

Item No. 9.2	Classification: Open	Date: 8 November 2016	Meeting Name: Planning Committee
Report title:	Development Management planning application: Application 16/AP/2681 for: Full Planning Permission Address: FORMER ODESSA STREET YOUTH CLUB, COMMERCIAL PIER WHARF, ODESSA STREET, LONDON SE16 Proposal: Demolition of the former youth club building and nightclub building, and removal of crane, and erection of two buildings arranged across a communal garden ranging from four to eleven storeys in height comprising 197sqm of Class A1/A3 (restaurant/cafe) floor space, 74 residential units (13 x 1 bedroom, 42 x 2 bedroom, 17 x 3 bedroom and 2 x 4 bedroom) with private gardens, balconies and terraces, communal amenity space, 23 parking spaces, 136 cycle spaces, refuse storage, creation of vehicle access from Odessa Street, associated works including electricity substation and construction of new section of Thames River Path and associated landscaping.		
Ward(s) or groups affected:	Surrey Docks		
From:	Director of Planning		
Application Start Date 13/07/2016		Application Expiry Date 12/10/2016	
Earliest Decision Date 13/08/2016			

RECOMMENDATION

1. That planning permission be granted subject to conditions and the applicant entering into an appropriate legal agreement by no later than 24 February 2017, and subject to referral to the Mayor of London and subject to a decision from Historic England not to list the crane.
2. In the event that the requirements of above are not met by 24 February 2017 the Director of Planning be authorised to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out under paragraph 116.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

3. This application is situated on land within the Canada Water Action Area, and has a formal designation which identifies the acceptable uses for the site as residential with a ground floor retail unit .The proposed development would deliver the following planning policy requirements and benefits for the wider Canada Water Area:
 - Provision of new section of Thames Path linking the site with pedestrian walk to the south
 - 74 new residential units with 21 affordable housing units (35% by habitable room)

- A new ground floor café/restaurant which provides an active fronting onto the river
- Provision of a high quality new building along the River Thames
- Removal of the existing derelict nightclub building which has been a nuisance neighbour for residents
- Improved public realm around the site.

Site location and description

4. The subject site has an area of 0.294ha and is located at 1 - 3 Odessa Street. It is bounded by Odessa Street to the east, Wyatt's Close to the north, the River Thames and River Walk to the east and Custom Reach House to the south. The site is comprised of a single storey youth club building fronting onto Odessa Street, an area of hard-standing linked to the youth club, an existing single storey night club building and a disused crane on an area of hard-standing. None of the existing structures on the site are currently in use, although there is public access to the area of hard-standing which includes markings that show it has been used for recreation purposes.



5. The site rises from west to east from Odessa Street towards the river frontage so that the river frontage is approximately 3m higher than ground level on Odessa Street. There are also some mature trees and shrubs within the site around the perimeter of the youth club boundaries and alongside the pedestrian path from Odessa Street to the river walk. Historically, the site was known as Commercial Pier Wharf and was used as a storage yard.

6. The site is not within a conservation area and there are no listed buildings close to the site. However a request has been made by a member of the public to Historic England to consider the existing crane for statutory listing (please see Paragraph 69, below). This request is currently under consideration by Historic England.
7. The surrounding area is predominantly residential with a mix of building typologies including the 1930's 4-storey deck access St Gabriels House to the west, 1990's 2-3 storey terraced housing on Wyatt's Close to the north, 1970's 9 storey residential block at Custom House to the south and the 9 storey 1990s New Caledonian Wharf beyond Custom House. Further to the south where the river walk projects further out towards the river there is an 11-storey residential building the King Frederick 9th Tower on Helsinki Square.

Details of proposal

8. The proposed development would involve the demolition of all existing structures on site including the youth club, night club and crane to allow for the erection of two separate residential blocks, Block A and Block B.
9. Block A would front onto Odessa Street and comprise 19 social rented flats. This building would be predominantly four storeys in height with a further two set back floors above (resulting in a total height of six storeys) This building would include an undercroft area to provide access to lower ground level parking and servicing area for both blocks. The appearance of this block from Odessa Street is shown below. The roof of this structure would be used for the provision of photo-voltaic (PV) panels.



10. Block B would have a frontage towards the river and would contain a ground floor commercial unit with an area of 197sqm and 55 private residential units. The building would rise to a height of 11 storeys stepping down one storey towards Custom House to the south and down to 5 storeys adjacent to Wyatt's Close to the north. The flat roofs of the proposed building would be used to provide additional private amenity space for residents of the block and also space for PV panels.



11. The rear elevations of the proposed buildings set a minimum distance of 16.14m apart, with the space between the buildings providing private and communal amenity space and a car park with 23 parking spaces. The space would also be used for servicing for the café/restaurant unit and would be accessed from Odessa Street.
12. During the course of the planning application the following amendments were submitted making the following changes to the proposed development:
 - Identification of an area of the car park where bin storage can be accommodated to allow for a central collection point
 - Alterations to size of windows on flank wall of affordable building to ensure the provision of dual aspect units
 - Details of the proposed treatment of the ground floor to provide access to flood defences where required
 - Additional details of the proposed energy strategy
 - Increase in affordable housing offer to 35% by habitable room.

13. Planning history

15/EQ/0250 Application type: Pre-Application Enquiry (ENQ)
 Pre-application discussions were held with the applicant during 2015-16, with the discussions centred on appropriate height and design, public realm including the river walk, daylight and amenity impacts on neighbours, parking, affordable housing, and the crane.

Planning history of adjoining sites

14. Docklands Settlement Site on Rotherhithe Street
 11/AP/2242. Full planning application

Demolition of existing buildings, and erection of 28 residential dwellings (6x1 bed; 13x2 bed; 9x3 bed) within a part three, part four storey building at the southern end of the site with associated car parking, cycle storage and amenity spaces. Erection of a new single storey community building (maximum height approximately 7 metres above ground) on the northern part of the site, accessed from Salter Road, providing general hall, meeting spaces and sports facilities, and a new flood-lit external sports pitch.

Decision date: 20/12/2011 Decision: Planning permission granted, and the

development is now complete.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Summary of main issues

15. The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:

- a) Principle/Land-use issues, including conformity with the CWAAP
- b) Environmental Impact Assessment
- c) Housing
- d) Affordable Housing
- e) Design, including impact of a tall building
- f) Impact on Residential Amenity
- g) Quality of Residential Accommodation
- h) Transport
- i) Flooding
- j) Sustainability
- k) Section 106/CIL.

Planning policy

16. Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The key development plan policies are set out below.

17. The site is situated within the Canada Water Action Area and has a site specific designation CWAAP22. In addition to that it sits within the following designations:

- Suburban Density Zone North
- Thames Policy Area
- Thames Special Policy Area
- Borough, Bermondsey and Rivers Archaeological Priority Zone
- Air Quality Management Area
- Public Transport Accessibility Level 1b (low).

18. National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework)

Section 1 'Building a strong, competitive economy'

Section 4 'Promoting sustainable transport'

Section 6 'Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes'

Section 7 'Requiring good design'

Section 8 'Promoting healthy communities'

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'

19. London Plan July 2016 consolidated with alterations since 2011

Policy 3.4 – Optimising housing potential

Policy 3.5 – Quality and design of housing developments

Policy 3.6 – Children and young people's play and informal recreation facilities

Policy 3.8 – Housing choice

Policy 3.9 – Mixed and balanced communities

Policy 3.12 – Negotiating affordable housing on individual private residential and mixed use schemes

Policy 3.16 – Protection and enhancement of social infrastructure
 Policy 5.1 – Climate change mitigation
 Policy 5.2 – Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
 Policy 5.3 – Sustainable design and construction
 Policy 5.6 – Decentralised energy in development proposals
 Policy 5.7 – Renewable energy
 Policy 5.9 – Overheating and cooling
 Policy 5.10 – Urban greening
 Policy 5.11 – Green roofs and development site environs
 Policy 5.12 – Flood risk management
 Policy 5.13 – Sustainable drainage
 Policy 5.15 – Water use and supplies
 Policy 5.21 – Contaminated land
 Policy 6.2 – Providing public transport capacity and safeguarding land for transport
 Policy 6.3 – Assessing effects of development on transport capacity
 Policy 6.9 – Cycling
 Policy 6.10 – Walking
 Policy 6.13 – Parking
 Policy 7.1 – Building London's neighbourhoods and communities
 Policy 7.2 – An inclusive environment
 Policy 7.3 – Designing out crime
 Policy 7.4 – Local character
 Policy 7.5 – Public realm
 Policy 7.6 – Architecture
 Policy 7.7 – Location and Design of Tall and Large Buildings
 Policy 7.8 – Heritage assets and archaeology
 Policy 7.14 – Improving air quality
 Policy 7.18 – Protecting open space and addressing deficiency
 Policy 7.19 - Biodiversity and access to nature
 Policy 7.21 – Trees and woodlands
 Policy 7.27 – Blue ribbon network: Supporting infrastructure and recreational use
 Policy 7.28 – Restoration of the blue ribbon network
 Policy 7.29 – The River Thames
 Policy 8.2 – Planning obligations
 Policy 8.3 – Community infrastructure levy

Mayor's Housing SPD 2015

20. Core Strategy 2011

Strategic Policy 1 – Sustainable development
 Strategic Policy 2 – Sustainable transport
 Strategic Policy 3 – shopping, leisure and entertainment
 Strategic Policy 4 – Places for learning, enjoyment and healthy lifestyles
 Strategic Policy 5 – Providing new homes
 Strategic Policy 6 – Homes for people on different incomes
 Strategic Policy 7 – Family homes
 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.

21. Southwark Plan 2007 (July) - saved policies

The council's cabinet on 19 March 2013, as required by paragraph 215 of the NPPF, considered the issue of compliance of Southwark planning policy with the National Planning Policy Framework. All policies and proposals were reviewed and the council

satisfied itself that the policies and proposals in use were in conformity with the NPPF. The resolution was that with the exception of Policy 1.8 (location of retail outside town centres) in the Southwark Plan all Southwark Plan policies are saved. Therefore due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans in accordance to their degree of consistency with the NPPF.

