

Item No: 11	Classification: Open	Date: 11 October 2016	Meeting Name: Planning Committee
Report title:		Addendum Late observations, consultation responses, and further information.	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		Grange East Dulwich	
From:		Director of Planning	

PURPOSE

1. To advise Members of observations, consultation responses and further information received in respect of the following planning applications on the main agenda. These were received after the preparation of the report and the matters raised may not therefore have been taken in to account in reaching the recommendation stated.

RECOMMENDATION

2. That Members note and consider the late observations, consultation responses and information received in respect of each item in reaching their decision.

FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION

3. Late observations, consultation responses, information and revisions have been received in respect of the following planning applications on the main agenda:

Item 11.1 – Application 16/AP/2747 for: Full Planning Permission – Dulwich Hospital, East Dulwich Grove, London SE22 8PT

Correction to paragraph 12 of the officer report:

- 3.1 The new health centre would provide ~~4,608sqm~~ 4,634sqm of floorspace comprising...

Correction to paragraph 16 of the officer report:

- 3.2 The first phase of the school would be completed in September 2018, and the health centre is expected to be completed by March / April 2018, not September 2018 as stated.

Correction to paragraph 46 of the officer report:

- 3.3 The ~~Health Authority~~ Clinical Commissioning Group has carried out extensive consultation...

- 3.4 Two additional supports received: - Two additional representations have been received in support of the proposal. The grounds for support are that the facility would be beneficial for the local community; would reduce the need for children and adults to travel for school and healthcare; the strong working relationship with the NHS bodes well for the ongoing site management; the campus design approach to the building would be acceptable; and the benefits of the proposal would outweigh any transport impacts which in any event are not insurmountable.

- 3.5 Follow-up response received: - A follow-up response has been received from a neighbouring resident reiterating concerns previously raised regarding a roof terrace to the health centre, and 7m lighting poles to its car park.
- 3.6 Officer response: - The proposed roof terrace is considered at paragraph 109 of the officer report. It would only be accessible from the staff room and would be approximately 45m from the nearest residential properties. As such officers do not consider that it would result in any loss of amenity to neighbouring occupiers by way of loss of privacy or noise and disturbance.
- 3.7 The lighting proposal is considered at paragraph 113 of the officer report. The rear gardens of the adjoining properties on Melbourne Grove are approximately 11m long and the lighting poles would be 2m beyond this. Given the separation distance officers do not consider that they would appear overly obtrusive, and condition 25 in the draft recommendation would prevent light pollution to the surrounding properties.
- 3.8 Follow-up response received - A follow-up response has been received from the head petitioner of the 42 signature petition requesting traffic calming measures and a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ); this response also relates to item 11.2 on the committee agenda for a new secondary school on the remainder of the Dulwich Hospital site.
- 3.9 The follow-up response reiterates general support for the proposals, but advises that the concerns of residents have not been adequately addressed in the officer report, and additional traffic and parking space use would negatively impact upon Melbourne Grove. The response invites officers to visit the road, advises that the outcome of a previous CPZ consultation was to increase parking spaces on the road which the proposal would negate, and that there is a conflict in restricting on-site parking to encourage use of public transport, whilst also stating that overspill parking could be accommodated on the surrounding streets. The petitioner would like to understand the limitation of the planning process in assisting with the traffic problems, and to gain information as to the best way to progress the concerns.
- 3.10 Officer response - The transport impacts of the proposal have been considered in paragraphs 69 to 105 of the officer report. Paragraphs 79-80 deal specifically with trip generation and advise that the health centre would generate two additional vehicle trips along Melbourne Grove in the morning peak compared to the existing hospital. The cumulative impact with the secondary school proposal is considered at paragraph 109 of the officer report for the school application. Cumulatively upon completion of the developments there would be 8 additional 2-way vehicle trips on Melbourne Grove in the morning peak and 4 additional 2-way trips in the evening peak which would equate to 4 additional cars per hour in the morning peak and 2 in the evening peak. Officers consider that this would not adversely impact upon the safe operation of the highway and as such do not consider that making Melbourne Grove a one-way street would be necessary.
- 3.11 Car parking is considered in paragraphs 111 to 120 of the officer report. On-street parking surveys have been carried out which demonstrate that there would be sufficient on-street parking available to accommodate potential overspill parking from both the proposed health centre and the proposed secondary school. Travel plan measures would be implemented to influence travel choices, and providing less parking would also encourage people to travel by alternative modes to the private car. As such it is possible that not all of the predicted overspill parking would occur.

3.12 Officers have visited the site on many occasions and are familiar with the area. The implementation of a CPZ is subject to separate regulations and cannot be required as a condition or planning obligation of a planning permission. Residents would need to contact the Council's Network Development Team with a view to securing a parking study of the area and possible implementation of a CPZ (which would be subject to local consultation in the affected area). Condition 24 of the draft recommendation would prevent staff at the health centre from being able to obtain parking permits in the event that a CPZ is implemented.

3.13 Overall officers are satisfied that the transport impacts of the proposal would be acceptable, including cumulative impacts with the proposed secondary school, and the recommendation remains that planning permission should be granted.

