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**Report title:**
Development Management planning application: Council's own development
Application 15/AP/4337 for: Council's Own Development - Reg. 3

**Address:**
74-82 RYE LANE IN FRONT OF PECKHAM RYE STATION AND 2-10 BLENHEIM GROVE, LONDON SE15 4RY

**Proposal:**
Creation of a new public square between Peckham Rye Station and Rye Lane following demolition of the arcade buildings currently located between the north and south railway viaducts; refurbishment of the railway arches facing onto the new square and refurbishment and erection of a two storey extension to the building at 2-10 Blenheim Grove/82 Rye Lane, to provide A1 (retail), A2 (financial and professional), A3 (restaurant/cafe), A5 (hot food takeaway), B1a (offices) and D1 (non-residential institution) uses, together with hard landscaping, public WC and other associated works.

**Ward(s) or groups affected:**
The Lane

**From:**
Director of Planning

**Application Start Date** 28/10/2015  
**Application Expiry Date** 17/02/2016  
**Earliest Decision Date** 25/12/2015  
**Time Extension Date** 14/03/2016

**RECOMMENDATION**

1. That planning permission be granted, subject to conditions.

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

**Site location and description**

2. The application site is located on the western side of Rye Lane, immediately in front of Peckham Rye Station which is a grade II listed building. Railway viaducts dominate the northern and southern parts of the site, and there is pedestrian access through the railway arches to Holly Grove to the north and Blenheim Grove to the south. Rye Lane is a busy shopping street, whilst Holly Grove is predominantly residential and contains a number of listed buildings. Blenheim Grove is more mixed in character and includes retail and commercial units, a church, industrial and residential uses.

3. The site comprises three 2-storey 1930s art deco style buildings and five railway arches. Two of the 1930s buildings form part of an arcade of retail units which fronts Rye Lane and extends back towards the station, with a covered pedestrian arcade between the two; the third is located on the southern corner of the site with frontages to both Rye Lane and Blenheim Grove. The buildings and arches are occupied by a range of uses including retail space, cafes, a bank, a dental surgery, a church and a sculpture studio.
4. The site sits within the Rye Lane Peckham Conservation Area which is characterised by the commercial town centre on Rye Lane, Peckham High Street and Peckham Hill Street; it adjoins the Holly Grove Conservation Area to the west.

Details of proposal

5. Full planning permission is sought by the Council for the creation of a new 1,200sqm public square in front of the station, following the demolition of the existing arcade buildings which sit between the viaducts. The exposed railway arches which would face the new square would be refurbished, and a 2-storey extension would be erected above 82 Rye Lane/2-10 Blenheim Grove which is the southern-most building on the site. A breakdown of the existing and proposed uses is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing (sqm)</th>
<th>Proposed (sqm)</th>
<th>Net (sqm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1 (retail), A2 (financial and professional services), A3 (café / restaurant, A5 (hot food takeaway)</td>
<td>2249</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>-1384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1a (offices)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 (non-residential institutions 'community space')</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sui Generis (WCs)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Internal Area</td>
<td>2830</td>
<td>1697</td>
<td>-1133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian / Public space</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>1756</td>
<td>927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3659</td>
<td>3453</td>
<td>-206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: D1 use includes health centres, places of worship and museums.

New public square

6. This would be directly in front of Peckham Rye Station and would measure approximately 36m x 32m. It would be paved with dark Irish blue limestone and would include low level planters, spill out space for the commercial uses on either side of the square, space for community events, and space for mobile traders on the southern side of the square. Other than external lighting and works to improve its setting, no works are proposed to the station building.

Refurbished railway arches

7. Two railway arches on the northern side of the square would be refurbished, with the arch closest to Rye Lane providing space for a shop or café/restaurant and the second arch to the north-west providing accessible public toilets. A new corten steel structure would be provided along part of the northern side of the square to support the station platform above.

8. On the southern side of the square the arches would provide flexible retail, financial and professional service and café/restaurant floorspace, ancillary plant areas and provide access to the upper floors of 2-10 Blenheim Grove which could be accessed from both the new square and Blenheim Grove. Glazing and corten steel canopies would be added to the refurbished arches on both sides of the square.

82 Rye Lane / 2-10 Blenheim Grove

9. There would be flexible retail space on the ground floor of this building, community and flexible retail space on the first floor, office space for 27 desks on the second floor opening out onto a terrace overlooking Rye Lane, and community space capable of accommodating 40 people on the top floor, together with a covered
community garden. The extension to the building would increase its height by approximately 5.5m and would be clad with metal and corrugated glass. The western side of the roof would be finished with silver profiled metal cladding, and profiled polycarbonate would be provided on the eastern side over the roof garden.

**Amendments**

10. During the course of the application the cladding material for the extension to 2-10 Blenheim Grove has been changed from corrugated polycarbonate to corrugated glass, additional cycle parking and a plan showing a potential location for a cycle hire docking station have been provided, and four trees have been added to the public square. Additional information regarding sustainability and equalities impacts has been provided.

11. The development would be jointly funded by the Council and the Greater London Authority (GLA). The Council was awarded a grant from the Mayor's Regeneration Fund in 2012 to contribute towards the delivery of the scheme, and it was subsequently agreed by the Council’s cabinet in April 2012 to enter into a grant agreement with the GLA to develop and deliver a proposal for the site. The freehold of the site is owned by Network Rail and there are complex head lease ownership arrangements. In light of this, in the event that planning permission is granted the Council would apply to the Secretary of State for a Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) to secure vacant possession of the site to enable the development to proceed.

12. The scheme would be delivered in the following broad phases:

   **Phase 1** (Summer 2016-Spring 2017) – Extension and remodelling works to 2-10 Blenheim Grove

   **Phase 2** (Spring 2017-Summer 2017) – Demolition of the buildings to the south of the pedestrian arcade, landscaping the southern part of the square and repairs/remodelling to the southern arches;

   **Phase 3** (Spring 2017-Summer 2018) – Demolition of the buildings to the north of the pedestrian arcade, landscaping of the northern part of the square, repairs/remodelling to the northern railway arches including any necessary repairs to the structure supporting the station platform above.

13. **Relevant planning history**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4 Station Way (Arcade building)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>13/AP/0336</strong> Application type: Lawful Development Certificate Proposed: Change of use of the upper floor from Class A2 (employment agency) to a self contained flat. Decision date: 14.03.2013. Decision: Refused (REF) for the following reason:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed development is not considered to be lawful because the proposed change of use does not comply with Class F of Part 3 of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **13/AP/0977** Application type: Full Planning Permission (FUL) Change of use of the upper floor from Class A2 (employment agency) to a self contained flat. Decision date: 23.05.2013. Decision: Refused (REF) for the following reason: |
| The resulting residential unit would provide a substandard level of accommodation, by virtue of the size of the rooms provided and the overall dwelling size; with a lack of outlook, natural light and ventilation given the sites location, resulting in a poor |

13/A/1971 Application type: Full Planning Permission (FUL) Change of use of the upper floor from an Employment Agency (Class A2) to a self contained flat. Decision date: 11/02/2014. Appeal against non-determination DISMISSED.

82 Rye Lane

07/AP/2169 Application type: Full Planning Permission (FUL) Internal and external alterations to form three retail units within floorspace of existing retail units incorporating three new shopfronts on flank elevation. Decision date 21/11/2007. Decision: Refused (REF) for the following reason:

The proposed development, by reason of the lack of standard shopfront design elements, would fail to be sympathetic to adjoining shopfronts and would be out of character with the streetscene. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policies 3.11 Efficient Use of Land, 3.12 Quality in Design and 3.13 Urban Design of the Southwark Plan [July] 2007 and SPG 2 'Shopfront Design and Materials'.

07/AP/2769 Application type: Full Planning Permission (FUL) Internal and external alterations to form three retail units within floorspace of existing retail units incorporating three new shopfronts on flank elevation. Decision date 22/01/2008. Decision: Granted (GRA)

Peckham Rye Station

11a Station Way

15-AP-5076 Removal of 1960s concrete stair to the station's north wing and installation of a new steel and timber stair; alterations to the existing 1930s station toilet. Application for listed building consent UNDER CONSIDERATION.

15-AP-3420 - Change of use from a Betting Office (Sui Generis) to a Restaurant (Use Class A3); alteration of x 2 existing windows into doorways for fire escape and delivery access and re-opening of x2 former openings in the north wall at first-floor level to provide extract ventilation. Planning permission GRANTED in January 2016 (associated listed building consent granted in November 2015).

12-AP-3665 - Creation of new cycle hub comprising the secure storage of passenger cycles and workshop/shop for repair/maintenance of cycles and sale of associated products; new frontage to arch. Planning permission was GRANTED in January 2013.

1-4 Holly Grove

13-AP-0554 - Change of use of the existing building from light industrial (Class B1) to an art gallery (Class De) at ground floor and a restaurant (Class A3) above with installation of means of escape staircase and new doors. Planning permission was GRANTED on 14/06/2013.

Unit 1 and 2, 12-16 Blenheim Grove

15/AP/4096 Application type: S.73 Vary/remove conds/minor alterations (VAR) Variation of Condition 5 of planning permission ref 14/AP/4300 that restricted trading hours for Class A3 purposes in order to allow extended trading hours to 23:00 on
Sundays.
Decision date 03/12/2015 Decision: Granted (GRA)

Unit 4, 12-16 Blenheim Grove

14-AP-0523 - Variation of condition 7 (opening hours) of planning permission dated 25/06/13 [application no.13/AP/0860 for the change of use of ground floor from Class A1 (retail) to Class A3 (restaurant/cafe), with extract duct to rear] to amend hours of operation from 8am 11pm Monday to Friday, 8am to midnight on Saturday and 9am to 2pm on Sunday and Public Holidays to: Monday-Thursday 7am - 12 midnight; Friday 7am - 1am; Saturday 8am -1am; and Sunday 9am-5pm. Planning permission GRANTED in September 2014.