Policy 2.1 – Enhancement of community facilities
Policy 2.5 - Planning obligations
Policy 3.1 – Environmental effects
Policy 3.2 – Protection of amenity
Policy 3.3 – Sustainability assessment
Policy 3.4 – Energy efficiency
Policy 3.6 – Air quality
Policy 3.7 – Waste reduction
Policy 3.8 – Waste management
Policy 3.9 – Water
Policy 3.11 – Efficient use of land
Policy 3.12 – Quality in design
Policy 3.13 – Urban design
Policy 3.14 – Designing out crime
Policy 3.15 – Conservation of the historic environment
Policy 3.19 – Archaeology
Policy 3.20 – Tall Buildings
Policy 3.28 – Biodiversity
Policy 3.29 – Development within the Thames policy area
Policy 3.30 – Protection of riverside facilities
Policy 3.31 – Flood defences
Policy 4.1 – Density of residential development
Policy 4.2 – Quality of residential accommodation
Policy 4.3 – Mix of dwellings
Policy 4.4 – Affordable housing
Policy 4.5 – Wheelchair affordable housing
Policy 5.2 – Transport Impacts
Policy 5.3 – Walking and Cycling
Policy 5.6 – Car parking

22. Canada Water Area Action Plan (2015)

The CWAAP was adopted in November 2015 and sets out the planning framework for delivering development in the area over the period up to 2026. The CWAAP looks at wider set of measures that are need to help the area fulfil its potential. The site is outside of the action area core and is designated proposal site 15.

23. The site specific designation includes residential use (Class C3) and retail use (Class A1/A3). The site specific designation covers the land including the former youth club building up to the river frontage, it does not include the neighbouring nightclub building. The estimated capacity of the site is for 25 residential homes and 300sqm of retail use. The site specific guidance states that the development pf this site is subject to appropriate replacement youth facilities being secured elsewhere to meet local needs. It is envisaged that the small scale café or shop would provide a useful local amenity and could help enliven this part of the Thames Path.

24. Southwark Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs)

- Residential Design Standards with Technical Update 2015
- Draft Affordable Housing SPD 2011
- Development Viability SPD 2016

- Thames River Basement Management Plan.
25. The site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 1b which is categorised as low accessibility.

Principle of development

26. The National Planning Policy Framework (2012) states that development that is sustainable should go ahead, without delay – a presumption in favour of sustainable development that is the basis for every plan and every decision.
27. This site is outside of the core area of the Canada Water Area Action Plan. (CWAAP). Policy 21 of the CWAAP states that there is capacity for 600 additional homes outside of the core area most of which will be delivered on proposals sites. The application site has a designation (CWAAP site 15), which identifies residential and retail uses as the required uses of this site, with an estimated residential capacity of 25. The proposed development would provide 74 flats with a 180sqm café/restaurant use proposed for upper ground floor fronting onto the river walk. This would accord with the required proposed uses for the site. The number of residential flats exceeds the estimated capacity as set out in the site designation. However, the delivery of a greater quantity of housing does not raise any concerns in principle, provided the urban design and housing quality are not compromised and that there is not significant harm to the amenity of neighbours; these issues are discussed later in this report.
28. The site specific guidance also states that the redevelopment of the site is subject to appropriate replacement youth facilities being secured elsewhere to meet local needs. The youth club facilities have been re-provided within the Dockland Settlement Centre at 400 Salter Road, approximately 170m from the existing site. The facilities are accessible to local residents through the council youth services at set times during the week and during the holidays. This is considered to be an appropriate replacement of the facilities that were available on the application site.
29. At present the Thames River Walk has to move away from the river frontage taking a 400m detour onto Odessa Street before reconnecting with the river frontage further to the south adjacent to Helsinki Square. The proposed development would allow for the completion of the River Walk along the river frontage with the removal of the existing night club and the extension of the pedestrian walkway up to the boundary with Caledonian Wharf. This is in accordance with CWAAP policy 6 which states that development proposals should provide or re-instate the Thames Path.
30. The proposed development is considered to be in accordance with the land use principles set out in the development plan, and the delivery of new housing is welcomed.

Environmental impact assessment

31. A request for a screening opinion was not submitted with the application. However, in this context it is considered that the development is unlikely to have an effect upon the environment of more than local significance by virtue of its nature, size or location based upon a review of the Schedule 3 selection criteria for screening Schedule 2 Development. The site is a brownfield site in an urban location, and is located outside a sensitive area as per regulation 2(1) and the development is unlikely to generate any significant environmental effects of a magnitude which would require assessment through an EIA.

Housing

32. The site is in the Canada Water Action Area. CWAAP policy 21 states that development within the Action Area will provide a minimum of 5100 net new homes of which 600 are to be delivered outside the core area during the plan period of 2011 - 2026. There have been a net total of 917 completions since the adoption of original version of the plan in March 2012. The proposed development would make significant contribution towards the delivery of homes outside of the core area.

Housing mix

33. Strategic policy 7 'Family Homes' of the Core Strategy 2011 prioritises the development of family homes. The policy sets out differing requirements for provision of family sized units depending upon the geographical area in which developments are located.
34. Developments of 10 or more units must provide at least 60% of units with 2 or more bedrooms. Within suburban areas at least 30% of units are required to be 3-bed or more.

Table 1 – Unit mix

Unit type	Quantity (affordable)	Percentage (affordable)
1-bed	13 (2)	18% (9.5%)
2-bed	42 (9)	57% (43%)
3-bed	17 (8)	23% (38%)
4-bed	2 (2)	3% (9.5%)
Total	74 (21)	100%

35. The proposed mix would provide a high proportion of units with 2 or more bedrooms (82%), but fall slightly short of the expected number of larger family homes (26% as opposed to the expected 30%). Having regard to the generous provision of family units within the affordable accommodation (equating to 47.5 % of the affordable units), the shortfall, which equates to 3 units, is considered to be acceptable.

Affordable housing

36. The NPPF adopted in March 2012 states that local planning authorities should set policies for affordable housing need on site, unless off-site provision or a financial contribution of broadly equivalent value can be robustly justified and the agreed approach contributes to the objective of creating mixed and balanced communities. Such policies should be sufficiently flexible to take account of changing market conditions over time.
37. Policy 3.12 of the London Plan states that the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing should be sought when negotiating on individual private residential and mixed use schemes. This should take account of individual circumstances including development viability and the affordable housing should normally be provided on site.
38. Strategic policy 6 'Homes for people on different incomes' of the Core Strategy requires developments to include a minimum of 35% affordable housing. This policy works in conjunction with saved policies in the Southwark Plan such as policy 4.5 'Wheelchair affordable housing' which states that for every affordable housing unit which complies with the wheelchair design standards, one less affordable habitable room will be required. Saved policy 4.4 'Affordable Housing' requires developments in the this area to provide this affordable housing in a tenure split of 70% social rented

and 30% intermediate/shared ownership units, which is also a requirement of CWAAP.

39. Based on a total of 256 habitable rooms within the development, 35% of this would equate to 89 habitable rooms required as affordable housing. The development proposes a total of 6 affordable wheelchair accessible units and therefore a total of 84 affordable habitable rooms are required. The proposal provides 89 habitable rooms as affordable housing (21 units). This equates to 35% affordable housing being provided on site.
40. The affordable accommodation would be predominantly situated within Block A fronting onto Odessa Street although two ground floor units within Block B are allocated as shared ownership units. The units are very high quality, with generous floor areas and private amenity spaces, and the units are predominantly dual aspect. This is a very positive aspect of the proposal.

Tenure split

41. The London Plan seeks a tenure split of 60% affordable rent and 40% intermediate in the affordable housing provision. The saved Southwark Plan requires a split of 70% social rented and 30% intermediate ownership and this is repeated in the CWAAP. The proposal is in accordance with this providing 71% social rented and 29% intermediate ownership when calculated by habitable room. The applicants had previously submitted a viability assessment that demonstrated that a 32% affordable housing offer was viable. This has been reviewed externally and it was considered that the proposed development could deliver a policy compliant 35%. The applicants have confirmed that the policy compliant provision of affordable housing is deliverable in line with the value and costing assumptions in the viability report. Formal confirmation of the viability of the revised offer will be confirmed ahead of committee.
42. The proposed development would therefore deliver a level of affordable housing in full compliance with the relevant affordable housing policies. This would be secured through the legal agreement.

Wheelchair units

43. Saved Policy 4.3 of the Southwark Plan 2007 requires 10% of units to be fully wheelchair accessible. The required 10% dedicated wheelchair accessible units should be served by 2 lifts if they are situated above ground floor level.
44. The proposal is providing eight wheelchair accessible units which equates to 10.8% of the 74 units proposed. These units are all two bedroom units, six would be affordable situated within Block A and two would be private on the ground floor of Block B. The upper floors within Block A on which the wheelchair units would be situated would have access to two lifts.

Design

Density

45. London Plan Policy 3.4 states that taking into account local context and character, the design principles of chapter 7 and public transport capacity, development should optimise housing output for different types of location. Core Strategy policy 5 states that developments above the density range within action areas will be permitted where the development has an exemplary standard of design.
46. The Mayor's Housing SPD provides guidance where density ranges may be exceeded

in justified exceptional circumstances. It states that development at densities outside these ranges will require particularly clear demonstration of exceptional circumstances. The key considerations when assessing appropriate levels of density include 'liveability', relating to proposed dwelling mix, design and quality, physical access to services, long term management of communal areas and the wider context of the proposal including its contribution to local 'place shaping'. It is important to take account of the development's impact in terms of massing, scale and character in relation to nearby uses.

47. The proposed development would have a density of 898 habitable rooms per hectare (hrph). This is significantly above the density range for suburban areas set out in the London Plan and Southwark Plan, which suggests a range of 250 - 350hrh.. However having regard to the Mayor's guidance and Southwark Core Strategy policy towards density a scheme with a density greater than the range set out in policy can be permissible where it can be demonstrated that there are exceptional circumstances.
48. As will be set out below the proposed buildings are considered to be of a very high quality of design and will provide an exceptional quality of living accommodation. All of the residential units exceed the minimum floor space requirements and have access to private amenity space. The setting of the building adjacent to buildings of a similar scale such as New Caledonian Wharf and Custom Reach House also indicate that a development of this density would not be out of character with its broader setting. The development sits on the open setting of the river and the scale of the buildings would not appear overly intensive in this context. The impact on neighbours' daylight, sunlight and outlook is discussed below in paragraph 73, where it is concluded that while the relationship would cause some loss of natural light for neighbours, the scale of the impact is not significantly harmful. .