3.14 Amendment to draft condition 15 (BREEAM)

a) ~~Before any fit out works begin, an independently verified BREEAM report (detailing performance in each category, overall score, BREEAM rating and a BREEAM certificate of building performance) to achieve a minimum 'very good' rating a BREEAM Design Stage Certificate achieving a minimum 'very good' rating shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and the development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with any such approval given;~~

b) Within 3 months of occupation a ~~certified Post Construction Review~~ BREEAM Final Stage Certificate (or other verification process agreed with the local planning authority) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, confirming that the agreed standards at (a) have been met.

Item 11.2 – Application 16/AP/2740 for: Full Planning Permission – Dulwich Hospital, East Dulwich Grove, London SE22 8PT

Correction to paragraph 18 of the officer report:

3.15 Phase 2 - Demolition of the ward buildings adjoining the Chateau would take place post-April ~~2020~~2019 when the replacement health centre would be operational.

Update to paragraph 164 of the officer report:

3.16 When compared to a scheme compliant with the Building Regulations the 'Be Lean' measures would reduce carbon dioxide emissions by 15%, the 'Be Clean' measures by 19% and the 'Be Green' measures by 9%. This would equate to a 43% reduction, in excess of the 35% policy requirement. The 'Be Green' contribution would be just 1% short of the 20% policy requirement but given that overall reduction would exceed the policy requirement, no objections are raised.

Additional representations received:

3.17 25 additional representations have been received in support of the application. Grounds for support are that the proposal would benefit the local community; there is a need for school places; it would be well designed and would make an excellent use of a derelict site; block C would appropriately 'book-end' the site; there would be no loss of greenfield land; most pupils would walk to school; it may result in traffic calming being implemented; and noise would be limited to school hours.

3.18 Paragraph 3.8 above addressing a follow-up response from the head petitioner requesting a CPZ and traffic calming measures is also relevant to this application.

Amendments to draft condition 10 (building recording):

3.19 Before any work hereby authorised begins including demolition, the applicant or successors in title shall secure the implementation of a programme of building recording for the wards and Chateau (detailed - level 2) and nurses' accommodation (level 4) in accordance with a written scheme of investigation, which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the details thereby approved.

3.20 Officers have reconsidered this issue and given the low, local significance of the nurses' accommodation blocks which are not considered to be heritage assets, are of the view that building recording is not necessary.

Amendment to draft condition 24 (highway works)

3.21 Details of a scheme for the following highway works shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

(as previously drafted.....)

f) Modification of existing accesses off East Dulwich Grove to the relevant standards in the Southwark Streetscape Design Manual.

Any damage to the highway caused by the developer shall be repaired by the developer.

3.22 Amendment to condition 29 of the officer report:

Before the first occupation of the development hereby permitted a Servicing, Parking and Pupil Drop-off and Collection Management Plan detailing how all elements of the site are to be trafficked, and serviced and managed shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. It shall include:

- a) measures to ensure that there would be no conflict between pupils entering the site and ~~food deliveries to block G~~ construction and servicing vehicles;
- b) Supervision of Melbourne Grove to discourage double parking and possible highway obstruction by vehicles dropping pupils off;
- c) Monitoring of the Jarvis Road entrance which should be undertaken in the second week of each term for the first three years of occupation. During phase 1 of the works when Jarvis Road is the only access to the school, Jarvis Road shall be supervised by staff daily at pupil drop-off and collection times to discourage this road from being used as a drop-off area.

The servicing and traffic management of the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approval given and the Management Plan shall remain extant for as long as the development is occupied.

3.23 Correction / Amendment to condition 42 (employment during construction):

During the construction of the development hereby permitted, the applicant shall provide a training and employment scheme comprising:

- 28 jobs at 26 weeks (or a contribution of ~~£120,400~~ £4,300 per job not provided shall be made paid to the Council towards training and employment in the borough in the event that this is not met);

- 28 short courses (or a contribution of ~~£4,200~~ £150 per short course not provided shall be ~~made~~ paid to the Council towards training and employment in the borough in the event that this is not met);
- 7 apprenticeships / NVQ starts (or a contribution of £135,100 £1,500 per apprenticeship not provided shall be ~~made~~ paid to the Council towards training and employment in the borough in the event that this is not met).

Conclusion of Director of Planning

3.24 Having taken account of the additional responses received, the recommendation remains that planning permission be granted for application numbers 16AP2747 and 16AP2740 subject to a s106 agreement and conditions for the health centre proposal and conditions for the school proposal, and following referral of both applications to the GLA.

REASON FOR URGENCY

4. Applications are required by statute to be considered as speedily as possible. The application has been publicised as being on the agenda for consideration at this meeting of the Planning Committee and applicants and objectors have been invited to attend the meeting to make their views known. Deferral would delay the processing of the applications and would inconvenience all those who attend the meeting

REASON FOR LATENESS

5. The new information, comments reported and corrections to the main report and recommendation have been noted and/or received since the committee agenda was printed. They all relate to an item on the agenda and Members should be aware of the objections and comments made.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Individual files	Chief Executive's Department 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH	Planning enquiries telephone: 020 7525 5403