Unit 5, 12-16 Blenheim Grove

12-AP-2871 - Change of use of ground floor from Class A1 retail to Class A3 restaurant/cafe with installation of duct to rear. Planning permission was GRANTED on 23/11/2012.

12-16 Blenheim Grove

09/AP/1580 – Conversion of first floor office to provide 3 No. residential units and erection of additional floor to provide an additional 3 No. residential units (6 units in total: 4 X 2 bed and 2 X 1 bed); terraces to rear first and second floors and new windows to flank elevation on first and second floors. Planning permission REFUSED and appeal DISMISSED.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Summary of main issues

14. The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:
   a) Principle of the proposed development in terms of land use
   b) Environmental impact assessment
   c) Design, conservation area and setting of adjacent listed buildings
   d) Trees and landscaping
   e) Impact of proposed development on amenity of existing occupiers and surrounding area
   f) Transport
   g) Planning obligations (S.106 undertaking or agreement)
   h) Mayoral and Southwark Community Infrastructure levy
   i) Sustainable development implications
   j) Ecology
   k) Contaminated land
   l) Air quality
   m) Statement of community involvement
   n) Human rights and equalities implications.

15. Planning policy

Planning policy designations (Proposals Map)

- Proposals site 6 Peckham and Nunhead Area Action Plan (PNAAP)
- Peckham major town centre
- Peckham action area core
- Protected shopping frontage 26
Rye Lane Peckham Conservation Area
Urban Density Zone
Air Quality Management Area

16. **National Planning Policy Framework**

National planning policy is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (‘NPPF’) which was adopted on 27 March 2012. The NPPF focuses on a presumption in favour of sustainable development, of which there are three strands; economic, social and environmental. The core planning principles include, amongst others, the requirement to ‘drive and support development’.

- Section 1 - Building a strong, competitive economy
- Section 2 - Ensuring the vitality of town centres
- Section 4 - Promoting sustainable transport
- Section 8 - Promoting healthy communities
- Section 7 - Requiring good design
- Section 10 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- Section 11 - Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
- Section 12 - Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

**National Planning Practice Guidance**

17. **London Plan July 2015 consolidated with alterations since 2011**

- Policy 2.15 Town centres
- Policy 3.1 Ensuring equal life chances for all
- Policy 3.2 Improving Health and Addressing Health Inequalities
- Policy 3.16 Protection and Enhancement of Community Infrastructure
- Policy 4.1 Developing London’s economy
- Policy 4.6 Support for and enhancement of arts, culture, sport and entertainment
- Policy 4.7 Retail and town centre development
- Policy 4.8 Supporting a successful and diverse retail sector and related facilities and services
- Policy 4.10 New and emerging economic sectors
- Policy 5.1 Climate change mitigation
- Policy 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
- Policy 5.3 Sustainable design and construction
- Policy 5.4 Retrofitting
- Policy 5.5 Decentralised energy networks
- Policy 5.7 Renewable energy
- Policy 5.9 Overheating and cooling
- Policy 5.15 Water use and supplies
- Policy 5.10 Urban greening
- Policy 5.12 Flood risk management
- Policy 5.13: Sustainable drainage
- Policy 5.15 Water use and supplies
- Policy 6.9 Cycling
- Policy 6.10 Walking
- Policy 7.1 Lifetime neighbourhoods
- Policy 7.2 An inclusive environment
- Policy 7.3 Designing out crime
- Policy 7.4 Local character
- Policy 7.5 Public realm
18. **Core Strategy 2011**

- Strategic policy 1 - Sustainable development
- Strategic policy 2 - Sustainable transport
- Strategic policy 3 - Shopping, leisure and entertainment
- Strategic policy 10 - Jobs and businesses
- Strategic policy 11 - Open spaces and wildlife
- Strategic policy 12 - Design and conservation
- Strategic policy 13 - High environmental standards
- Strategic policy 14 - Delivery and implementation

**Southwark Plan 2007 (July) - saved policies**

19. 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.

- SP20 - Development site uses
- 1.4 - Employment Sites Outside the Preferred Office Locations and Preferred Industrial Locations
- 1.10 - Protecting the range of services available outside the town and local centres and protected shopping frontages
- 2.1 - Enhancement of community facilities
- 2.2 – Provision of new community facilities
- 2.6 – Planning obligations
- 3.2 - Protection of amenity
- 3.3 – Sustainability assessment
- 3.4 – Energy efficiency
- 3.6 – Air quality
- 3.7 - Waste reduction
- 3.9 - Water
- 3.11 - Efficient use of land
- 3.12 - Quality in design
- 3.13 - Urban design
- 3.14 – Designing out crime
- 3.15 – Conservation of the historic environment
- 3.16 – Conservation areas
- 3.18 - Setting of Listed Buildings, conservation areas and World Heritage Sites
- 3.28 - Biodiversity
- 5.2 - Transport impacts
- 5.3 - Walking and cycling
• 5.6 - Car parking
• 5.7 – Car parking for the mobility impaired

20. Supplementary Planning Documents

Holly Grove Conservation Area Appraisal 2008
Sustainable design and construction SPD (2009)
Sustainability assessments SPD (2009)
Sustainable Transport SPD (2010)
Residential Design Standards SPD (2011)
Rye Lane Peckham Conservation Area Appraisal (2011)
Section 106 planning obligations and community infrastructure levy (CIL) SPD (2015)

Peckham and Nunhead Area Action Plan (2014)

21. The Peckham and Nunhead Area Action Plan (PNAAP) was adopted on 26th November 2014 and sets out the planning framework that will help to deliver long lasting improvements to Peckham and Nunhead over the next 15 years. Part of the PNAAP vision is that Peckham will be a place with attractive and pleasant neighbourhoods, surrounding a lively town centre that meets the needs of a very diverse community.

22. The site sits within the action area core and is designated proposal site 6 within the PNAAP, which also includes the station, 74 Rye Lane, 4 Holly Grove and Dovedale and Blenheim Courts at the rear of the station. The site designation lists business use (B1), retail use (A1/A2/A3/A4) and a public square as required land uses, and community/cultural/leisure use (D) and residential (C3) as other land uses that would be accepted.

Principle of the proposed development in terms of land use

23. Section 2 of the NPPF requires planning policies to recognise town centres as the heart of their communities, to support their viability and vitality, and to define a network and hierarchy of centres that is resilient to anticipated future economic changes. Paragraph 17 of the NPPF seeks to “promote mixed use developments, and encourage multiple benefits from the use of land in urban and rural areas” Policy 2.15 of the London Plan sets out the strategic approach to town centres, including the need to sustain and enhance the vitality and viability of town centres and to contribute towards an enhanced environment, urban greening, public realm and links to green infrastructure. Policies 4.7 and 4.8 of the London Plan are also relevant which require the scale of retail development to be related to the size and function of the town centre, a sequential town centre first approach to new retail development, and to support a diverse retail sector including markets.

24. In terms of Southwark’s policies, strategic policy 3 of the Core Strategy encourages the protection and enhancement of town centres to secure a range of shops, services and facilities to meet the needs of Southwark's population. Saved policies 1.5, 1.7 and 1.9 of the Southwark Plan require provision to be made for small business units, set out which uses will be acceptable in railway arches, require a broad range of uses in town centre, and afford protection to protected shopping frontages where A1 uses should not fall below 50%.

25. At approximately 75,000sqm, Peckham town centre has the largest amount of shopping floorspace in Southwark and is designated a Major Town Centre in the London Plan, the Core Strategy and the saved Southwark Plan. It includes many smaller shops along Rye Lane, the Aylesham shopping centre to the north of the site,
and there are a number of local markets including Peckham Rye, Choumert Road and Atwell Road markets. Peckham is home to many small businesses and is becoming increasingly recognised for its growing number of creative industries.

26. Chapter 4 of the Core Strategy sets out the vision for Peckham and Nunhead action area and states that: “The area will continue to be home to a diverse and dynamic community with shops, community facilities and services. New development will help bring improvements to streets and public spaces, making them greener, more pleasant and safe. It will be easier to get around by walking and cycling and there will continue to be good public transport links.” Paragraph 4.47 of the Core Strategy advises that the Council will work with Network Rail to help deliver improvements to the areas around Peckham Rye and Queens Road stations, including a possible new square that will transform the area around Peckham Rye Station and the railway arches.

27. The desire to improve the station forecourt is reinforced through the PNAAP vision for the area, which advises that the Council will work with Network Rail, the GLA, Transport for London (TfL) and the train operating companies to deliver improvements around Peckham Rye Station, including delivering significant change to the setting of Peckham Rye Station, reviving the splendour of the station building and creating a public square. It advises that the improved station and forecourt will provide a new focal point, enhancing the station entrance, increasing footfall and encouraging people to spend time in Peckham.

Retail floorspace

28. The PNAAP site designation requires A1/A2/A3 uses, all of which would be delivered through the proposal. It also requires A4 uses (drinking establishments) which although not specifically included, could be delivered in the event that the area at the rear of the station which also forms part of the site designation comes forward for redevelopment. The proposal includes A5 floorspace which is not listed in the site designation, but there are no objections to this given the town centre location and because there is currently an A5 use on the site.

29. There is currently 2,249sqm of A class floorspace on the site and 865sqm would be re-provided, resulting in a net loss of 1,384sqm and a partial loss of protected retail frontage 26. Neighbouring residents have raised concerns regarding the impact this would have on local businesses, whether they would be priced out of the new development, and some have questioned why the existing arcade buildings cannot simply be refurbished.

30. The station is one of the main arrival points into Peckham and Nunhead, with an estimated two and a half million people using it each year. It is a fine, grade II listed building, the grandeur of which is largely concealed by the 1930s arcade buildings in front of it, which also restricts movement in front of the station. This is recognised in the supporting text to the PNAAP site designation which states that “Since the 1930s there has been an arcade in front of the station, which restricts visibility of the station from Rye Lane and creates a low quality public space”.