Scale and massing (tall building)

49. The development rises up to 11-storeys and as it is within the Thames policy area it must be assessed against saved policy 3.20 - tall buildings. Policy 3.20 states that tall buildings will generally be located in the CAZ and in areas with good access to public transport, although the policy does not preclude their development in other areas. In terms of design, the policy sets out the following criteria for tall buildings:
 - (i) Makes a positive contribution to the landscape
 - (ii) Is located at a point of landmark significance
 - (iii) Is of the highest architectural standard
 - (iv) Relates well to its surroundings, particularly at street level
 - (v) Contributes positively to the London skyline as a whole consolidating a cluster within the skyline or providing a key focus within views.
50. The proposed development involves the removal of the existing derelict nightclub building which is considered to have a poor relationship with the river frontage and does not make a positive contribution to the character of the area. The removal of this building allows for the extension of the river walk and is considered to be a positive addition to public realm. The provision of landscaping to public spaces across the development would make a clear positive contribution to the landscape.
51. The site is directly adjacent to the river frontage at a point where the river walk projects out 18m towards the river as the route extends north. The site is also seen in the context of three existing buildings which range in height from 9 to 11 storeys in height. Given the situation next to the river and at the juncture where the embankment projects out the site is considered to be a point of landmark significance where a taller building can be accommodated.



52. On the river frontage the design is composed as series of vertical 'slices' that terrace up from the lower scaled buildings to the west, to a peak at the dogleg in the river walk, and then step down modestly to reflect the scale of the buildings to the east. This gives the design a highly articulated profile and a strong vertical expression. Each vertical slice is slightly angled to capture views of the river and includes the residential balconies. The base will be animated by a café set back and within the colonnaded area which faces onto the river walk. The top is recessive and elegant and introduces high level terraces as each vertical 'slice' sets back.
53. On Odessa Street the proposal is a more modest articulated block which is designed to reinforce the street edge and is deliberately set at a lower height to reflect the more modest prevailing heights on the street. Most importantly, the detailing and materials of this block retain the same features and articulation of the river frontage building. In this way the development is immediately recognisable from this important approach and is consistent in its high quality design.
54. The architecture is considered to be of a very high standard. This will be discussed further in paragraphs below. However the key aspects of the design include:
 - The breaking up of the massing with different heights of the vertical elements (which also step down towards the lower density housing to the north)
 - Complex massing with 6 separate elements with high quality materials and a richly detailed façade
 - Generous balconies and roof terraces for each residential unit.
55. The proposed development relates well to its surroundings with the highest point situated away from the lower residential properties to the north. It is set back 8m from the river frontage to the east and at the ground floor level the café/restaurant use will provide outdoor seating that will increase activity along the river frontage. One of the proposal's most significant contributions to the landscape of the area is how it devotes part of the site to open up the river walk and takes the opportunity to introduce comprehensive improvements to the public realm on its three public edges.
56. The development is not part of a tall building cluster however it should be regarded as forming a positive part of a small group of taller buildings (King Frederick Tower, New Caledonian Wharf and Custom House).

Detail design

57. Policy 3.12 of the saved Southwark Plan sets out an expectation for new development to be of a high quality of architectural design. As noted in paragraph 21 above, the standard of architecture of the proposed development is considered to be very high.
58. Both buildings will predominantly be finished in brick with a metal cladding used for

details such as balcony framing. The specific brick type has not been proposed however the indicative images suggest a high quality light toned brick that will reference the historical warehouse brick architecture of the Rotherhithe and wider docklands area.

59. It should be noted that Block A which contains the affordable housing will be of a equally high quality of design to the private Block B.
60. It is considered the scale of the building is appropriately mitigated by the breaking up of the massing into vertical elements of different heights so that only one bay rises to the full 11 storeys and this faces onto the river. This break down of the massing enables the design of Block B to accommodate generous sized roof terraces and recessed balconies. The different heights and projections on Block B would also result in more recessed surfaces on soffits, flank walls and the reveals which further helps break down the overall massing of the structure. The ultimate success of the design will be dependent on the choice of materials and the detailed finishes and therefore these should be required by condition.
61. Policy 3.12 of the Saved Southwark Plan requires that “developments should achieve a high quality of both architectural and urban design, enhancing the quality of the built environment in order to create attractive, high amenity environments people will choose to live in, work in and visit”. The proposed development is considered to be of a high quality of design and the improvements associated with the extension of the river walk and enhancement of the public realm are benefits which should be accorded significant weight.

Removal of the crane

62. There is a crane on the site which reflects the site's previous use as part of London's docklands. It is a 'Scotch Derrick' crane which is secured on the site by three concrete posts and projects out over the river front. As can be seen from the image below this is a prominent feature along this section of the river frontage and a significant number of representations from local residents as well as from the Greater London Industrial Archaeology Society (GLIAS), have been received objecting to its removal. Notification was received from Historic England on 6 September 2016, confirming that they have received a request to have the crane statutorily listed.



63. While the crane is not a designated heritage asset it is recognised as a prominent local landmark which provides a reminder of the previous use of the site and surrounding area as industrial docklands. Additional information has been sought from the applicants in relation to the merits of the crane, its history and its structural soundness. The applicants have submitted an updated archaeological assessment that fully considers the history and significance of the crane as well as a condition survey which sets out its current condition.

64. Scotch Derrick Cranes were common on wharves along the Thames up until the 1960s. The crane is defined by its long lattice jib (long arm of the crane) which extends out over the river. It is secured to the river frontage by three concrete legs. The cab is situated on the central leg with two further supporting legs either side of this. This crane was originally used to lift wood from boats or barges on the river to the wharf. The site around the crane was redeveloped in the 1980s with a small area of open space and the river walk being provided around it.

65. The NPPF paragraph 129 states:

'Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this assessment into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.'

66. The applicants have provided a detailed history of the site and its surroundings dating back to the late eighteenth century. The site had a variety of uses shown on maps until the construction of Commercial Dock Pier by the early 1860s. Following this the site became established as a wharf. The history sets out that the site was owned by Kemp, Collins and Co, spar and timber importers from the early twentieth century. Maps from 1916 show that there were cranes on this site and neighbouring sites but there is no evidence that these are linked to the crane currently on site. The site was bombed during World War II and all buildings/structures on site were removed.

67. A new crane was rebuilt on site in 1945. This had a shorter jib, a cab with a different form and square concrete supports in contrast the current craned which has longer jib, a different form of cab with more glazing and round concrete support legs. Aerial photos from the time show that this crane was in use until at least 1965. The current crane appears in photographs of the site from 1969. It is clear from the historic photographs and other documentary evidence, which has been assessed by the council's archaeologist, that the crane which currently stands on the site was erected some time between 1965 and 1969, and not immediately post-war as assumed by the GLIAS letter of objection.



68. The crane was then in use through to the 1980s when the site ceased use as an industrial dock as part of the wider redevelopment of the Docklands Area. The structure has been in situ on the site for over 40 years and has some interest as part of the evolving history of the Docklands. However given the relatively recent history of the existing structure and its present poor condition, officers do not consider that the structure complies with the criteria for formal listing. If permission is granted it is recommended that a condition will be attached requiring the submission of a detailed investigation and record of the crane which can be made available for future reference.
69. Notwithstanding the above, Historic England are still to complete their assessment of the crane and their decision may not be made until January 2017. As such it is recommended that Members make any grant of planning permission subject to Historic England deciding not to List the crane. This would require officers to submit a further report to this committee in the event that the crane is listed in order to reconsider the proposals in light of the new information.
70. The removal of this crane would be necessary to allow this current development proposal to proceed. The merits of the development that provides high quality new homes on a redundant brownfield site must be weighed against the merits of retaining the crane structure. In making the recommendation that planning permission should be granted, officers have taken account of the poor condition of the crane structure, its relatively recent date of construction and its impact on the area of public realm within which it sits. In these circumstances, it is considered that the merits of delivering the development significantly outweighs the merits of retaining the crane structure .If Historic England were to decide to List the crane, then it would become a formally designated heritage asset, with a presumption in favour of its retention and the balance of benefits would alter accordingly.

Conclusion to design

71. The proposed development is considered to be of a high quality of design and is an appropriate location for a tall building within the Thames River Frontage Area. The crane is recognised as a distinctive feature within the local area but is not considered to be of such importance to merit formal listing and retention on the site. Appropriately worded conditions will be attached to secure a detailed record of the existing structure. The proposed development would therefore accord with the site specific requirements by providing a high quality design and an enabling the delivery of this section of Thames River Walk.

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

72. Strategic Policy 13 of the Core Strategy sets high environmental standards and requires developments to avoid amenity and environmental problems that affect how we enjoy the environment. Saved Policy 3.2 of the Southwark Plan states that planning permission for development will not be granted where it would cause a loss of amenity, including disturbance from noise, to present and future occupiers in the surrounding area or on the application site. Furthermore, there is a requirement in Saved Policy 3.1 to ensure that development proposals will not cause material adverse effects on the environment and quality of life.

Daylight and sunlight

73. An assessment of the likely significant impacts of the development on daylight and sunlight has been submitted with the application. Local residents have expressed concern that the proposed development will have a negative impact on daylight and

sunlight to neighbouring properties. The impacts on levels of daylight received by neighbouring properties have been assessed in line with best practice guidance produced by the Building Research Establishment (BRE). The report prepared by Luminia London uses three methods to assess the impact of the proposed development on neighbours: the Vertical Sky Component (VSC) test and the No Sky Line (NSL) or Daylight Distribution analysis and Average Daylight Factor (ADF).

74. In considering the impact upon sunlight, the test is based upon a calculation of annual probable sunlight hours (APSH) for all window faces within 90 degree of due south. BRE guidelines require that a window should receive a minimum of 25% of the annual probable sunlight hours, of which, 5% should be received in winter months. Where window sunlight levels fall below this recommendation, the window should not lose more than a 20% loss of its former value. The report considers the impact on the following neighbours:

- New Caledonian Wharf
- Custom Reach House
- Gabriel House
- The houses along Spence Close
- The houses along Wyatt Close.

