3 metres of, a public sewer. Thames Water will usually refuse such approval in respect of the construction of new buildings, but approval may be granted in some cases for extensions to existing buildings. The applicant is advised to contact Thames Water Developer Services on 0845 850 2777 to discuss the options available at this site.

Surface Water Drainage - With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of groundwater. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. They can be contacted on 0845 850 2777. Reason - to ensure that the surface water discharge from the site shall not be detrimental to the existing sewerage system.

Thames Water would advise that with regard to sewerage infrastructure capacity, we

would not have any objection to the above planning application.

Water Comments - On the basis of information provided, Thames Water would advise that with regard to water infrastructure capacity, we would not have any objection to the above planning application.

Thames Water recommend the following informative be attached to this planning permission. Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a minimum pressure of 10m head (approx 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point where it leaves Thames Waters pipes. The developer should take account of this minimum pressure in the design of the proposed development.

Neighbours and local groups

Flat 74, Whites Grounds Estate

Concerned at potential for noise and disruption during construction works and noisy building works going on outside of reasonable hours to the detriment of residents of Whites Grounds Estate. Also concerned about the effect of light loss, privacy and noise disturbance should the building be erected. The representations of daylight/overshadowing shown in Document No. 2015TAN-RED-Rev.A in my opinion seek to show the estate as already existing in a state of near-permanent darkness. This is not the case, with flats on the first and second floors enjoying many hours of tree-shaded sunlight in the afternoon and evening. Flats on the ground floor have always suffered a lack of light due to the excessively high boundary wall between The Tanneries Yard and the estate – a problem that has led to unwanted antisocial nighttime activities from others beyond the estate. I urge the council to scrutinise the light-loss ramifications further and not to take the document as fact. Considering probable future light loss and the likely subsequent noise pollution from the new buildings once completed, I stress that I oppose this application in the strongest terms.

18 Winchester Walk, SE1 9AG

I very strongly object to this application which brazenly intends to fell a fine row of healthy poplar trees 'to facilitate construction'. Just when the presence of trees is proven to be vital to the health and wellbeing of residents, the developer, as ever in search of an immediate buck, decides they are of no importance at all.

Leathermarket Joint Management Board

The removal of the trees will cause a substantial loss of amenity for the residents of the neighbouring block in Whites Grounds. The Tanneries site is currently substantially of an industrial nature - full of rusting containers and very unattractive. The trees provide a shield to the Whites Grounds residents that will be lost if the development goes ahead. The trees also provide important greenery for the Whites Grounds estate and surrounding area, in what is a highly-developed part of London. I would like to see a plan for replacement trees for those proposed for removal.

Some concern that it may be possible to look into the proposed first-floor accommodation via the north-facing skylights from the upper balconies of the Whites Grounds block.

The wall against which the properties are being built is not in great condition and has had a number of patch repairs over the years. There has also been a continuing dispute about the condition of a sewer which lies immediately under the proposed site of the houses. There is ongoing uncertainty about responsibility for the wall.

I would like to see an analysis of the effect of this development on the state of the wall and sewer and would wish to see a plan to mitigate any problems cause by the construction and development of this area.

I appreciate the applicant's attempts to demonstrate that the overshadowing impact would be acceptable. However I note that a line of trees is not as impermeable to light as a brick wall, which does not seem to have been acknowledged in this analysis.