31. The PNAAP advises that the communities of Peckham and Nunhead have long expressed a desire for the station, its forecourt and rear court to be improved, and that every stage of consultation on the PNAAP highlighted overwhelming support for improving the station and removing the arcade buildings. The PNAAP advises that this is one of the key aspirations of the plan which will help to transform the area, identifies Peckham Rye Station as a key development opportunity to improve the retail offer in Peckham, and defines Peckham Rye Station and surroundings as a proposal site that will contribute to the delivery of the vision for the area.
32. The site designation specifically requires a public square to be created in front of the station, and in order to create a meaningful public space of a size which would be appropriate to that of the station building, a loss of retail floorspace would arguably be inevitable. The existing 1930s buildings are not in a good condition and detract from the streetscene and whilst they could be refurbished, it would not then be possible to create a public square and the problems of congestion and overcrowding around the station would remain.

33. The proposed development would include 865sqm of good quality, flexible retail floorspace suitable for small businesses, together with space for mobile traders on the southern side of the square. The square would create an attractive and welcoming environment which people would want to spend time in, and could potentially act as a catalyst for further development in the area. The new square would be visible to those passing through on the trains and may encourage people to shop in Rye Lane, which would have a positive impact on the wider area.

34. It is not yet known which of the existing businesses would take up space in the completed development as this would be subject to lease negotiations, and as there would be less retail floorspace than currently exists on the site it would not be possible for all of the existing traders to return. Space has however, provisionally been allocated in the scheme to enable the bank to return (to support the largely cash economy of Rye Lane), and the dental surgery which has over 9,000 registered patients) although again this would be subject to lease negotiations. Details of the likely rents for the new units are not known at this stage, although the submission advises that commercial rents in the development area are relatively high, and there is little evidence to suggest that rents would be significantly higher following the redevelopment.

35. A number of measures are available to assist the existing businesses including:

- Delivery of the development in phases to allow some of the current occupiers the opportunity to be relocated during the development. The Council would negotiate with leaseholders to find alternative premises either within the scheme if possible, nearby, or in a location of their choice.

- Independent business support consultants ‘Tree Shepherd’ have been commissioned to support affected tenants and leaseholders to understand and manage their legal rights and obligations including leasehold interest buy-back and relocation. They provide a dedicated Business Networker on site one day a week to network with the businesses which have raised concerns, discuss their needs and distribute information on timescales and phasing and to engage them in the support offer.

- Identification of relocation sites. Hindwoods Ltd. has been appointed to provide monthly updates on commercial properties which are available to rent as suitable relocation sites for affected businesses. They advise of properties of a similar size and use within Rye Lane and Peckham High Street.

- A Traders’ day was held in April 2015 to provide face-to-face assistance and advice to affected businesses to help them understand their options, rights and obligations in relation to the proposal.

- Meanwhile provision. An Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) has been undertaken which identified Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) business owners as being particularly vulnerable to the potential loss of existing business premises arising from the proposal. The Council has identified a site within its ownership at
Bournemouth Close which is approximately 270m from the site and a feasibility study has been commissioned to establish the potential for it to accommodate up to 257.6sqm of additional A class floorspace. This would be aimed at relocating a number of the BME hair and beauty businesses currently operating from the site.

Business floorspace

36. The PNAAP site designation also requires B1 floorspace to be provided and the scheme would deliver 213sqm of new, additional office accommodation at second floor level at 2-10 Blenheim Grove. This would be a positive aspect of the scheme which would create employment opportunities and would be in accordance with the aspirations for jobs and businesses set out in strategic policy 10 of the Core Strategy. It would assist in improving the economic vitality and vibrancy of the area and as the accommodation would be let as a co-working environment, it would provide desk space for small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs) and start-up businesses.

Community use

37. Paragraphs 70 and 72 of the NPPF seek to promote healthy communities through the delivery of accessible, social spaces. This includes through the creation of high quality public spaces which encourage the active and continual use of public areas and through the delivery of shared spaces and community facilities to enhance the sustainability of communities. Strategic policy 4 of the Core Strategy advises that there will be a wide range of well used community facilities that provide spaces for many different communities and activities in accessible areas, and saved policy 2.1 of the Southwark Plan affords protection to existing D class floorspace.

38. The PNAAP site designation lists community/cultural/leisure use as another acceptable land use and the scheme would deliver 262sqm of D1 class floorspace including community garden in the extension to 2-10 Blenheim Grove. This would be a very positive aspect of the scheme and although it would be 33sqm less D class floorspace than currently exists on the site, it would be in a refurbished building with lift access and incorporating a covered community roof garden which it is anticipated would be used by local groups. It is therefore considered that the replacement provision, in spite of being slightly smaller, would be of a better quality than that which currently exists at the site.

39. To conclude in relation to land uses, the proposed development would deliver a new public square at the heart of Peckham which is a significant positive aspect of the scheme. With the exception of A4 floorspace which could be delivered at the rear of the site in the future, the scheme would deliver all of the land uses required by the proposal site designation. It would also deliver office and community spaces which would provide employment opportunities and a place for people to meet and socialise. The reduction in retail floorspace across the site is noted, but necessary in order to provide a meaningful new public square. It is considered that the wider regeneration benefits to the area would outweigh any harm caused, and the Council as applicant has put in place measures to assist existing businesses affected by the proposal. Overall the proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of land use and is fully supported in principle.

Environmental impact assessment (EIA)

40. In 2015 the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment (Amendment) Regulations were issued, which raised and amended the thresholds at which certain types of development project need to be screened in order to
determine whether an environmental impact assessment is required.

41. **EIA Development** is defined as meaning either:
   
a) Schedule 1 development; or
   
b) Schedule 2 development likely to have significant effects on the environment by virtue of factors such as its nature, size or location.

42. The proposed development does not fall within the definition of Schedule 1 development (which includes developments such as power stations and waste transfer stations).

43. Schedule 2 development is defined by the EIA Regulations as:
   
   Development of a description mentioned in Column 1 of the table in Schedule 2 where:
   
a) any part of that development is to be carried out in a sensitive area; the site is not located in a sensitive area as defined by the regulations; or
   
b) any applicable threshold or criterion in the corresponding part of Column 2 of that table is respectively exceeded or met in relation to that development.

44. Column 1 of the table in Schedule 2, Category 10 (b), relates to ‘Urban Development Projects’. The proposed development would be an Urban Development Project and as such is development of a description mentioned in Column 1 of the table in Schedule 2. Consequently the proposed development would constitute Schedule 2 development within the meaning of the EIA Regulations if the corresponding threshold in Column 2 of the table in Schedule 2 is exceeded or met. The corresponding threshold was amended by the 2015 Regulations, the relevant part of which reads as follows:
   
   In the case of urban development projects, the existing threshold of 0.5 hectares is raised and amended such that a project will need to be screened if:
   
   - the development includes more than 1 hectare of development which is not dwellinghouse development
   - the development includes more than 150 dwellinghouse
   - the area of the development exceeds 5 hectares.

45. None of the above are applicable in this instance because the development would not include more than 1ha of development which is not dwellinghouse development, would not include any dwellinghouses, and the area of the development would not exceed 5ha (the site area is 0.37ha). In light of this no further screening is required and it is concluded that the development would not constitute EIA development.

**Design, conservation area and setting of adjacent listed buildings**

46. The key design and conservation policies that apply include sections 7 ‘Requiring good design’ and 12 ‘Conserving and enhancing the historic environment’ of the NPPF (2012), Strategic Policy SP12 Design and conservation, of the Core Strategy (2011) and saved policies 3.16 ‘Conservation Areas’ and 3.18 ‘Setting of conservation areas, listed buildings and world heritage sites’, of the Southwark Plan (2007). All these policies require that development avoids causing harm to heritage assets and their settings, reflects local distinctiveness in design and conserves or enhances the character and appearance of conservation areas, listed buildings and
heritage assets and their settings. The site specific guidance in the PNAAP designation requires development at Peckham Rye Station to include the creation of a public square in the forecourt of the station, and to conserve or enhance the historic character of the listed station building and the surrounding conservation areas and listed and locally listed buildings. Representations have been received both in support of and objecting to the design of the proposal, and its impact on the setting of heritage assets and the surrounding streetscene.

47. In respect of heritage assets affected by the proposal, the station building is a fine, grade II listed building dating from 1865. Blenheim Grove includes a number of listed buildings generally located across the road and a short distance to the west of the development in the Holly Grove Conservation Area. There are a number of heritage assets nearby including grade II listed paired villas on Holly Grove to the north, and most notably, the substantial Art Deco building immediately opposite at 117-125 Rye Lane which is noted in the Conservation Area Appraisal as an important unlisted building which makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. As such this building is an undesignated heritage asset worthy of preserving or enhancing in its own right.

Demolition of the arcade buildings and creation of a public square

48. In a conservation area the demolition of buildings and the resultant harm caused to the character and appearance of the conservation area is resisted, unless there is an appropriate replacement scheme and the loss can be justified in accordance with the tests set out in the NPPF. The degree of any harm is categorised by the NPPF as being either 'less than substantial' or 'substantial' and the NPPF goes on to set out the justification required for each.

49. The existing buildings on the site are not identified in the Historic Area Assessment (prepared by Historic England - formerly English Heritage), or the Council's adopted conservation area appraisal as important unlisted properties contributing positively to the conservation area. In fact, the conservation area appraisal notes the station forecourt buildings as negative contributors and states that: “The wider setting of the Grade II listed Peckham Rye Station is adversely affected by the poor architectural quality of the buildings immediately in front of the station (No's 74a-80 Rye Lane) These buildings not only harm the setting of the listed building but also have a negative impact on Rye lane itself, leaving narrow, congested footways at the final approach to this important transport hub. The station itself lacks any presence on Rye Lane and can be accessed from Blenheim Grove and Holly Grove through two arched openings in the viaducts. These ‘tunnel-like’ openings lack animation and, due to their alignment with the façade of the station, define a route across the front of the station and do not provide an appropriate forecourt to it. As such, their loss can be considered to cause less than substantial harm to the conservation area as a whole. In these cases, the NPPF at paragraph 134 requires that the harm is balanced by substantial public benefits.