Property	No. of windows tested	No. retaining at least 80% of their baseline value	No. with up to 29.99% reduction in VSC	No. with between 30%-39.99% reduction in VSC	No. with over 40% reduction in VSC
New Caledonian Wharf	74	54	20	1	1
Custom Reach House	38	25	9	4	0
Gabriel House	74	61	11	2	0
Spence Close	5	5	0	0	0
Wyatt Close	29	8	0	3	18

Wyatt Close

75. During the pre-application process the space between the two buildings was increased and the height stepped down towards Wyatt's Close to reduce the potential impact on daylight and sunlight. However the units on Wyatt Close are those which will receive the biggest noticeable decline in daylight levels. Of the 29 windows tested on these properties 21 would receive a decline of over 30% in VSC. The principal living rooms and main bedrooms of the properties on Wyatt's Close are situated on the north elevation facing away from the application site. Therefore the windows most affected are generally small kitchens or secondary bedrooms. The houses in Wyatt Close currently face a clear site, meaning that any new building of more than a very

modest height would cause a noticeable impact on light levels within the dwellings. It should be noted that all of the rooms tested would receive VSC levels of over 15%.

76. In these circumstances, and when weighed against the benefits of bringing this brownfield site into productive use, it is considered that the harm caused is not so severe as to warrant refusal of an otherwise acceptable scheme.

St Gabriel House

77. This is a residential building situated to the west of the site on Odessa Street. 74 windows facing towards the development site have been tested in relation to the impact of the development on daylight and sunlight. 61 of these would lose less than 20% of their baseline value. 11 would experience a minor impact while 2 would experience a moderate impact with a reduction of 31-39.99% of VSC.

Custom Reach House

78. This is the 9 storey block of flats situated to the south of the proposed development site. There are 4 windows out 38 tested that would receive a decline of over 30% in VSC and a further 9 that would receive a decline of over 20%. These windows are similar to those within Wyatt's Close as they currently have outlook over a cleared site which results in existing VSC levels that exceed what would normally be expected within a city location. It should be noted that all of the rooms experiencing a significant decline would retain VSC levels of between 24% and 27%. With the removal of the night club building there will also be a slight improvement to light to some of the lower units. As such the proposed development is considered to have an acceptable impact on the residents of this block.

New Caledonia Wharf

79. This is a 9 storey block of flats that is situated to the south of the proposed development site beyond Custom Reach House. Of the 74 windows tested 20 would have a minor impact of between 20-29.99%, one would experience a decline of 33% and one would experience a decline of over 40%. The rooms with the largest percentage decline are all situated on the 8th floor of this property. These rooms have very low existing VSC levels as a result of the large canopy which projects out from the roof of this property. Therefore while there will only be a slight fall in the actual VSC level this appears as a very high percentage decline. The other rooms on the lower floors would all retain relatively high VSC levels. Therefore the scale of the impact on these windows is not considered sufficient to outweigh the positive aspects that the proposed development would provide.

Impact on sunlight received by neighbours

80. The impact of the scheme on sunlight to neighbouring properties has been assessed using the Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH) test. The test follows the same methodology that is outlined above for VSC, with guidance advising that if a reduction in sunlight is 20% or less of its original value then the retained sunlight received is adequate. Only rooms with windows facing within 90 degrees of due south are assessed. The houses along Wyatt's Close are the only dwellings that fall within this criterion.
81. Of the rooms assessed only one ground floor kitchen window would fail to comply with the BRE Guidelines for sunlight. This shortfall is limited to winter sunlight where the residual APSH value was 4% compared the minimum recommendation of 5%. Therefore the impact of the proposed development in terms of sunlight to neighbouring properties is considered to be acceptable.

Privacy and overlooking

82. Supplementary Planning Guidance for Residential Design Standards 2011 states that in order to prevent unnecessary problems of overlooking, loss of privacy and disturbance, development should achieve the following distances between residential windows.
- A minimum distance of 12m at the front of the building and any elevation that fronts onto a highway
 - A minimum distance of 21m at the rear of the building.
83. The proposed development complies with these minimum separation distances to neighbours and given the proposed arrangement of the buildings, it is not considered that the proposed development would result in a material impact on the amenity of any adjoining occupiers from overlooking or a loss of privacy.

Quality of residential accommodation

84. Saved policy 4.2 of the Southwark Plan asserts that planning permission will be granted provided the proposal achieves good quality living conditions, and includes high standards of accessibility, privacy and outlook, natural light, ventilation, space, safety and security, and protection from pollution. This policy is reinforced by the Residential Design Standards with Technical Update SPD (RDS 2015). Section 2.2 of the SPD sets out the criteria required to be met for high density schemes which include:
- Significantly exceed minimum floorspace standards (both flats and rooms)
 - Provide for bulk storage
 - Include a predominance of dual aspect units in the development
 - Exceed the minimum ceiling height of 2.3 metres required by the Building Regulations
 - Have natural light and ventilation in kitchens and bathrooms
 - Exceed amenity space standards
 - Meet good sunlight and daylight standards
 - Have excellent accessibility within dwellings including meeting approved document M of the Building Regulations (M4(2) standard for all non wheelchair homes
 - Minimise corridor lengths by having increased number of cores.

Unit	Overall unit sizes Proposed (sqm)	SPD minimum sqm	Amenity space proposed sqm	SPD minimum sqm
1-bed	51-55	50	6-12.7	10
2-bed	70-93	61 (3p)/71 (4p)	6-69.6	10
3-bed	87-121	74 (4p)/ 85 (5p)/95 (6p)	10-65.4	10
4-bed	119-135	106 (6p)/115 (7p)	15.7-57.6	10

85. The proposed residential units would all equal and in most cases significantly exceed the minimum unit size requirements set out in the council's RDS. On average the affordable residential units would exceed the minimum floor space requirements by 9.5 % while the private units would exceed minimum floor space standards by 5%.

Aspect and outlook

86. The applicants state that only three of the residential units would be single aspect units and that, of these, none would be north facing. However several of the units defined by the applicant as dual aspect would not comply with the council's definition of dual aspect windows as they include windows which are too small to be opened and that would not provide cross ventilation and outlook from 2 windows at 90 degree angles or more. Using the council's approach which would exclude these units the proposed development would provide 65 (88%) dual/triple aspect units and 12% single aspect units. There will be no single aspect north facing units. This would deliver a clear predominance of dual aspect units which is a key requirement of exemplary residential quality, and is a particularly positive aspect of the design.

Privacy and overlooking

87. The RDS states that there should be a minimum distance of 12m at the front of the building and any elevation that fronts onto a highway and 21m between developments at the rear. The nearest residential buildings facing towards the proposed development are those on Odessa Street to the west and Wyatt's Close to the north. In both instances there will be no directly facing habitable room windows within 12m of a habitable room window of the proposed residential accommodation. The distance between the rear elevations of Block A and Block B is a minimum of 16m at the closest point. However there are no directly facing primary habitable room windows and secondary windows which are within 17m are marked as obscure glazed. The proposed development is considered to have acceptable levels of privacy and outlook for prospective residents.

Internal daylight, sunlight and overshadowing

88. A daylight and sunlight report based on the Building Research Establishment (BRE) Guidance has been submitted which considers light to the proposed dwellings using the Average Daylight Factor (ADF). ADF determines the natural internal light or day lit appearance of a room and the BRE guidance recommends an ADF of 1% for bedrooms, 1.5% for living rooms and 2% for kitchens. This also adopts an ADF of 2% for shared open plan living/kitchen/dining rooms.
89. The data considers the impact on the habitable rooms of the lower and upper ground floors and the first floor of Block A, as the rooms above this level all have ADF levels greater than recommended minimum. Of the rooms tested 5 would fall below the minimum ADF levels. Four of these are kitchen/living/dining rooms and one is a bedroom. These rooms fall below as a result of the recessed balcony/private amenity space that is accessed from these rooms. This is considered acceptable as the provision of external private amenity space outweighs any harmful effect caused by the shortfall in daylight levels. In the context of the development as a whole and the quality of accommodation and daylight levels to almost all the units within the scheme this shortfall is considered acceptable.

Amenity space

90. Section 3 of the Residential Design Standards SPD sets out the council's amenity space requirements for residential developments and states that all flat developments must meet the following minimum standards and seek to exceed these where possible:
- 50 sqm communal amenity space per development
 - For units containing three or more bedrooms, 10 sqm of private amenity space
 - For units containing two or less bedrooms, 10 sqm of private amenity space

should ideally be provided. Where it is not possible to provide 10 sqm of private amenity space, as much space as possible should be provided as private amenity space, with the remaining amount added towards the communal amenity space requirement

- Balconies, terraces and roof gardens must be a minimum of 3 sqm to count towards private amenity space.
91. The proposed development would provide 74 residential units. All of the residential units have private amenity space in the form of balconies or roof terraces ranging in size from 6sqm to 66.3sqm. Each of the larger family units with 3 or more bedrooms has at least 10 sqm of private amenity space. The total shortfall of amenity space is calculated by the total amount of amenity space by which each unit falls short of 10sqm. This calculation gives a shortfall of 97.3sqm. This shortfall and the requirement for a minimum of 50sqm of amenity space would be offset by the provision of 263sqm of communal amenity space. The level of amenity space provision represents a provision in excess of the minimum amenity requirement.
92. The proposed development has a child yield of 38 children and child play space requirement of 380sqm. 230sqm of this is required for under 5s and 90sqm for 5-11 age groups. This will be provided on site. The communal gardens will provide a total of 590sqm of dedicated play space. A financial contribution has been agreed with regard to the provision of play space for over 12s which cannot be accommodated on site. Overall, the scheme provides high quality amenity space for all its residents, with the occupiers in the affordable units having equal access to the communal space between the two blocks.
93. In addition to the communal and private amenity space provided the proposed development provides a small pocket of landscaping adjacent to the entrance to Block B and the river walk. With this and the improvements to the public realm associated with the extension of the river walk the proposed development has the potential to improve the quality of the public realm along this stretch of the river frontage. Full details of the proposed landscaping will be sought by condition.

Transport issues

94. The NPPF states that planning decisions should ensure developments that generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised (para. 34).
95. Core Strategy strategic policy 2 encourages walking, cycling and the use of public transport rather than travel by car. Saved policy 5.1 of the Southwark Plan states that major developments generating a significant number of trips should be located near transport nodes. Saved policy 5.2 advises that planning permission will be granted for development unless there is an adverse impact on transport networks; and/or adequate provision has not been made for servicing, circulation and access; and /or consideration has not been given to impacts of the development on the bus priority network and the Transport for London (TfL) road network.
96. An assessment of the impacts of the development on transport is included within the submitted transport statement prepared by Caneparo Associates. A framework travel plan has also been submitted.

Car parking

97. The site is in an area with low public transport accessibility (PTAL 1b) and there is unrestricted parking on surrounding streets as they are not within designated Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). The development would therefore need to make

adequate provision for on site parking to mitigate against any overspill parking. The parking standard in the saved Southwark Plan for this area is a maximum of 1.5 spaces per unit. The proposed development would provide approximately 0.31 spaces per unit. The applicants have provided details of car ownership levels set out in census data for this area. This states that only 51% of households in the area own a car.

98. The development provides 23 car parking spaces at the lower ground floor level which are accessed from Odessa Street. Eight of these are reserved for disabled parking. 20% of the disabled parking bays will have access to electric charging points and a further 20% will have passive provision, should there be demand for additional points in the future. These spaces will be for the use of the residential development.
99. The applicant's consultants conducted two overnight parking surveys on two consecutive days in autumn 2015. The surveys were carried out at 05.00 in the morning as this is considered to be the time at which parking demand is at its peak. The survey covered the following streets: Odessa Street, Rotherhithe Street, Defoe Road, Vaughan Street, Gulliver Street, Elgar Street and Spence Close. The study found that there was on street parking capacity of 50 spaces on the first evening and 43 spaces on the second. This indicates that there is spare on-street parking capacity to accommodate any over-spill parking from the proposed development.
100. Furthermore the applicants have committed to providing car club incentives to reduce the development's potential demand for car ownership. This contribution will come in the form of a specific parking bay on-street adjacent to the site and lifetime membership and £50 driving credit per residential unit on site. These details are considered to demonstrate that an acceptable level of parking has been provided and that any overspill parking required can be accommodated on street. The car club measures discussed will be secured within the section 106.

Cycle parking

101. A total of 136 cycle parking spaces will be provided for the prospective residents of the proposed development. This is in line with London Plan requirement for 1 space per 1-bed unit and 2 spaces for each unit with 2 beds or more. This will be provided in the form of Sheffield stands and Josta stands located within secure covered stores at the lower ground floor level of Block A and Block B.

Servicing

102. The site will be serviced from a dedicated loading bay within the on-site car park. This will allow for servicing by transit sized vehicles. Any larger vehicles will undertake servicing from the street. Swept path diagrams have been provided which demonstrate that appropriately sized vehicles will be able to access the servicing space. Delivery and servicing will be secured by condition.
103. Refuse collection would be undertaken from Odessa Street. The commercial bin store and the bin store for residential properties of Block B are situated over 20m from the access point to the site. The collection of waste will have to be appropriately managed so that bins are moved to the temporary refuse loading zone on collection day and returned to stores that same day.

Travel plan

104. A travel plan has been submitted and is considered to be acceptable. This will need to be secured through the section 106 legal agreement.

Flooding

105. The site is located in a high risk flood zone - Flood Zone 3 - which is defined as having a 'high probability' of river and sea flooding by the 'flood risk and coastal change' section of the National Planning Practice guidance (NPPG). Southwark's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) indicates that, in the unlikely event of a breach in the defences, the rate of inundation to the site is defined as 'less than six hours' and the flood hazard rating for the site (based on depth and velocity of floodwaters) is designated as 'significant' to 'extreme' (Figures C, D and E). Residential accommodation is classified as 'more vulnerable' by the 'flood risk and coastal change' section of the NPPG. The FRA identifies that the main flood risk to the application site is tidal and originates from the River Thames. The site is protected by the existing River Thames flood defences which also protect the other properties with the vicinity of the site.
106. The proposed development has been discussed with officers from the Environment Agency at both the pre-application and application stages. Following advice at the pre-application stage building B has been set back 8m from the river wall to the east and 4m from the river wall in the south east corner. This set back was required to enable potential works to be carried out to the landward side of the flood wall. During the course of the planning application the applicants have provided further details of the mechanism by which access to the river defences will be secured. The Environment Agency has confirmed that these details are acceptable subject to appropriately worded conditions.
107. A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been submitted addressing the level of flood risk and also the flood mitigation measures to be incorporated within the design of the proposed development. Although residential accommodation is proposed to be located at the ground floor level and above, the units at the ground floor level are all duplexes with the sleeping accommodation located at the first floor level and above. The FRA sets out the ground floor level within Block A area 2.18m AOD, which is below the breach scenario flood levels. However, the first floor level of these buildings are 5.68m AOD which is above the levels of the breach modelling scenarios set out in the Environment Agency Product 4.
108. The café use within Block B is considered to be a "less-vulnerable" use and will match the external ground floor levels directly outside of the commercial unit. Behind the café in the same block the upper ground floor level of the residential units would be at 5.71m. This is 450mm above the existing riverside and Café level and 300mm above the 2065 breach level.
109. The Environment Agency have been consulted and provided no objection to the proposed development. They are pleased to note that the sleeping accommodation will be located at the first floor level and above.
110. The proposals are considered to comply with policy 3.9 and 3.31 of the saved Southwark Plan and SP13 of the Core Strategy.

Impact on trees

111. Saved Policy 3.13 of the Southwark Plan requires a high quality streetscape and landscaping to be delivered. Policy 7.21 of London Plan states that existing trees of value should be retained and any loss as the result of the development should be replaced following the principle of the 'right place, right tree'. Wherever appropriate the planting of additional trees should be included in new developments particularly large-canopied species. None of the trees on or around the site are formally protected by tree preservation orders.

112. An arboricultural survey has been submitted with the planning application. This identifies 11 trees on or in the vicinity of the site that would need to be removed to accommodate the proposed development. A further 2 around the site will be retained and will need to be protected during construction. This results in a net loss of 1043 cm stem girth of B category trees. Although 6 trees are proposed as part of new landscaping which will help mitigate the adverse effects to amenity and screening, insufficient space is available for any additional planting on site. The mitigation will be secured the section 106 legal agreement. Additional conditions will also be attached requiring submission of detailed landscaping proposals and tree protection measures.

Planning obligations (S.106 undertaking or agreement)

113. Saved policy 2.5 'Planning obligations' of the Southwark Plan and policy 8.2 of the London Plan advise that planning obligations can be secured to overcome the negative impacts of a generally acceptable proposal. Core Strategy 14 and Saved Policy 2.5 of the Southwark Plan state that planning obligations will be sought to reduce or mitigate the impacts of the development. These local policies are reinforced by the council's section 106 planning obligations/community infrastructure Levy SPD

114. The following financial contributions will be secured in the legal agreement:

Archaeology contribution: £11,171
Contribution towards childrens play space (12+): £9060
Contribution for replacement tree planting: £32,593
Employment during construction: £100,950 , or provision in kind

Total: £ 153,774
Admin charge (2% of total) £ 3076

Overall Total: £ 156,850

115. In addition, the following non-financial contributions would be secured within the s106 agreement:

- Provision of 35 % Affordable Housing
- Employment in construction/completed development provisions including fall-back contribution if targets not met
- Marketing strategy for the wheelchair adaptable units
- Funding and Lifetime free car club membership for each unit
- Travel Plan
- Demolition and Construction Environmental Management Plans
- Delivery and Servicing Management Plan
- Compliance with Energy Strategy
- Public Realm improvements
- Provision of new public realm along the river frontage
- Tree Planting Strategy to secure provision of new trees in and around the new site.

116. In the event that the legal agreement has not been signed by 24 February 2017, it is recommended that the Director of Planning be authorised to refuse planning permission, if appropriate, for the following reason:

In the absence of a signed section 106 legal agreement there is no mechanism in place to secure adequate provision of affordable housing and mitigation against the adverse impacts of the development through contributions and it would therefore be

contrary to Saved Policy 2.5 Planning Obligations of the Southwark Plan 2007, Strategic Policy 14 Delivery and Implementation of the Core Strategy (2011) Policy 8.2 Planning Obligations of the London Plan (2016) and the Southwark section 106 Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure Levy SPD (2015).

Southwark CIL and Mayoral CIL

117. Section 143 of the Localism Act states that any financial contribution received as 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 a Mayoral CIL payment of £332, 645 and a Southwark CIL payment of £1, 614,700 are due.

Sustainable development implications

118. This section concerns the environmental role of planning in ensuring sustainable development. The NPPF defines this role as contribution to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy.
119. The London Plan policy 5.2 sets out that development proposals should make the fullest contribution to minimising carbon dioxide emissions in accordance with the energy hierarchy Be lean: use less energy; Be clean: supply energy efficiently; Be green: use renewable energy. This policy requires development to have a carbon dioxide improvement of 35% beyond Building Regulations Part L 2013 as specified in Mayor's Sustainable Design and Construction SPG.
120. Policy 5.3 states that developments should demonstrate that sustainable design standards are integral to the proposal, including its construction and operation, and ensure that they are considered at the beginning of the design process. LP5.7 Within the framework of the energy hierarchy major development proposals should provide a reduction in expected carbon dioxide emissions through the use of on-site renewable energy generation, where feasible.
121. Strategic Policy 13 of Core Strategy states that development will help us live and work in a way that respects the limits of the planet's natural resources, reduces pollution and damage to the environment and helps us adapt to climate change.
122. The applicants have submitted an energy statement and a sustainability statement for the proposed development which seek to demonstrate compliance with the above policy.

Energy

123. An energy statement has been submitted which provides an initial assessment of the energy demand and carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions from a baseline building and estimates the expected energy and CO₂ emissions savings associated with the proposed development. This sets out that the proposed development will have total regulated CO₂ emissions of 122.95 tonnes per annum prior to any efficiency measures and a 35% improvement beyond Buildings Regulations Part L 2013.

The 'be lean' (use less energy)

124. The measures proposed include:

- Enhanced insulation to walls, floors and roofs
- Low fabric u-values and air permeability rates. To reduce heat loss
- Low energy lighting and low water use fittings
- Communal space will have automatic lighting control with lamp efficacy of at least 30 lumens/watts.

125. These measures would reduce carbon dioxide emissions by 2.48% when compared to a scheme compliant with building regulations.

The 'be clean' measures (supply energy efficiently)

126. The applicant has carried out an investigation of the potential for connection to existing or planned district heating networks but has found that while there are proposals for the CWAAP core area there are no plans to extend this out towards this site. The applicants are proposing to design the development to allow for future connection to a district heating network should one become available in the future.

127. The 'be clean' measures include:

- The applicant intends to install a communal heat network within the site which will be connected to all apartments and retail space. This will incorporate possible connection for future neighboring developments.

128. The emission savings from the CHP have been calculated as 24.5% when compared to a scheme compliant with building regulations.