50. There are significant public benefits that would flow from the demolition of these buildings, all of which ensure that the demolition is not only desirable but also necessary in order for these benefits to be realised. The benefits include: a significantly improved setting to the grade II listed Peckham Rye Station through the creation of a new public square, substantial environmental improvements and improvements to the visual amenity of the area offered by a new landscaped public space, and improved access, permeability and seating in this busy and congested heart of Rye Lane.

51. Officers are satisfied that the proposed demolition of these buildings and their replacement with a high quality public square would not harm the significance of the
conservation area or its setting, and would significantly enhance the setting of the grade II listed station building. In relation to any possible ‘harm’ that may be perceived by others; Officers consider that the harm, if any, to heritage assets would be nominal. If the Council consider that there is some harm to heritage assets, there is a strong presumption against granting planning permission. However, taking together the substantial public benefits of the proposal including the creation of a new landscaped public space (where there are currently buildings), the enhanced setting of the listed station as well as the improved access to the town centre means that, notwithstanding the special regard which must be given to any possible harm to heritage assets, it is considered that the public interests of the development would significantly outweigh any harm caused.

52. In terms of the quality of design, Officers are satisfied that the proposal would be strongly contextual, developed from a detailed understanding of the conservation area. The angled design of the paving to the square would reflect not just the prevailing patterns of movement into and across the square from Rye Lane, but would also echo the rich and diverse commercial character of the conservation area and its people. Whilst the proposed patterns may appear strident in plan form, they would be centred on the listed building and are proposed to be executed in a single colour (dark grey) similar to that found in the cobbled streets in and around the conservation area. This dynamic design and monochromatic approach, accented by inlaid steel strips and emphasised by landscaped planters, would result in a high quality space with a generous feel and a lush green finish. In this busy urban context, the accent would be provided by the landscaped planters and the trees that have been designed to catch the eye and lead the pedestrian from Rye Lane into the new public space.

53. The edges of the space to the north and south are defined by the railway viaducts which would be turned into new active frontages. The arches would be in-filled with new shopfronts framed in the rich dark ochre/red tones of corten steel to reflect the industrial heritage of Rye Lane and the railway viaducts which intersects it. On the southern side one shopfront would also serve as the main entrance to the office space and community facility above, giving it a prime town square address. Officers are satisfied that these shopfronts would preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area and contribute positively to the setting of the listed station building. Appropriate advertisement displays and external seating would allow for the individual expression of the businesses which would occupy then.

Refurbishment and extension of 82 Rye Lane/2-10 Blenheim Grove

54. The proposed extension would be a two-storey structure; a flexible business space and community building located on top of the Art-Deco styled parade of shops on Blenheim Grove. The ‘light-weight’ structure has been designed to maximise the amount of flexible space available for community uses and to appear as an elegant, contrasting pavilion on top of the existing building. The design has a simple, serrated roofline which would give it an industrial appearance and it is proposed to be clad in alternating ribbed and plain glass which would give it a complex, layered and dappled appearance. Its simple form and tactile cladding would complement the existing building successfully and would announce the new station square without overwhelming it. The use of traditional materials such as cast glass as a form of cladding would soften its form and at the same time give it a light industrial appearance.

55. The scale of the extended building would be appropriate and it has been designed to complement the setting of the square, whilst also not overshadowing what would be an important new space. Viewed from the square the extended building would be modest in scale and set behind the elevated railway line. It has been designed to
form a backdrop to the busy railway line, anchoring but not overwhelming the proposed public space. Its height is considered to be appropriate in relation to the Blenheim Grove streetscene, with the increase in height marking the corner with Rye Lane.

56. In conclusion, Officers are satisfied that the proposal is a high quality design that would not cause any harm to heritage assets, conserving and enhancing the historic environment of the Rye Lane Conservation Area and significantly improving the setting of the grade II listed Peckham Rye Station. The quality of the design would rely to a great degree on the quality on the architectural and landscape detailed design as well as the quality of the cladding materials, especially the cast glass and the corten steel cladding which should be presented on site where it can be compared with the existing finishes in the conservation area, and conditions are recommended to secure this.

Comments of the Design Review Panel

57. The proposal was reviewed by the Design Review Panel in September 2015. In its conclusion, the Panel were broadly supportive of the proposal and the ambition of the design. They felt that many aspects of the scheme were well considered and appropriate, and encouraged the architects to develop their design in greater detail, especially the landscaping to the new station square, the design of the shop fronts, and the design of the two-storey extension to 2-10 Blenheim Grove. These have all been addressed by the current application. The landscaping has been developed with a specialist landscape architect and includes mature planting as well as planted beds. The shop front design and extension on Blenheim Grove have been refined, with a new cast glass finish to give it a more enduring and high quality feel.

Trees and landscaping

58. Policy 7.5. of the London Plan requires London’s public spaces to be secure, accessible, inclusive, connected, easy to understand and maintain, to relate to local context, and to incorporate the highest quality design, landscaping, planting, street furniture and surfaces. It states that developments should use public realm to contribute to the easy movement of people through the space, maximise opportunities for greening, and should incorporate local social infrastructure such as public toilets, drinking water fountains and seating where appropriate. Concerns have been raised by neighbouring residents regarding the paving design, planters and lack of trees.

59. The proposed public square has been designed to provide clear pedestrian routes to and from the station and through to Holly Grove and Blenheim Grove. The scheme would include publically accessible WCs, low level planters with integrated seating, spaces for mobile traders, community events and external seating for new cafes and restaurants around the edges of the square. Following concerns raised by local residents the plans have been amended to include four trees in the new square, the largest of which would be located on the north-eastern side close to Rye Lane. Three smaller trees are proposed further into the square, and these should be secured through a landscaping condition. This is considered to be a significant positive aspect of the scheme which would complement the square and enhance the streetscene and setting of the listed building.

60. The proposed offset chevron planter layout would provide a dynamic response to the new public space, which would be intensively trafficked with retail, market stall, transport interchange and potential community events. Surfacing should be used to subtly direct station access and delineate use zones either side of the central path, the principle being that the geometric form would be most noticeable when looking
Concerns have been raised regarding the provision of iron platform supports to the northern side of the square, but this is an engineering requirement to support the platform above. The use of corten steel for the supports would be appropriate to the industrial uses in the vicinity and would be softened and enhanced by the training of climbing plants. Although Virginia Creeper is listed as a controlled invasive species, its use in a confined part of the design would be acceptable, given that this would be a key part of the landscape design, the likely poor growing conditions and length of time needed for it to establish. The species would also be appropriate in relation the architectural setting and historical context of the site.

The lighting to the development would include low-level uplighting to the viaducts, directional lighting to provide more general light to the square, and low-level lighting to the planters. This is welcomed and would form an integral feature of the design helping to accentuate and draw interest into the different parts of the scheme, and a condition for a detailed plan is recommended.

Concerns have been raised that the planters would become filled with litter, and residents have questioned who would maintain the square and the proposed community garden. The plans do not currently incorporate bins, therefore a condition requiring details to be submitted for approval is recommended. A condition for a detailed landscaping plan is recommended, and the volume and type of plants could reduce the likelihood of litter. The square would be a public space maintained by the Council, and discussions are currently being held with the Council’s Parks and Open Spaces Service and Highways Development Management Team in this respect. Overall the landscaping is considered to be of a high quality which would provide a significant enhancement to the public realm and is welcomed.

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

Strategic policy 13 of the Core Strategy requires developments to achieve high standards for reducing air, land, water, noise and light pollution and avoiding amenity and environmental problems that affect how we enjoy the environment in which we live and work; saved policy 3.2 of the Southwark Plan seeks to ensure an adequate standard of amenity for existing and future occupiers. Concerns have been raised regarding loss of amenity to neighbouring occupiers from the proposed extension above 2-10 Blenheim Grove, including loss of light and overlooking which are considered below.

The demolition of the existing buildings would be carried out in phases, and although temporary in nature it is recognised that this process could result in some noise and disturbance. A condition is therefore recommended requiring an environmental management plan to be submitted for approval which would minimise the impact upon neighbouring residents.

Impact of the proposed uses

All of the proposed uses would be typical of those found within town centres and should not result in any loss of amenity to neighbouring occupiers by way of noise and disturbance. A noise survey assessment has been undertaken in relation to potential plant noise from the development which has been reviewed by the Council’s Environmental Protection Team (EPT) and a condition is recommended.

No hours of operation have been provided, therefore a condition is recommended limiting the hours during which any A3 and A5 uses within the development could
operate to:

Monday to Thursday - 7am to midnight
Friday - 7am to 1am
Saturdays - 8am to 1am
Sundays - 9am to 10:30pm on Sundays.

68. With the exception of the Sunday hours, this would be as per Unit 4 12-16 Blenheim Grove which was granted planning permission for these hours in September 2014. This neighbouring building is required to close at 5pm on Sundays, but given that the application site is closer to Rye Lane a later time until 10:30pm is considered appropriate. Use of the roof terrace to the office space and community garden should be limited to 10pm, and details of extraction and ventilation for any A3/A5 uses should also be conditioned.

**Impact of the proposed structures**

69. The refurbishment of the railway arches, the supporting structure to platform 3 and all the associated landscape works would not result in any loss of amenity to neighbouring occupiers. Outlook from buildings to the north and east would be significantly improved following the demolition of the existing arcade buildings.

70. There are flats above shops on the southern side of Blenheim Grove, but the extension above number 2-10 would not be particularly large and would not result in any significant loss of amenity. A 25 degree loss of light test has been undertaken and whilst the extension would bisect a 25 degree line taken from the centre of the neighbouring windows, it would only do so marginally and the impact would not be significant. It would be a typical relationship of properties facing each other across a street and the extension would be a lightweight, glazed structure which would not appear overbearing to its neighbours.

71. There would be just over 12m between the extension and the buildings on the southern side of Blenheim Grove, which the Residential Design Standards SPD advises is sufficient to maintain privacy where properties face each other across a street. In relation to light pollution, the submission advises that the corrugated glass for the extension could be fabricated with either a smooth or textured/rough finish, and that a rough finish would prevent any excessive glare. The extension would emit a soft glow and its inner, secondary glazing could be adjusted if necessary to prevent any light spillage. The extension would sit above the neighbouring units in Blenheim Grove to the east of the site and would not result in any adverse impacts to this building.