The 'be green' measures (use renewable energy)

129. The 'be green' measures include:

- Installation of photovoltaic panels with a 9kW peak on roof space which is not required for roof terraces or green/brown roof to deliver 11.9% savings against the base rate emissions.

130. This measure would reduce carbon dioxide emissions 11.9% when compared to a scheme compliant with building regulations.

131. The cumulative savings from the sustainability proposals set out in energy statement would deliver 35.1% against the base rate emissions for a development of this size. This is in compliance with requirements set out in policy 5.2 of the London Plan 2016.

Other matters

Air quality

132. The site is located within an Air Quality Management Area. An air quality assessment has been submitted. The mitigation measures as outlined in this plan should be ensured by way of condition.

133. It is also recommended that a Construction Management Plan be requested by way of condition, in order to ensure that any construction impacts are minimised.

Land contamination/groundwater assessment

134. A desk study was submitted which indicated the presence of contamination at this site. The full extent of contamination has not been established and so it is recommended that conditions be applied which would ensure that the risks from land contamination to the future users are minimised and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers and neighbours.

Archaeology

135. The Museum of London Archaeology desk based assessment states that the geotechnical investigation and subsurface deposit model indicates that any prehistoric remains, if present, will be deeply buried, and consequently would be affected by the impact of piling; this could be mitigated by archaeological investigation and controls on foundation design to ensure minimum impact upon potential existing archaeological remains. The reports show that the impact into the archaeological resource has been quantified and that archaeological mitigation is required, but this can be managed through the planning process by conditions on any grant of consent. The site has the potential to contain a range of landward structures most probably of post-medieval date, relating to the original river wall, revetments, jetties, barges and the other various industrial buildings and activities that have taken place here. The assessment report recommends a programme of archaeological investigation, which will add further information on the foundation design and the impact of the proposal on the buried archaeological resource; archaeological evaluation would be the first step in this process.

Ecology

136. The applicants have submitted an ecological assessment with the application. This document assesses the ecological interest of the site and any potential impacts resulting from the development are assessed. This has been reviewed by the council's ecology officer and the mitigation measures including the provision of 3 bat tubes and 4 nest bricks will be secured by condition.

Conclusion on planning issues

137. The proposed redevelopment of this brownfield site would remove a nightclub which has historically caused a nuisance to residents, and create a new section of river walk animated by a cafe. It would provide much needed housing, including a policy-compliant number and mix of affordable housing. The design is of a very high quality, both in terms of its architecture and the accommodation it provides, and the high density has not resulted in unreasonable compromises in the housing accommodation or the relationship with the context. The height of the building, although defined as a 'tall building', sits comfortably within this river front context and the quality of the design and public realm meets the expectation of saved Southwark Plan policy 3.20 on tall buildings. The impacts on the neighbours' amenity – sunlight, daylight and privacy – have been assessed and, while the impacts are recognised, they are not so harmful as to warrant refusal of an otherwise acceptable scheme. While the level of parking provision is relatively low, the analysis of the surrounding streets indicates that any overspill parking should not cause undue parking stress on-street.
138. The existing crane is in a poor state of repair and, although a large number of objectors clearly see the crane as a local landmark, it is a relatively recent construction. Historic England is assessing an application to formally List the crane, but the evidence examined by the council's archaeologist suggests that the structure

would not meet the criteria for Listing. However, in the event that Historic England took a decision to List the crane, then the weight to be attached to its retention would be increased significantly. Therefore it is recommended that the Committee resolves to grant planning permission, but the decision not be issued until a decision is made by Historic England. In the event that the crane was Listed, officers would refer this application back to this Committee in order that it could reconsider the proposal in light of this additional information.

Community impact statement

139. 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.

Consultations

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

Consultation replies

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

Summary of consultation responses

142. Representations from the occupiers of 100 properties have been received objecting to the proposals. Many objections cite support for the principle of redeveloping the site, but raise concerns regarding the specific nature of the proposals.

143. Objections:

Principle/land uses

- Loss of playspace which is an important community asset. The only other freely accessible space for football is almost 1 mile away
- Division between private and affordable housing would fail to create cohesive community
- Loss of crane as a local landmark and last reference to areas industrial heritage
- The river walk path will not be complete as it will only open up width of building while the path is closed when the farm is closed
- Loss of youth club will result in increase in loitering youths
- Lack of infrastructure to provide.

Design

- The scale of development is too great
- Density is above council maximum density levels and that specified within the SPD
- Detrimental impact on the river frontage
- Out of character with the surrounding streets
- Inadequate/inappropriate landscaping and means of enclosure
- Loss of trees

- Segregation between residents
- The position of the two blocks situated in a less interesting layout in contrast to the original proposals shown at consultation stage
- The height of blocks too great in relation to neighbouring properties
- “Pocket Park” too small.

Amenity

- Proposal is not in the best interests and safety of local residents
- Detrimental impact on local infrastructure (schools, GPs, transport).

Gabriel House

- Loss of right to light
- Loss of daylight and sunlight
- Loss of view of river
- Overspill parking into parking area
- Overbearing visual impact.

Caledonian Wharf

- Loss of privacy from overlooking and opening up of riverside path
- Loss of daylight
- Loss of sunlight
- Overshadowing
- Detrimental visual impact
- Negative impact on infrastructure in terms of broadband speeds, water pressure, drainage
- Detrimental impact on fire safety
- Loss in value
- Loss of view
- Loss of exclusivity of riverside path
- Potential structural damage to buildings
- Loss of privacy to swimming pool
- Loss of communal amenity space with sunlight.

Custom House Reach

- Loss of light
- Loss of views
- Loss of privacy
- Impact on water front terrace
- No consideration for the integration of the Custom House Reach communal garden
- Loss of access to river affecting mooring rights of residents
- Loss of existing parking for Custom House Reach.

Wyatt Close

- Loss of daylight
- Loss of privacy
- Overshadowing of access route
- Loss of satellite signal.

Vaughan Street

- Loss of satellite signal.

Transport

- Increased traffic congestion and increased demand for parking
- The proposed development would adversely affect highway/pedestrian safety
- Increase in on-street parking will restrict or block emergency vehicle access in the surrounding area
- Noise and disruption from construction traffic
- Scale of development should be reduced so that there is parking for each unit
Other recent developments have proposed much higher parking to unit ratios (11/AP/2242, 14/AP3387). The development does not meet criteria for reduced parking
- Existing public transport is operating at capacity levels. The proposed development will exacerbate existing problems particularly at Canada Water.

Affordable housing

- Insufficient clarity with regard to affordable housing offer
- Failure to provide sufficient affordable housing.

Sustainability

- Detrimental impact on the river wall defences.

Other

- Loss of footfall to Ship and Whale Pub
- Loss of community cohesion
- Detrimental impact on the viability of Surrey Docks Farm due to café competition
- No demand for another café when there are two others in the vicinity
- Increased risk of crime at New Caledonian Wharf
- Detrimental impact on Barnard House Sheltered Housing on Vaughan Street where there will be no access for emergency vehicles
- Increased demand for already stretched local services (GP Surgery, Water Pressure, broadband speeds)
- Construction will impact on tourism
- Plans submitted are not to scale
- Costs to local residents due to need to provide security gate to stop parking in the spaces available to Gabriel House
- Proposal will result in empty homes as a result of foreign investors
- Loss in value of flats at New Caledonian Wharf
- Developer's Consultation Exercise was not accurate and skewed towards positive answers. Developers have not responded to or addressed the concerns of local residents;
- Inappropriate re-assignment of public land for private gain
- Potential unexploded ordinances on site. Can developer provide written assurance of that there is adequate insurance cover and details of providers.

Letters of support

144.A letter of support has been received from Surrey Docks Farm. While they note the local concerns represented they recognise the benefits that can arise as a

consequence of the development. In particular the proposal can make a significant CIL contribution. CIL funding can be used for projects identified on the Community Infrastructure Projects List for the Bermondsey and Rotherhithe Area. The provision of new community facilities on Surrey Docks Farm is a local project on this list.

145. They also recognise the benefit of opening up the Thames Path as this will complement the section which exists in front of the Farm. The proposed development with the café will complement their own development proposals and will help raise the profile of this section of the river frontage.

146.1 letter of support has been received from residents of the local area. They support the proposals on the following grounds:

- Welcome the redevelopment of gap site.

Comments received from statutory consultees

Archaeology

147. The applicants have submitted a desk based assessment (DBA) with this application by MOLA, dated June 2016. There is agreement that the recommendations of the MoLA report that an archaeological watching brief is required during preliminary ground preparation and subsequent ground reduction to ensure that any post-medieval remains are not removed without record. There is also a requirement for archaeological building recording (Level 2) of the derelict mid 20th century wharf crane prior to its removal. Conditions are requested in relation to Archaeological Watching Brief, Archaeological Building Recording and Archaeological Reporting.

Ecology officer

148. This application has been reviewed with regard to ecology. The ecology survey and bat survey report is fine. The report makes recommendations for ecological enhancement. Conditions are recommended to secure these.

Environment Agency

149. No objection to the planning application as submitted, subject to the attached conditions (see section 1) being imposed on any planning permission granted. Without these conditions, the proposed development on this site poses an unacceptable risk to the environment and we would wish to object to the planning application.

Environmental protection officer

150. No objections subject to conditions to ensure appropriate internal insulation for proposed residential units, protection from vertical sound transmission between commercial and residential properties, restrictions on plant noise, details of kitchen extraction ventilation for commercial kitchen, suitable investigation of site contamination with remediation where necessary, construction management and hours of site works.

Flood and drainage team

151. Regarding surface water drainage, we expect developers to limit flow to the equivalent greenfield runoff rates in line with the London Plan (2015).

152. We also request the FRA and Drainage Strategy are updated with details of who will be responsible for the management and maintenance of the SuDS.

153. We note that evidence is not provided on third party agreement of surface water discharge to the sewer system. We do not need to see this, but the applicant should ensure that it is obtained.

154. Please also refer to any comments received from the Environment Agency at full application stage. There is EA correspondence included in the FRA and therefore we believe we understand their views on this application.

GLA

Principle of development

155. The youth club facilities have been re-provided, and, on the basis that this site is now surplus to local social infrastructure requirements, the proposed high density residential-led redevelopment of this underused Opportunity Area site is strongly supported in accordance with London Plan policies 2.13, 3.3 and 3.16.