72. The extension would sit directly opposite numbers 127-131 Rye Lane which are to the east; these are single-storey retail units and there do not appear to be any residential uses in close proximity. In any event there would be a separation distance of approximately 16m which would be sufficient to maintain good levels of light, outlook and privacy in the event these buildings were extended in the future to incorporate residential uses on their upper floors.

73. To conclude, it is not considered that the uses or structures within the proposed development would result in any significant loss of amenity to neighbouring occupiers. The proposed public square would represent a significant improvement to Rye Lane which could be enjoyed by residents and visitors alike.

**Transport issues**

74. Strategic policy 2 of the Core Strategy seeks to encourage walking, cycling and the
use of public transport rather than travel by car, to help to create safe, attractive, vibrant and healthy places for people to live and work, by reducing congestion, traffic and pollution. Saved policy 5.2 of the Southwark Plan seeks to ensure that developments do not result in adverse highway conditions; 5.3 requires the needs of pedestrians and cyclists to be considered and 5.6 and 5.7 relate to car parking. A detailed Transport Statement has been submitted in support of the application.

75. The site has a high public transport accessibility level (PTAL) of 6b and the station has formed part of the London Overground network since 2012; the site also sits within a controlled parking zone (CPZ). Paragraph 2.1 5 of the PNAAP recognises that Rye Lane is the focus of pedestrian movements and links to this key destination and thoroughfare are of variable quality. It further notes that Rye Lane suffers from congested footways, particularly around the station and at the junction with Peckham High Street.

76. The proposed development would create an attractive new public space, improved access to Peckham Rye station and would ease overcrowding in the station forecourt. It would provide a welcoming place for people to wait for busses along Rye Lane and although some residents have commented that the bus stops should be moved, this falls under the remit of TfL.

77. Although no works to the station building are proposed, discussions have taken place and a Service Legal Agreement between the Council and Network Rail has been entered into. The landscaping would be organised to locate space for market traders and external seating for cafés around the northern and southern edges of the square defined by raised planters, which would ensure that a clear route to the station entrance would be retained. The new square would provide an accessible, step-free environment and some of the seating include back and arm supports suitable for people with mobility impairments.

78. The plans have been amended to provide additional cycle parking to serve the various uses within the development and to show a possible location for a future cycle hire docking station. There would be 8 long-stay and 16 short stay cycle parking spaces to serve the development, which would comply with the London Plan standards. There are also 62 cycle parking spaces available in the cycle hub which is in one of the railway arches next to the station, although this does not form part of the application site. The applicant has identified an area of land on the southern side of Elm Grove which is to the north of the site as a potential location for a cycle hire docking station, although this would need to be agreed with TfL and subject to a separate planning application.

79. Paragraph 4.4.12 of the PNAAP recognises that servicing and deliveries to retail premises on Rye Lane often contribute to congestion and a reduction in parking spaces at peak times. Servicing to the northern side of the square would take place from Elm Grove, using an existing 15m long loading bay and no objections are raised in this regard. The Transport Statement advises that some of the servicing and deliveries would take place from Blenheim Grove, although this would not be possible owing to existing on-street restrictions. A condition is therefore recommended requiring details of a servicing management plan to be submitted for approval, although it is noted that a reduction in servicing requirements is anticipated owing to the reduction in retail floorspace.

80. No car parking is proposed to serve the development and given its highly accessible location, no objections are raised. The Transport Statement advises that accessible parking would be provided on Blenheim Grove which again would not currently be possible owing to on-street restrictions. However, given the proximity of existing
accessible parking at Holly Grove/Elm Grove it is not considered necessary to require any in this instance. Refuse from the development would be stored within the units and collected from the street in accordance with existing restrictions.

81. The Transport Statement includes a Travel Plan framework which sets out measures to encourage sustainable travel. This would be overseen by a travel plan co-ordinator and would include travel information packs and initiatives to encourage walking and cycling. A condition to secure the implementation of the travel plan has bee included in the draft recommendation.

82. Overall, it is considered that the proposal would significantly enhance the pedestrian experience in this area by reducing congestion around the station forecourt, and no adverse transport impacts are anticipated.

Planning obligations (S.106 undertaking or agreement)

83. Saved policy 2.5 ‘Planning obligations’ of the Southwark Plan and policy 8.2 of the London Plan advise that Local Planning Authorities should seek to enter into planning obligations to avoid or mitigate the adverse impacts of developments which cannot otherwise be adequately addressed through conditions, to secure or contribute towards the infrastructure, environment or site management necessary to support the development, or to secure an appropriate mix of uses within the development. Further information is contained within the Council's adopted Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure Levy SPD.

84. Although a major planning application, the proposed development would not meet the threshold for requiring any s106 contributions because it would not deliver a net increase of 1,000sqm of non-residential floorspace. No other impacts requiring mitigation through a s106 agreement have been identified. A s278 agreement would be required under the Highways Act (1980) to secure the quality of the public realm works, and an informative advising the applicant of this is recommended.

Mayoral and Southwark Community Infrastructure Levy

85. 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. In this instance no Mayoral or Southwark CIL payment would be due.

Sustainable development implications

86. 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. Policies 5.5 and 5.6 require consideration of decentralised energy networks and policy 5.7 requires the use of on-site renewable technologies, where feasible. Of note is that developments must reduce their carbon dioxide emissions by 40% when compared to the 2010 Building Regulations requirement. The applicant has submitted an energy statement in support of the application and in relation to the Major’s energy hierarchy, and the following is proposed:
Be lean (use less energy)

The existing building fabric would be improved including replacing the existing windows with better performing units and measures to reduce solar glare and consequently demand for mechanical cooling.

Be clean (supply energy efficiently)

Energy efficient fluorescent or LED lighting systems would be used throughout the development. The provision of combined heat and power (CHP) has been explored but was not deemed feasible for a number of reasons, including a predicted low and intermittent domestic hot water demand, limited seasonal space heating requirements and no infrastructure to export heat to any adjacent buildings or a community energy scheme. Peckham has been identified by the Council as an area which could be served by a future district energy scheme, but the site sits well away from the area identified for this. It is not proposed to future-proof for connection, because as set out below the heating demand for the development would be met through air source heat pumps.

Be green (use renewable energy)

A range of renewable energy technologies including photovoltaic panels and solar water heating have been considered and discounted. Air source heat pumps have been found to be suitable and would be incorporated into the development to meet both its heating and cooling demand.

The measures outlined above would reduce the carbon dioxide emissions of the scheme by 3.3% when compared to a Building Regulations compliant scheme. It is recognised that this would be significantly short of the London Plan requirement, but as no new-build is proposed, with all of the floorspace being created through refurbishment or extension no objections are raised. There is no requirement for a contribution towards the Council's carbon off-set fund in this instance because the proposal would not meet the threshold of providing a net increase of 1,000sqm of non-residential floorspace.

87. In terms of Southwark’s policies, strategic policy 13 of the Core Strategy ‘High environmental standards’ sets out a number of standards and those relevant to the proposed development are as follows:

- Community facilities must achieve at least BREEAM ‘very good' and all other non-residential uses must achieve at least BREEAM ‘excellent'
- Major development must achieve a reduction in carbon dioxide of 20% from using on-site or local low and zero carbon sources of energy
- Major developments must reduce surface water run-off by more than 50%.

88. A BREEAM pre-assessment report has been submitted which advises that the development could achieve BREEAM ‘very good’. This would be acceptable for the community facilities, but the policy requirement for retail and office workspace is ‘excellent’. The reasons why ‘excellent’ cannot be achieved include limitations arising from the refurbishment of existing buildings and uncertainties regarding internal acoustic levels and daylighting in the refurbished railway arches. In light of these constraints, no objections are raised to the development achieving ‘very good’ and a condition to secure this is recommended.

89. The proportion of the development’s predicted energy requirements which would be met through renewables will be provided in the addendum. However, it is noted that
the only type of equipment found to be suitable was air source heat pumps with no opportunity for photovoltaics owing to limited roof space. With regard to surface water run-off, the site drainage has not yet been fully developed and the Council’s Flood and Drainage Team has recommended a condition to limit run-off rates which forms part of the draft recommendation.

90. Saved policy 3.3 of the Southwark Plan advises that planning permission will not be granted for major development unless the applicant demonstrates that the economic, environmental and social impacts of the proposal have been addressed through a sustainability assessment; a sustainability assessment and addendum have duly been submitted in support of the application.

91. The proposal would deliver the transformation of a key gateway into Peckham and Nunhead by providing high quality public realm, retail, community and business floorspace, and could act as a catalyst for further improvements along Rye Lane and increased spending in the local area. It would address problems of congestion and the unsightly appearance of the station forecourt and could encourage more people to spend time in the area. Good quality retail and business floorspace would assist in improving the economic performance of Peckham, particularly as the accommodation would be suitable for small and medium enterprises and start-ups. The scheme would incorporate measures to reduce its carbon dioxide emissions and would achieve BREEAM ‘very good’. The submission acknowledges that there could be disproportionate impacts on Black and Ethnic Minority groups as a result of the proposal and the applicant has put in place a number of measures to help to support these groups which are detailed at paragraph 35 of this report.

Ecology

92. Saved policy 3.28 of the Southwark Plan states that the Local Planning Authority will take biodiversity into account in its determination of all planning applications and will encourage the inclusion in developments of features which enhance biodiversity, requiring an ecological assessment where relevant. This is reinforced through policy 19 of the PNAAP which requires new development to improve the overall greenness of the area, through the planting of street trees, creating living roofs and walls, and providing habitats for wildlife which increase biodiversity; major new developments should provide opportunities for food growing and how the proposal would meet these requirements should be demonstrated at application stage.