156. The youth club facilities have been re-provided, and, on the basis that this site is now surplus to local social infrastructure requirements, the proposed high density residential-led redevelopment of this underused opportunity area site is strongly supported in accordance with London Plan policies 2.13, 3.3 and 3.16.

Housing

157. The proposed high quality, high density housing provision is broadly supported in line with London Plan Policy 3.3. Nevertheless, the proposed provision of affordable housing (32% by habitable room) requires rigorous independent review in line with London Plan Policy 3.12.

Urban design

158. The proposed design of this prominent riverside development is supported in line with London Plan policies 3.5, 3.7, 7.4, 7.6 and 7.27.

Inclusive access

159. The proposed approach to access and inclusion is supported in accordance with London Plan Policy 7.2.

Sustainable development

160. Following clarifications on the energy strategy the Council will secure the associated energy and climate change adaptation measures by way of planning condition in accordance with London Plan policies 5.2, 5.10 and 5.13.

Transport

161. Whilst the scheme is generally acceptable in strategic transport terms issues in respect to: access; cycle parking; trip generation and impact on public transport network; deliveries, servicing and construction and travel planning should be addressed in line with London Plan policies 6.3, 6.9, 6.10, 6.13 and 6.14.

Highways

162. No objections to the proposed development. Section 278 agreement will be required to cover the works to Thames River Path, Odessa Street footway, drainage system,

trees on highway and street lighting. Approval in principle is required in order for LBS to ascertain its structure integrity. Swept path drawings and details of bin holding area have been provided following request.

Historic England

163. Thank you for your letter of 4 October 2016 notifying Historic England of the application for planning permission relating to the above site. On the basis of the information provided, we do not consider that it is necessary for this application to be notified to Historic England under the relevant statutory provisions, details of which are enclosed.

164. We are aware that the crane associated with this application is currently being considered for listing. If the crane is listed, a listed building consent application should be made to remove the crane, which consultation to Historic England may be required.

Local economy team

165. The principle of developing the site was initially established when it was designated as a proposal site in the Canada Water Area Action Plan (CWAAP). The site is allocated for residential development in the adopted (CWAAP).

166. The youth club and recreational facilities formerly provided on the Site have been relocated to the nearby Docklands Settlement Community Centre, at 400 Salter Road.

167. LET support this application.

168. The transport assessment, and design and access assessment show no particular concerns around access, visibility, or disturbance.

169. Section 106 clause in relation to employment during construction is required.

London Fire Brigade

170. No objections or comments to raise at this juncture.

Metropolitan Police

171. To assist the developer in achieving Secured by Design accreditation, it is recommended that a 'Secured by Design' condition be attached to any permission that may be granted in connection with this application and that the wording is such that the development will follow the principles and physical security requirements of Secured by Design.

Port of London Authority

172. No objections in principle but would like to see consideration given to the use of the River Bus as an alternative form of sustainable transport. Information is required to be provided by way of condition in relation to 1) provision of targets for river bus use (which reflects the targets set out within the River Action Plan), measures to encourage river bus use, Timetable for River Bus stop.

173. It is also noted that the use of waterborne transport for bulk removal of materials has not been acknowledged, despite the site's river side location. This would have the potential to displace significant number of HGV movements from the local highway. The London Plan specifically promotes the use of the waterways for transport of

freight and general goods and therefore it is considered prudent that the LPA are satisfied that serious consideration has been given to this method of transport.

174. The Thames River Walk passes close to the site. It is pleasing to note that the proposed regeneration will enable the provision of the final missing sections of the Thames Walkway on the Southwark waterfront. The PLA support the development's aim in creating a 'destination' along this section of the Thames Riverside, and accords with the aims and objectives of the PLAs Thames Vision which seeks to promote the use of the river, and revitalising the River as a leisure focal point is encouraging.

175. It is noted on page 13 of the Design and Access Statement that the proposal includes for a crane sculpture, which would overhang the Thames. Further information is encouraged with regard to this sculpture, particularly on how far the crane would overhang the Thames, and whether consideration as to what impact this may have on the River regime, particularly from a navigational point of view? The applicant would need to apply for a River Works Licence from the PLA before such a structure is erected. Certainly matters relating to navigational safety on the River would be considered at this stage, but it would be worth exploring this during the planning process. As a minimum, an informative should be imposed advising the Applicant make contact with the PLA in terms of the required River Works Licence.

Tower Hamlets

176. No comment on the proposals

Urban Forester

177. In contrast to the design previously submitted at pre-app which sought to retain the majority of mature trees on site, the proposed development now results in the removal of all but one or two of the 13 existing trees:

- 4 x Category C Poplar, Willow and Acacia
- 7 x Category B Poplar and Willow.

178. These have been noted as being visually significant.

179. Based on the outline landscape plans this results in a net loss of 1043 cm stem girth of B category trees. Although 6 trees are proposed as part of new landscaping which will help mitigate the adverse effects to amenity and screening, insufficient space is available for any additional planting on site.

180. In order to adhere to London Plan policy requiring no net loss of canopy cover, the shortfall should be provided for planting within the vicinity of the development via a section 106 agreement. Based on a cost of £500 per 16cm girth tree planted in soft, this equates to a payment of £32,593. Suitable locations can be found in neighbouring open space and Southwark highways and housing estate land.

181. Confirmation is needed that tree T13 is to be retained as this is unclear.

182. Cross sections should be amended to provide suitable soil volumes in hard surfaced area using cellular systems (e.g. Silvacell/Stratacell).

183. Further details of landscaping and tree protection measures should be provided via condition in order to ensure the quality of design shown in the outline landscape plans. Please see recommended wording included.

Human rights implications

184. 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.

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

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Site history file: TP/291-C Application file: 16/AP/2681 Southwark Local Development Framework and Development Plan Documents	Chief Executive's Department 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH	Planning enquiries telephone: 020 7525 5403 Planning enquiries email: planning.enquiries@southwark.gov.uk Case officer telephone: 020 7525 3920 Council website: www.southwark.gov.uk

APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	Consultation undertaken
Appendix 2	Consultation responses received
Appendix 3	Recommendation

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Simon Bevan, Director of Planning	
Report Author	Robin Sedgwick, Senior Planning Officer	
Version	Final	
Dated	26 October 2016	
Key Decision	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments sought	Comments included
Strategic Director, finance and corporate services	No	No
Strategic director, environment and leisure	No	No
Strategic director, housing and community services	No	No
Director of Regeneration	No	No

APPENDIX 1

Consultation undertaken

Site notice date: 15/07/2016

Press notice date: 21/07/2016

Case officer site visit date: n/a

Neighbour consultation letters sent: 14/07/2016

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:

British Waterways
Cllr Bill Williams
Cllr Kath Whittham
Cllr S Cryan
EDF Energy
Environment Agency
Greater London Authority
Historic England
London Borough of Lewisham
London Borough of Tower Hamlets
London Fire & Emergency Planning Authority
Metropolitan Police Service (Designing out Crime)
Natural England - London Region & South East Region
Port of London Authority
Thames Water - Development Planning
Transport for London (referable & non-referable app notifications and pre-apps)
Twentieth Century Society

Neighbour and local groups consulted:

Flat 102 New Caledonian Wharf SE16 7TW
Flat 101 New Caledonian Wharf SE16 7TW
Flat 100 New Caledonian Wharf SE16 7TW
Flat 103 New Caledonian Wharf SE16 7TW
Flat 2 Gabriel House SE16 7HQ
Flat 1 Gabriel House SE16 7HQ
Flat 104 New Caledonian Wharf SE16 7TW
Flat 99 New Caledonian Wharf SE16 7TW
Flat 94 New Caledonian Wharf SE16 7TW

8 Wyatt Close London SE16 5UL
14 Vaughan Street London SE16 5UW
12 Vaughan Street London SE16 5UW
7 Spence Close London SE16 5UH
16 Vaughan Street London SE16 5UW
22 Vaughan Street London SE16 5UW
20 Vaughan Street London SE16 5UW
18 Vaughan Street London SE16 5UW
6 Spence Close London SE16 5UH

Flat 28 Gabriel House SE16 7HQ	Flat 21 New Caledonian Wharf SE16 7TN
Flat 27 Gabriel House SE16 7HQ	Flat 20 New Caledonian Wharf SE16 7TN
Flat 26 Gabriel House SE16 7HQ	Flat 19 New Caledonian Wharf SE16 7TN
Flat 29 Gabriel House SE16 7HQ	5 New Caledonian Wharf Odessa Street SE16 7TN
Flat 32 Gabriel House SE16 7HQ	Office New Caledonian Wharf 6 Odessa Street SE16 7TW
Flat 31 Gabriel House SE16 7HQ	16 Viewfield Road SW18 1NA
Flat 30 Gabriel House SE16 7HQ	27 New Caledonian Wharf 6 Odessa Street SE16 7TN
Flat 25 Gabriel House SE16 7HQ	Flat 8, 1 Rainbow Quay London Se16 7uf
Flat 20 Gabriel House SE16 7HQ	6 Odessa Street Flat 13, New Caledonian Wharf SE16 7TN
Flat 19 Gabriel House SE16 7HQ	84 New Caledonian Wharf London SE16 7TW
Flat 18 Gabriel House SE16 7HQ	59 Elgar Street Rotherhithe SE16 7QR
Flat 21 Gabriel House SE16 7HQ	59 Elgar Street Rotherhithe SE16 7QR
Flat 24 Gabriel House SE16 7HQ	Flat 94 New Caledonian Wharf 6 Odessa St SE16 7TW
Flat 23 Gabriel House SE16 7HQ	Flat 103, New Caledonian Wharf London SE16 7TW
Flat 22 Gabriel House SE16 7HQ	Flat 12 Custom House Reach 5 Odessa Street SE16 7LX
Flat 43 Gabriel House SE16 7HQ	18 Custom House Reach Odessa Street SE16 7LX
Flat 42 Gabriel House SE16 7HQ	18 Custom House Reach Odessa St se167lx
Flat 41 Gabriel House SE16 7HQ	Flat 77, New Caledonian Wharf 6 Odessa Street SE16 7TW
Flat 44 Gabriel House SE16 7HQ	57 New Caledonian Wharf 6 Odessa St SE16 7TW
Flat 106 New Caledonian Wharf SE16 7TW	337 Rotherhithe Street London SE16 5LJ
Flat 46 Gabriel House SE16 7HQ	111 New Caledonian Wharf London SE16 7TW
Flat 45 Gabriel House SE16 7HQ	24 Vaughan Street Rotherhithe Se16 5UW
Flat 40 Gabriel House SE16 7HQ	327 Rotherhithe Street London SE16 5LT
Flat 35 Gabriel House SE16 7HQ	Flat 27 Gabriel House 10 Odessa Street SE16 7HQ
Flat 34 Gabriel House SE16 7HQ	49 New Caledonian Wharf 6 Odessa Street SE16 7TN
Flat 33 Gabriel House SE16 7HQ	46 New Caledonian Wharf 6 Odessa Street SE16 7TN
Flat 36 Gabriel House SE16 7HQ	Flat 91 New Caledonian Wharf London Se16 7TW
Flat 39 Gabriel House SE16 7HQ	8 New Caledonian Wharf Odessa Street SE16 7TN
Flat 38 Gabriel House SE16 7HQ	12 Custom House Reach London SE16 7LX
Flat 37 Gabriel House SE16 7HQ	62 New Caledonian Wharf 6 Odessa Street SE16 7TW
19 Wyatt Close London SE16 5UL	18 Howland Way London SE16 6HN
18 Wyatt Close London SE16 5UL	18 Howland Way London SE16 6HN
17 Wyatt Close London SE16 5UL	43 Neckinger London SE16 3QL
20 Wyatt Close London SE16 5UL	49 Queen Of Denmark Court London SE16 7TB
351a Rotherhithe Street London SE16 5LJ	South Dock Lock Office Rope St Se167sz
22 Wyatt Close London SE16 5UL	Mv Elisabeth South Dock Marina Lock Office Rope Street SE16 7SZ
21 Wyatt Close London SE16 5UL	59 Barfleur Lane London SE8 3DD
16 Wyatt Close London SE16 5UL	Rotherhithe St Rotherhithe
11 Wyatt Close London SE16 5UL	Flat 11, Building 100, Alaska Buildings 61 Grange Road SE1 3BA
10 Wyatt Close London SE16 5UL	1b Holyoake Court London se16 5hj
9 Wyatt Close London SE16 5UL	24 Shipwright Road London SE16 6QB
12 Wyatt Close London SE16 5UL	20 Keel Close London SE16 6BX
15 Wyatt Close London SE16 5UL	130 Adams Gardens Estate St. Marychurch Street SE16 4JH
14 Wyatt Close London SE16 5UL	71 Greenland Quay London SE16 7RR
13 Wyatt Close London SE16 5UL	Appartment 7 Hood Point 307a Rotherhithe Street SE16 5HA
3 Custom House Reach Odessa Street SE16 7LX	No Address X
23 Custom House Reach Odessa Street SE16 7LX	South Dock Marina London SE167SZ
21 Custom House Reach Odessa Street SE16 7LX	50 New Caledonian Wharf London Se16 7TW
4 Custom House Reach Odessa Street SE16 7LX	Email
8 Custom House Reach Odessa Street SE16 7LX	5 Sovereign Crescent London se16 5xh
6 Custom House Reach Odessa Street SE16 7LX	374 Rotherhithe Street London SE16 5EF
5 Custom House Reach Odessa Street SE16 7LX	Blenheim Court King & Queen Wharf SE16 5ST
20 Custom House Reach Odessa Street SE16 7LX	3 Hurley Crescent London SE16 6AL
11 Custom House Reach Odessa Street SE16 7LX	9 Blythwood Road London N4 4EU
10 Custom House Reach Odessa Street SE16 7LX	Surrey Docks Farm South Wharf SE16 5ET
1 Custom House Reach Odessa Street SE16 7LX	Flat 6 Gabriel House 10 Odessa Street SE167HQ
12 Custom House Reach Odessa Street SE16 7LX	Flat 20 Walker House Odessa Street SE16 7HD
2 Custom House Reach Odessa Street SE16 7LX	Flat 5, Walker House 11 Odessa Street SE16 7HD
17 Custom House Reach Odessa Street SE16 7LX	24 Vaughan Street, Rotherhithe London SE16 5UW
16 Custom House Reach Odessa Street SE16 7LX	5 Bray Crescent Rotherhithe SE16 6AN

Re-consultation: n/a

APPENDIX 2

Consultation responses received

Internal services

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

Statutory and non-statutory organisations

Greater London Authority
Historic England
London Fire & Emergency Planning Authority
Natural England - London Region & South East Region
Port of London Authority
Thames Water - Development Planning
Transport for London (referable & non-referable app notifications and pre-apps)

Neighbours and local groups

Appartment 7 Hood Point 307a Rotherhithe Street SE16 5HA
Blenheim Court King & Queen Wharf SE16 5ST
Email representation
Flat 10 New Caledonian Wharf SE16 7TN
Flat 103, New Caledonian Wharf London SE16 7TW
Flat 103 New Caledonian Wharf SE16 7TW
Flat 106 New Caledonian Wharf SE16 7TW
Flat 11, Building 100, Alaska Buildings 61 Grange Road SE1 3BA
Flat 110 New Caledonian Wharf SE16 7TW
Flat 111 New Caledonian Wharf SE16 7TW
Flat 12 Custom House Reach 5 Odessa Street SE16 7LX
Flat 17 Custom House SE16 7LQ
Flat 17 New Caledonian Wharf SE16 7TN
Flat 19 Gabriel House SE16 7HQ
Flat 19 New Caledonian Wharf SE16 7TN
Flat 19 New Caledonian Wharf SE16 7TN
Flat 20 Walker House Odessa Street SE16 7HD
Flat 27 Gabriel House SE16 7HQ
Flat 27 Gabriel House 10 Odessa Street SE16 7HQ
Flat 31 Gabriel House SE16 7HQ
Flat 33 Gabriel House SE16 7HQ
Flat 34 Gabriel House SE16 7HQ
Flat 39 Gabriel House SE16 7HQ
Flat 42 New Caledonian Wharf SE16 7TN
Flat 43 Gabriel House SE16 7HQ
Flat 43 New Caledonian Wharf SE16 7TN
Flat 46 New Caledonian Wharf SE16 7TN
Flat 49 New Caledonian Wharf SE16 7TN
Flat 49 New Caledonian Wharf SE16 7TN
Flat 5, Walker House 11 Odessa Street SE16 7HD
Flat 50 New Caledonian Wharf SE16 7TN
Flat 53 New Caledonian Wharf SE16 7TN

Flat 54 New Caledonian Wharf SE16 7TN
Flat 6 Gabriel House 10 Odessa Street SE16 7HQ
Flat 77 New Caledonian Wharf SE16 7TW
Flat 77, New Caledonian Wharf 6 Odessa Street SE16 7TW
Flat 8 New Caledonian Wharf SE16 7TN
Flat 8, 1 Rainbow Quay London Se16 7uf
Flat 84 New Caledonian Wharf SE16 7TW
Flat 89 New Caledonian Wharf SE16 7TW
Flat 9 New Caledonian Wharf SE16 7TN
Flat 90 New Caledonian Wharf SE16 7TW
Flat 91 New Caledonian Wharf London Se16 7TW
Flat 94 New Caledonian Wharf SE16 7TW
Flat 94 New Caledonian Wharf 6 Odessa St SE16 7TW
Flat 95 New Caledonian Wharf SE16 7TW
Flat 96 New Caledonian Wharf SE16 7TW
Mv Elisabeth South Dock Marina Lock Office Rope Street SE16 7SZ
No Address X
Office New Caledonian Wharf 6 Odessa Street SE16 7TW
Rotherhithe St Rotherhithe
South Dock Lock Office Rope St Se16 7sz
South Dock Marina London SE16 7SZ
Surrey Docks Farm South Wharf SE16 5ET
1b Holyoake Court London se16 5hj
11 Wyatt Close London SE16 5UL
111 New Caledonian Wharf London SE16 7TW
12 Custom House Reach London SE16 7LX
12 Custom House Reach Odessa Street SE16 7LX
130 Adams Gardens Estate St. Marychurch Street SE16 4JH
15 Wyatt Close London SE16 5UL
16 Viewfield Road SW18 1NA
17 Custom House Reach Odessa Street SE16 7LX
17 Custom House Reach Odessa Street SE16 7LX
17 Wyatt Close London SE16 5UL
18 Custom House Reach Odessa St se16 7lx
18 Custom House Reach Odessa Street SE16 7LX
18 Custom House Reach Odessa Street SE16 7LX
18 Custom House Reach Odessa Street SE16 7LX
18 Howland Way London SE16 6HN
18 Howland Way London SE16 6HN
20 Keel Close London SE16 6BX
24 Shipwright Road London SE16 6QB
24 Vaughan Street London SE16 5UW
24 Vaughan Street, Rotherhithe London SE16 5UW
24 Vaughan Street Rotherhithe Se16 5UW
27 New Caledonian Wharf 6 Odessa Street SE16 7TN
28 Vaughan Street London SE16 5UW
3 Hurley Crescent London SE16 6AL
327 Rotherhithe Street London SE16 5LT
337 Rotherhithe Street London SE16 5LJ
34 Vaughan Street London SE16 5UW
374 Rotherhithe Street London SE16 5EF
374 Rotherhithe Street London SE16 5EF
43 Neckinger London SE16 3QL
46 New Caledonian Wharf 6 Odessa Street SE16 7TN
49 New Caledonian Wharf 6 Odessa Street SE16 7TN
49 Queen Of Denmark Court London SE16 7TB
5 Bray Crescent Rotherhithe SE16 6AN

5 New Caledonian Wharf Odessa Street SE16 7TN
5 Sovereign Crescent London se16 5xh
50 New Caledonian Wharf London Se16 7TW
57 New Caledonian Wharf 6 Odessa St SE16 7TW
59 Barfleur Lane London SE8 3DD
59 Elgar Street Rotherhithe SE16 7QR
59 Elgar Street Rotherhithe SE16 7QR
6 Custom House Reach Odessa Street SE16 7LX
6 Odessa Street Flat 13, New Caledonian Wharf SE16 7TN
62 New Caledonian Wharf 6 Odessa Street SE16 7TW
71 Greenland Quay London SE16 7RR
8 Custom House Reach Odessa Street SE16 7LX
8 New Caledonian Wharf Odessa Street SE16 7TN
84 New Caledonian Wharf London SE16 7TW
9 Blythwood Road London N4 4EU
9 Custom House Reach Odessa Street SE16 7LX