93. A bat assessment report has been submitted which advises that a daytime bat assessment was undertaken at the site in October 2015. No evidence of bats or potential for bat roosts were found during the survey, although the report notes that there may be pigeon nests on the site. The Council’s Ecology Officer has reviewed the report and agrees with its findings. All birds nests are protected by law and an informative is recommended advising the applicant of the need to undertake demolition outside the bird nesting season if possible. If any birds nests needed to be removed the applicant would have to obtain a license from Natural England. The new trees and planting in the square would enhance the ecological value of the site and the provision of a community garden is welcomed.

Contaminated land

94. A preliminary site risk assessment has been submitted with the application, the brief for which was to obtain and collate information on the environmental characteristics of the site and to assess the potential constraints associated with the proposed redevelopment. The report concludes that any risks associated with contamination would be low, and suggests that no further investigations are necessary. The report
has been reviewed by EPT which agrees with its findings.

Air quality

95. The site is located in an air quality management area. An air quality assessment has therefore been submitted with the application which considers the potential air quality impacts during the construction and operational phases of the development. It concludes that the proposal is unlikely to be adversely affected by, or have a significant impact upon local air quality. The report has been reviewed by EPT and is found to be acceptable.

Statement of community involvement

96. A statement of community involvement (SCI) has been submitted, setting out the consultation which the applicant carried out before the planning application was submitted. It advises that in May 2014 the Council commissioned architects Ash Sakula in partnership with ‘What If’ to initiate a CoDesign process with the local community in Peckham. The purpose of this was to establish the local community’s aspirations for improvements around Peckham Rye Station.

97. The CoDesign process was launched in July 2014 and completed at the end of October 2014. It was based at a consultation shop next to the station entrance to allow traders, local people, commuters and other users of the station area to drop in. It included a programme of events, outreach activities to engage hard to reach communities, and facilitated a dialogue between the applicant and the community.

98. New technology including social media, blogs and smart phone applications were used, and a CoDesign website was set up. The SCI advises that the initial CoDesign process engaged over 200 people during the course of the events and activities programme.

99. The scheme architects Landolt + Brown were appointed in February 2015 and held four CoDesign workshops with local businesses, residents and members of key stakeholder groups. The workshops were advertised through the delivery of approximately 2,000 flyers to addresses surrounding the site between one and two weeks in advance of each workshop, announcements made at Sunday worship in some of the nearby churches, publication on the dedicated website, through social media, and via email to people who had joined a mailing list built up by the project architects. Following each workshop, the presentations and a summary of the feedback was posted on the website.

Human rights and equalities implications

100. Members should take account of the provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998 as they relate to the planning application and the conflicting interests of the Applicants and any third party opposing the application in reaching their decisions. The provisions of the Human Rights Act 1998 have been taken into account in the processing of the application and the preparation of this report. In particular, Article 6 (1), of the European Convention on Human Rights in relation to civil rights and a fair hearing; Article 8 of the ECHR in relation to the right to respect for private and family life and Article 1 Protocol 1 of the ECHR in relation to the protection of property have all been taken into account.

101. In addition, the Equality Act 2010 provides protection from discrimination in respect of certain protected characteristics namely: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion, or beliefs and sex and sexual orientation. It places the Local Planning Authority under a legal duty to have due regard to the
advancement of equality in the exercise of its powers including planning powers. Officers have taken this into account in the assessment of the application and Members must be mindful of this duty, inter alia, when determining all planning applications. In particular Members must pay due regard to the need to:

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Equality Act

- Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it

- Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

102. The Council appointed AECOM to undertake an Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) of the proposals which was carried out in March 2015 and submitted with the planning application; the full document is Appendix 3. The EqIA focuses on assessing and recording the likely positive and negative equality impact of the proposed development scheme for affected people sharing protected characteristics identified in the Equality Act 2010, and considers how the Council has fulfilled its duties under the Equalities Act.

103. The proposal would involve the removal of the existing arcade buildings and 82 Rye Lane/2-10 Blenheim Grove which approximately 20 businesses operate from including cafes, hairdressers, food retailers and a bank. The EqIA has identified potential negative equality impacts arising for people of South Asian, West African and Afro-Caribbean origin (BME) as well as people of mixed race and of faith/religious groups owing to the loss of existing business premises and to some degree, access to culturally-specific goods and services. Measures to support these groups have been set out in detail at paragraph 35 of this report including the commissioning of a feasibility study to deliver alternative business accommodation within approximately 270m of the site; this would be aimed at relocating a number of the BME hair and beauty businesses currently operating from the site.

104. The EqIA concludes that the proposal would give rise to a number of positive equality impacts arising from an improved and more accessible public realm and streetscape, improved public safety, and potential new business opportunities which could generate new employment opportunities for local people. People sharing protected characteristics are likely to be able to share in these benefits. Officers are satisfied that the application material and Officers' assessment has taken into account these issues.

Conclusion on planning issues

105. The principle of the proposed development would acceptable in land use terms. Although there would be a loss of retail floorspace on the site, an attractive new public square would be created at the heart of Peckham town centre, revealing the listed station building behind and easing issues of congestion and overcrowding in the station forecourt. This is a key aspiration of the Peckham and Nunhead Area Action Plan and is welcomed. This key gateway into Peckham would be transformed into an attractive and inviting space, and could encourage more people to spend time in the area and act as a catalyst for further redevelopment and increased local spending. The square would be lined with retail uses, and the provision of office space and community facilities would create job opportunities and an attractive venue for residents to meet and socialise. Measures have been taken to assist existing businesses affected by the proposals, including meanwhile provision to consider the feasibility of relocating some of the existing BME
businesses within 270m of the site. Officers consider that the loss of the existing arcade buildings would not result in any harm to the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area, and that the new proposals would significantly enhance the setting of the listed station. No adverse transport or amenity issues are proposed, and for the reasons set out in full above, it is recommended that planning permission be granted.

Community impact statement

106. In line with the Council's Community Impact Statement the impact of this application has been assessed as part of the application process with regard to local people in respect of their age, disability, faith/religion, gender, race and ethnicity and sexual orientation. Consultation with the community has been undertaken as part of the application process.

a) The impact on local people is set out above.

b) The following issues relevant to particular communities/groups likely to be affected by the proposal have been identified above.

c) The likely adverse or less good implications for any particular communities/groups have been also been discussed above. Specific actions to ameliorate these implications have been identified above.

Consultations

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

Consultation replies

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

Summary of consultation responses

109. 36 objections, 29 representations in support and 5 general comments have been submitted following the initial round of consultation.

110. Grounds for objecting:

- Poor design / out of keeping / too high extension to 2-10 Blenheim Grove and steel girders to support platform 3
- Existing buildings should be retained and refurbished
- Harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area and setting of the listed station building
- Poor landscaping to public square including materials, landscape architect should be appointed
- Proposed planters would result in litter, reduce areas for market stalls, cause congestion and would be a maintenance burden
- Lack of trees and boundary enclosure to public square
- Lack of free, accessible public toilets within the scheme – officer response – accessible WCs are proposed in the north-western railway arch
- Loss of existing businesses and start-up space / pricing locals out; vacant premises on Rye Lane should be refurbished
- Existing businesses not guaranteed to return
- Lack of publicity / consultation, particularly with affected businesses
- Ineffective CoDesign process
- Co-work space is proposed elsewhere in the vicinity
- Loss of light and overlooking owing to extension to 2-10 Blenheim Grove
- Question whether the community garden would be accessible to all, or just certain community groups
- Lack of cycle parking
- Money better spent on cycle routes and improving bus stops
- Lack of refuse storage
- Lack of servicing space and potential for illegal parking
- Retail units should have individual design and freedom to use the spaces in front of them
- Shallow steps within the scheme would be a trip hazard
- Poor lighting to the development
- Train noise would hinder activities within the buildings and community garden
- The Rye Lane bus stops should be moved
- The square should be used for community events
- Loss of garages
- Should take place in parallel with improvements to the station
- Chain businesses should be kept away from the area
- Existing hairdressers on Blenheim Grove act as a community facility should be allowed to remain given that the building would be retained
- Would not serve existing community, but seeks to attract new people to the area
- Impact on BME communities.

111. Grounds for support:

- Effective co-design process / good public engagement
- Proposal well designed and unique to Peckham
- Existing buildings and eyesore and should be removed
- Would help to improve the wider area
- Significant improvement to the area but trees should be provided and planters could fill with litter
- Area currently run-down and unsightly
- The listed station should be visible
- Improved access to the station
- High quality materials, signage, lighting and regular maintenance required
- Question who would maintain the public garden; public garden should be omitted
- Use of the space by the visually impaired should be considered
- Would attract businesses to the area
- Recess into public toilet doors should be omitted to prevent anti-social behaviour.

112. General comments:

- The structural supports for platform 3 should be smaller
- Impact on the setting of the listed station
- Planters would fill with litter
- A night view of the development is required
- Individual shopfront designs should be incorporated
- Incorrect use of the words size and scale in the Design and Access Statement
- Poor landscaping
- Question whether the community garden would be a maintenance burden to the Council
- Plans should be made more visible on the Council’s website.

113. Re-consultation:

Neighbouring residents were re-consulted (21 days) following the receipt of an
Equalities Impact Assessment, together with further information regarding the phasing of the development, cycle parking and sustainable construction measures. It is noted that the Equalities Impact Assessment had already been displayed on a separate page on the dedicated web page but had not been submitted with the planning application.

114. Following the re-consultation 7 objections, 8 letters in support and two general comment have been received. No new issues were raised from the objections; the representations in support welcomed the inclusion of trees and requested that lifts be provided in the station, and the general comment queried why residents had not been re-consulted about the inclusion of trees, whether details on their species and location should be included, and whether another CoDesign meeting could be held.

Environmental Protection Team

115. Recommend approval with conditions.

Highways Development Management Team

116. Although the open space (Station Square) is not deemed as public highway, it can be perceived as public realm and therefore should be treated as such and comply with the Southwark Streetscape Design Manual (SSDM). Since the application site falls within ‘Heritage’ designation, the public open space must be paved with York stone natural stone paving slabs. Furthermore, the footways fronting the development site on Rye Lane must be repaved using York stone natural stone paving slabs with 150mm granite natural stone kerbs. Surface water from the open space is not permitted to flow onto the public highway and vice versa in accordance with section 163 of the Highways Act 1980. Detailed drawings should be submitted to confirm this requirement.

Ecology Officer

117. The bat assessment is acceptable; agree with its findings; no further surveys are required. The report notes Pigeons are nesting in the buildings; all birds nests are protected by law. If there are active nests at the time of demolition a licence from Natural England will be required to remove any nests. The planting is good apart from the Virginia Creeper, *Parthenocissus quinquefolia* which should be avoided as it is a schedule 9 plant on the Wildlife and Countryside Act.

Archaeology Officer

118. The site is not located within an archaeological priority zone. The buildings to be demolished, whilst dating from the 1930s, are not recommended for recording. As such, no archaeological response is necessary for this application.

Flood and Drainage Team

119. No major comments. However, as the site drainage has not yet been developed, we would recommend a condition to limit surface water run-off rates; no further comments following re-consultation.

Network Rail

120. Awaiting feedback from Network Rail’s Asset Protection team in relation to this planning application; request that the deadline for comments is extended.
London Underground

121. London Underground Infrastructure Protection has no comment to make on this planning application. There are Network Rail assets close to this site (no further response following re-consultation).

Historic England

122. Do not wish to comment in detail, but offer the following general observations.

123. Peckham Rye Station is listed grade II and appears on Historic England's Heritage at Risk Register. We would strongly encourage you to condition any approval of this scheme to ensure the appropriate repair of the listed building. The repair of the 'at risk' building could be considered to be a heritage benefit which benefits the public as set out in the NPPF. Recommendation - would urge the Council to address the above issues, and recommend that the application should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance, and on the basis of your specialist conservation advice. It is not necessary for us to be consulted again. However, if you would like further advice, please contact us to explain your request. (No further comments after re-consultation).

The Peckham Society

124. The Peckham Society which has for a long time campaigned for the opening up of the railway station generally welcomes these proposals and also the amendments made to the earlier proposals, which have resulted in a less intensive peripheral development. As described on page 3 of the Design and Access Statement, the aim of relieving pedestrian congestion in front of the station and on Rye Lane is one that receives the Society's wholehearted support.

125. The Society believes that the retention of the 1930s building on Blenheim Grove continues a gradual process of enhancing the Rye Lane Conservation Area and with its extension creates some valuable replacement building volume in lieu of that lost in the opening up. It also appreciates the light touch applied to the design of this element.

126. The Peckham Society like the Design Review Panel believes that the landscape proposals are over complicated. By introducing so many planters and so much seating the opening up of the forecourt has again become constrained. In reality it will be hard enough to stop the space filling up with street traders who will incidentally provide colour. The Society welcomes the recognition that durable materials are necessary and also adequate drainage but suggests that the cobbles in the illustration on page 29 of the Design and Access Statement would be a good surface especially as any patterning will be often hidden by ad-hoc additions to the square as well as by the pedestrians and it is the surrounding vertical surfaces which will enliven and characterise the space. About fifteen years ago there was an experiment with planters in Rye Lane which did not flourish and were filled with cigarette butts and other waste. However as stated at the beginning the Peckham Society hopes overall that this application is granted.

Victorian Society

127. The Society is supportive of the general principle of the application. However, there are certain elements of the proposals which we encourage the Council to revisit.
128. The principle of creating a public space in front of the station is one that we welcome. It could greatly improve the setting of the listed building, returning the configuration of its immediate setting to something approaching its original form. Views of the station from Rye Lane would also be greatly enhanced. However, the proposed design of the paved square in front of the station is overly strident and harmfully busy and energetic. Something a little calmer and responsive to its architectural context would likely integrate more successfully, allowing the full and unencumbered drama of the listed building to be fully appreciated. We understand that a structure of some form on the north side of the proposed square is required in order to support the platform above. In that case, evoking the original colonnade with that proposed seems reasonable. The Committee suggested that a corresponding colonnade erected against the southern viaduct might improve the scheme. Not only would it more closely replicate the configuration and strong symmetry of the original station forecourt, it could provide the new shops proposed to occupy the southern viaduct arches with a covered external area that could prove highly practical. Finally, we would stress that this project represents a major opportunity to undertake some much-needed and potentially highly beneficial works to the station itself. Presently, Peckham Rye Station is inscribed on Historic England’s ‘Heritage at Risk’ register and various elements of repair are badly needed. In addition, we strongly encourage the Council to consider reinstating lost elements of the building’s principal façade, such as ironwork detailing, which are clearly discernible on historic photographs. The scholarly reinstatement of the canopy over the main entrance would greatly enhance the station’s historic appearance and could also perform a very practical function, one which may be very welcome once the arcade is removed.

Conservation Area Advisory Group

129. After discussion members agreed that a number of aspects of the scheme were inappropriate to the bold gritty urban character of the site generated by the strong Victorian engineering of the brick vaulted viaducts, the strongly designed Italianate listed station building and the bold large pergola-like structure remaining following demolition along one side of the large central public space.

130. The following observations relating to aspects of the design lay were expressed:

The light airy structure on top of the viaduct, apparently intended to suggest African huts (but more reminiscent of sea-side chalets) was inappropriate to the bold large scale brick viaduct, the station building and the scale and character of the area. In particular, its polycarbonate roof was thought inappropriate due to the material’s relatively short life and the difficulty of keeping it clean.

- The Core 10 planters were wrong. They are inappropriate in scale, form and material. Simple bold large-scale urban landscaping was needed here.

- Planting should be similarly bold and urban in scale. This is not the location for flower borders, which are wrong in character and scale and impractical in terms of maintenance and year-long appearance and appropriateness.

- The layout pattern of planters spreading into the space reduces the usefulness and flexibility of the area as a public space capable of hosting a variety of uses, events and functions. Fairly large trees would be much more appropriate and require considerably less maintenance.

- The paving pattern seems too fussy, though a bolder scheme using appropriate tough materials with the strong zigzag pattern could work.

- The method and design of night-time lighting for this large public piazza-like area
is an important consideration that appears to have been entirely forgotten in the design. Perhaps some seating should be considered too.

131. The sloping canopies under the rail viaduct arches were criticized. They were thought to detract from the bold architecture of the viaduct and were considered likely to harbour a growing layer of dirt and dust as time passes. A simple, well detailed, glazed screen, well set back within the arched opening allowing the arched form to read strongly was suggested to be all that is needed in these openings.

132. In conclusion, the panel felt that the scheme had all the hall-marks of committee design: and all its failings. The scheme proposed was almost entirely inappropriate to the CA, both architecturally and practically. It needed a good strong, tough urban design scheme appropriate to the character of the area and the listed station building and the railway structures bounding the space.

Metropolitan Police

133. Good to see that the applicants have mentioned in paragraph 4.7 security and CCTV. A development of this nature will I can see only improve the area. Use the station often and it is very dark and awkward for users not used to the area. The crowding of the streets by the shops with their fruit and veg makes it difficult to walk past.

134. I have not had any contact from the agent so I have cc'd them in also the British transport police in case it slipped by them as they do cover the foyer and immediate frontage.

135. This development is in a busy residential and retail area. There are certain crimes that are above the London average. There is a planning application in 133 Rye Lane on the other side of the road and bridge. Construction with these two sites must be looked at for the highways and disruption to traffic and travellers. When areas are badly marked out pedestrians can become victims of crime and traffic accidents more easily. Would therefore seek a condition that Secured by design certification must be achieved in the physical security and design and layout. Even with refurbishments this can be achieved.

Transport for London

136. Understand that this application was referred to the Mayor or London, but that it is not yet clear if it meets referral criteria. Should the application be referable, the comments below should not be taken to be reflective of the Mayor or GLA’s position. The application site is adjacent to, but not including Peckham Rye Station itself. The Planning Statement highlights that discussions have taken place with Network Rail with regard to Asset Protection, so TfL (London Overground) services which serve the station wouldn’t be impacted, unless advised by Network Rail. As such, TfL has no comments from a rail operations perspective.

137. Unfortunately the application focusses on public realm, rather than identifying specific interchange improvements, although it is acknowledged that removing the buildings in front of the station building will improve pedestrian flow (and visibility) to and from the station, which will benefit interchange. Examples are given below.

138. The transport assessment states that the bus stops serving the station are of poor quality – for example northbound bus passengers wait under the railway arch – but the proposals do no include specific measures and/or more definite plans to improve facilities for waiting bus passengers. For example, the TA states:
'There is a future aspiration to relocate the northbound bus stop U flag on Rye Lane approximately 10m south adjacent the new public square to provide more space for waiting bus passengers and allow pedestrians to pass without obstruction. Delivery of this aspiration is subject to further discussion and agreement with TfL, but if agreed this would provide significant potential benefit to the quality of the public realm, enhance the pedestrian environment and interchange facilities between public transport modes.'

139. The ideal time to deliver this improvement is logically at the same time as the station square works, so the application could have been more forthright in this respect i.e. that this improvement would be funded and delivered as part of the station square works, subject to TfL agreement, rather than being a ‘future aspiration’.

140. No provision for taxis/private hire is mentioned.

141. Peckham has been identified as a potential area where cycle hire could expand to, and this expansion has strong support from the council. The station square and surrounding area would be a logical location where provision of a cycle hire docking station may be considered, but there is no mention of this in the application material, for example passive ‘safeguarding’ of a potentially suitable area.

Natural England

142. Natural England has no comments to make on this application. The lack of comment from Natural England does not imply that there are no impacts on the natural environment, but only that the application is not likely to result in significant impacts on statutory designated nature conservation sites or landscapes. It is for the local planning authority to determine whether or not this application is consistent with national and local policies on the natural environment. Other bodies and individuals may be able to provide information and advice on the environmental value of this site and the impacts of the proposal to assist the decision making process. We advise LPAs to obtain specialist ecological or other environmental advice when determining the environmental impacts of development. Protected Species - If the proposed works could, at any stage, have an impact on protected species, then you should refer to our Standing Advice which contains details of survey and mitigation requirements.

Thames Water

143. Informatives are recommended.

Environment Agency

144. No objections. Recommend a condition requiring a remediation report in the event that unexpected contamination is encountered during building works.

Human rights implications

145. 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.

146. This application has the legitimate aim of providing a new public square, retail, business and community floorspace. 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.
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APPENDIX 1

Consultation undertaken

Site notice date: 03/11/2015
Press notice date: 12/11/2015
Case officer site visit date: 03/11/2015
Neighbour consultation letters sent: 03/11/2015

Internal services consulted:
Ecology Officer
Economic Development Team
Environmental Protection Team Formal Consultation [Noise / Air Quality / Land Contamination / Ventilation]
Flood and Drainage Team
HIGHWAY LICENSING
Highway Development Management
Housing Regeneration Initiatives
Waste Management

Statutory and non-statutory organisations consulted:
EDF Energy
Environment Agency
Greater London Authority
Heritage Lottery Fund, 7 Holbein Place
Historic England
London Fire & Emergency Planning Authority
London Underground Limited
Metropolitan Police Service (Designing out Crime)
Natural England - London Region & South East Region
Network Rail (Planning)
Thames Water - Development Planning
The Peckham Society, 178 Peckham Rye
The Victorian Society
Transport for London (referable & non-referable app notifications and pre-apps)
Twentieth Century Society

Neighbour and local groups consulted:
40 Denman Rd Peckham SE15 5nr
3 Choumert Mews London SE15 4BD
4 Choumert Mews London / SE15 4BD
6 Choumert Mews London SE15 4BD
Haynes House 1b Choumert Grove SE15 4RB
1 Choumert Mews London SE15 4BD
2 Choumert Mews London SE15 4BD
7 Choumert Mews London SE15 4BD
18 Holly Grove London SE15 5DF
47-49 Rye Lane London SE15 5ET
51-57 Rye Lane London SE15 5ED
Peckham Delivery Office 2-4 Highshore Road SE15 5AU
Flat 18 Chloe Court SE15 4UN
Flat 19 Chloe Court SE15 4UN
Flat 20 Chloe Court SE15 4UN
Flat 15 Chloe Court SE15 4UN
Flat 16 Chloe Court SE15 4UN
Flat 17 Chloe Court SE15 4UN
Flat 12 Thalia Court SE15 4ST
141 Rye Lane London SE15 4ST
Flat 9 Thalia Court SE15 4ST
Flat 10 Thalia Court SE15 4ST
Flat 11 Thalia Court SE15 4ST
Flat 1 Chloe Court SE15 4UN
Railway Arch 229 Blenheim Grove SE15 4QL
44-46 Blenheim Grove London SE15 4QL
7 Blenheim Grove London SE15 4QS
11 Blenheim Grove London SE15 4QS
First Floor 12-16 Blenheim Grove SE15 4QL
95a Rye Lane London SE15 4ST
163a Rye Lane London SE15 4TL
104-106 Rye Lane London SE15 4RZ
36 Blenheim Grove London SE15 4QL
105 Bellenden Road London SE15 4QY
44 Choumert Road London SE15 4SE
59 Bellenden Road London SE15 5BH
21 Holly Grove London SE15 5DF
22 Holly Grove London SE15 5DF
23 Holly Grove London SE15 5DF
17 Holly Grove London SE15 5DF
19 Holly Grove London SE15 5DF
17 Holly Grove London SE15 5DF
19 Holly Grove London SE15 5DF
20 Holly Grove London SE15 5DF
28 Holly Grove London SE15 5DF
29 Holly Grove London SE15 5DF
52a 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
52 B 30 Holly Grove SE15 5DF
26 Holly Grove London SE15 5DF
27 Holly Grove London SE15 5DF
60 Elm Grove London SE15 5DE
62 Elm Grove London SE15 5DE
64 Elm Grove London SE15 5DE
52 Elm Grove London SE15 5DE
56 Elm Grove London SE15 5DE
58 Elm Grove London SE15 5DE
9-10 Holly Grove London SE15 5DF
14 Holly Grove London SE15 5DF
15 Holly Grove London SE15 5DF
16 Holly Grove London SE15 5DF
11 Holly Grove London SE15 5DF
12 Holly Grove London SE15 5DF
13 Holly Grove London SE15 5DF
31 Holly Grove London SE15 5DF
43a 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
14c 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HD
14b 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HD
14a 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HD
27a 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HD
27b 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HD
21 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HD
20 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HD
19 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HD
24 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HD
23 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HD
22 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HD
39 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
56 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
55 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
59 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
58 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
67 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
66 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
64 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
63 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
62 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
61 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
60 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
65 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
64 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
63 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
62 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
61 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
60 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
69 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
68 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
67 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
66 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
65 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
64 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
63 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
62 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
61 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
59 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
58 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
57 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
32 Holly Grove London SE15 5DF
33 Holly Grove London SE15 5DF
36 Blenheim Grove London SE15 5DE
55f 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
54g 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
54e 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
54d 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
54c 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
54b 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
54a 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
53f 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
53e 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
53d 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
52b 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
51f 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
51e 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
51d 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
51c 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
51b 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
50 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
49 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
48 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
47a 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
47b 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
47 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
46a 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
46b 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
46 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
45 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
44 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
43 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
42 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
41a 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
41 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
40 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
39 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
38 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
37 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
36a 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
35 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
34 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
33 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
32 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
31 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
30 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
29 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
28 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
27 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
26 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
25 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
24 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
23 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
22 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
21 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
20 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
19 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
18 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
17 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
16 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
15 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
14 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
13 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
12 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
11 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
10 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
9 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
8 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
7 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
6 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
5 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
4 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
3 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
2 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
1 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
2 Quantock Mews London SE15 4RG
3 Quantock Mews London SE15 4RG
Flat D Central Buildings SE15 5DW
Market Cafe Rye Lane Market SE15 5BY
Flat A Central Buildings SE15 5DW
Flat B Central Buildings SE15 5DW
13c 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
51f 81 Hanover Park SE15 5HE
Market Office Rye Lane Market SE15 5BY
14c 81 Hanover Park SE15 5SHD
| Flat 11 Chloe Court SE15 4UN | Flat 12 Chloe Court SE15 4UN |
| Flat 13 Chloe Court SE15 4UN | Flat 8 Chloe Court SE15 4UN |
| Flat 14 Chloe Court SE15 4UN | Flat 10 Chloe Court SE15 4UN |

**Re-consultation:** 27/01/2016

---

6 Maxted Road London Se15 4ll
12 Blenheim Grove Peckham SE15 4QL
47 Blenheim Grove London SE15 4
71 Montpelier Rd London SE15 2HD
94 Furley Road London se15 1ug
38 Northfield House London SE15 6TL
30 Talfourd Road Peckham SE15 5NY
114 Beillenden Road London SE15 4RF
91 Shenley Road London SE58NE
4 Alpha Street London Se15 4nx
4 Woodcombe Crescent London SE23 3BG
8 Reif Road London Se15 4js
19 Sarawak Court 47 Consort Road SE15 3SS
201d Camberwell Grove Se58ju
87 Lyndhurst Way London SE15 4PT
168 Rye Lane Peckham Se15 4TL
5 Buchan Road SE15 3HQ
294 Southampton Way London SE5 7HQ
23 Lyndurst Way London se15 5ag
53 Thurlow Hill London SE21 8JW
22 Wroxton Road Nunhead se15 2bn
7 Sturdy Road London se15 3rh
24 Southwood Avenue Coulson CR5 2DT
25 Highshore Road Peckham SE15 5AA
91 Lyndhurst Way London SE15 4PT
Chartered Landscape Architect 24 Southwood Avenue CR5 2DT
Unit 156, Camberwell Business Centre 99-103
Lomond Grove SE5 7HN
APPENDIX 2

Consultation responses received

Internal services

Environmental Protection Team Formal Consultation [Noise / Air Quality / Land Contamination / Ventilation]
Flood and Drainage Team

Statutory and non-statutory organisations

Environment Agency
Historic England
London Underground Limited
Metropolitan Police Service (Designing out Crime)
Thames Water - Development Planning
The Victorian Society
Transport for London (referable & non-referable app notifications and pre-apps)

Neighbours and local groups

Chartered Landscape Architect 24 Southwood Avenue CR5 2DT
Flat 22 5 Bournemouth Road SE15 4BJ
Flat 7 1a Blenheim Grove SE15 4QS
Unit 156, Camberwell Business Centre 99-103 Lomond Grove SE5 7HN
1 Halliwell Rd London SW2 5HB
11 De Crespigny Park London Se68ab
114 Bellenden Road London SE15 4RF
12 Blenheim Grove Peckham SE15 4QL
12 Highshore Road London SE15 5AA
144 Benhill Road Camberwell SE5 7LZ
16 Holly Grove London SE15 5DF
168 Rye Lane Peckham Se15 4TL
178 Peckham Rye London SE22 9QA
19 Anstey Road London Ss15 4jx
19 Sarawak Court 47 Consort Road SE15 3SS
20 Highshore Road London SE15 5AA
201d Camberwell Grove Se58ju
21 Highshore Road London SE15 5AA
210 Cheltenham Road Bristol BS6 5QU
22 Wroxtton Road Nunhead se15 2bn
23 Highshore Road London SE15 5AA
23 Highshore Road London SE15 5AA
23 Lyndurst Way London se15 5ag
24 Southwood Avenue Coulsdon CR5 2DT
25 Highshore Road London SE15 5AA
25 Highshore Road Peckham SE15 5AA
294 Southampton Way London SE5 7HQ
3 Solway Road London SE22 9BG
30 Talfourd Road Peckham SE15 5NY
31c Elm Grove London SE15 5DB
33 Coll'S Road London SE15 2NU
33 Highshore Road London SE15 5AF
33 Highshore Road London SE15 5AF
37 Flaxman Road Camberwell SE5 9DL
37 Flaxman Road London SE5 9DL