

Item No: 9.	Classification: Open	Date: 8 November 2016	Meeting Name: Planning Committee
Report title:		Addendum Late observations, consultation responses, and further information.	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		Peckham, Surrey Docks and The Lane	
From:		Director of Planning	

PURPOSE

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

RECOMMENDATION

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

FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION

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

Item 9.1 – Application 16/AP/3075 for: Council’s Own Development – Reg 3 – 91-93 Peckham High Street and Peckham Square, London SE15 5RS

ADDITIONAL NEIGHBOUR CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Statutory Consultee Response

- 3.1 Southwark Conservation Area Advisory Group (CAAG) consultation response is summarised as follows:
 - The arch is recognised as an iconic image for the area and is an important part of the character of today’s Peckham and a symbol of change that has benefitted the area. The loss of the arch and the views through it, and framed by it (particularly when approaching it along the old canal), would be very regrettable, particularly for the very modest benefit of the amount of additional building proposed. A better and more cohesive square could be an advantage but the brief (presumably) and the plans submitted did not go far in achieving this in return for the destruction of the arch and the loss of views and a distinctive covered public space. The panel felt that if it is to go, contrary to their wishes, it should be for a worthy and significant scheme of quality.
 - The proposed two new blocks and changes to the square did little to help create a notable high quality civic space and the new shop fronts as shown were not appropriate to the period terrace.

- The architecture was thought to be not contextual, lacking modelling, rather banal and ordinary and not worthy of this prominent and important location and would not sit comfortably beside the architecture of the adjoining Victorian pub building and would form an unfortunate termination of the vista northwards up Rye Lane.
- Inappropriate location for housing.
- They suggested that what is needed here is something special and a rethinking of the brief and the scheme to achieve this. If the arch is to go despite the group's recommendations, then an appropriate alternative use, and site for it, should be identified.

3.2 The Council's Flood and Drainage team have reviewed the Flood Risk Assessment submitted. They have recommended a condition stating that the development is to be carried out in accordance with the Flood Risk Assessment.

Officer Comment

3.3 A condition will be attached in accordance with the recommendation.

Additional Neighbour Representations

3.4 10 further representations have been received since the report. 9 of these further emphasised the following concerns:

- Demolition of a key feature of the regeneration of Peckham should be resisted
- Loss of public space and areas for markets, public meetings and events is counter productive
- The proposal is a poor architectural response for such a prominent civic space
- The proposal lacks the distinctive detailing of neighbouring developments and does not enhance the character of the Conservation Area
- The proposed development of site 2 results in a building which disrupts the building line of Peckham High Street and will block views of the Higgin Jones building to south and Surrey Canal Walk to the north
- The proposed development fails to resolve conflict between cyclists and pedestrians at the entrance to the square
- The proposed development in conjunction with the Mountview redevelopment would result in the square becoming a wide boulevard as opposed to a square
- The current development should have been considered at the same time as the Mountview Development
- The proposal should have included improvements to public realm along Peckham High Street
- The site is inappropriate for new housing in the noisiest part of the town centre
- The proposed development should be re-designed retaining a sensitive redevelopment of site 1 and removing the proposed development at site 2 with wider improvements for the public realm.

3.5 One was in support of the proposal and emphasised the following points:

- The site is in a prime area of Peckham and is currently under used
- The removal of the arch will open up views of the clock tower to the south.

AMENDMENTS TO OFFICER REPORT –

- 3.6 A further query was received from a member of the public in relation to the information submitted in relation to Financial Viability. This included a specific query in relation to paragraph 60 of the report which states that: *clarification within the document which confirms that the deficit shown is as a result of the primary objective for the residential being the delivery of affordable homes rather than capital receipt.*
- 3.7 The notes on the Financial Viability Assessment Executive summary were not attached to the document that was published on the Council's website. For clarity these are attached to this addendum below:

Please note:

1. The Build costs used within the Valuation are based on Rex Procter and Partners Budget Estimate Nr1 dated 22/06/16. The Base cost of £9,856,269 equates to a cost per square metre of £3,498, this is a high figure compared with BCIS and other costed development schemes within the Borough. In addition to this high figure (£3,498 psm) a further 20% has been added to account for the other non construction related costs and fees bringing the total cost to £11,827,500 (£4,917). The Valuation has been undertaken using these provided costs.
 2. Adding the additional 20% to an already high figure in the opinion of the Valuer is sufficient to cover all the usual fees associated with delivering a development scheme. Additional accounting for Disposal fees for the residential and commercial space is deemed unnecessary and would only serve to further inflate cost and so increase the deficit in the Residual Land Value.
 3. In normal commercial circumstances a positive Residual Land Value would be produced by a Development Scheme. This scheme at the Council's behest is to primarily provide Affordable Housing which is the reason for the gap between Residual Value and the Benchmark.
- 3.8 *It is assumed that Housing Zone funding has been identified to address or partially address the deficit in the Residual Land Value of -£7,676,385 in order to deliver the subject development which provides 53.5% Affordable Housing. It is understood that the delivery of Affordable Housing rather than capital receipt is the primary objective of this scheme.

APPLICATION FOR ARCH TO BE LISTED AS AN ASSET OF COMMUNITY VALUE

- 3.9 Members are informed that an application has been submitted for consideration of Peckham Arch and the associated public amenity land to be recognised as an 'Asset of Community Value' under the provisions of the Localism Act 2011.

COMMENTS FROM THE DIRECTOR OF PLANNING

- 3.10 The recommendation remains that planning permission be granted with conditions and subject to completion of a s106 agreement.

Item 9.2 – Application 16/AP/2681 for: Full Planning Permission – Former Odessa Street Youth Club, Commercial Pier Wharf, Odessa Street, London SE16

AMENDMENTS TO OFFICER REPORT

- 3.11 Members should note the following minor corrections and/or points of clarification arising from the report.

<u>Paragraph</u>	<u>Amendment</u>
9	First sentence should be amended to state that Block A contains 13 social rent and 6 shared ownership units.
10	First sentence should be amended to state that Block B would contain 53 private and 2 shared ownership residential units.
39	A revised accommodation schedule has been submitted which states that the proposed development provides a total of 263 habitable rooms. This change arises from a corrected method of calculation of larger habitable rooms. The affordable housing requirement for this would be 92 habitable rooms. The applicants are providing 94 affordable habitable rooms, which equates to 35.7%.
51	This paragraph states that neighbouring buildings to the south range in height from 9 to 11 storeys. Members should note that due to the increases in ground level towards the river frontage these buildings appear as 8-10 storeys in height when viewed from the river while the proposed building would stand 11 storeys when viewed from the river frontage.
85	The minimum floor area for a 2 bed 4 person unit is 70sqm.
92	The proposed child yield is 33. The applicants are proposing to provide 90sqm of under-5 play space on site. There would be a shortfall of 240sqm which requires mitigation in the form of financial contribution of £36,240
92.	Replace the first 4 sentences with: The proposed development has a child yield of 33 children and child play space requirement of 330sqm. 130sqm is required for under 5s, 120sqm for 5-11s and 80sqm for 12+. The communal gardens provide 90sqm of dedicated play space for under 5s. A financial contribution has been agreed with regard to the shortfall in the provision of play space
108	The upper ground floor level of the residential units on the ground floor behind the commercial unit would be 5.92m not 5.71m stated.
114	Contribution towards childrens play space should be £36 240.

Additional representation

- 3.12 An email representation has been received from a resident of Custom House Reach, stating that the development will restrict or remove rights associated with the access to a slipway, mooring and terrace along the river frontage. The applicant has stated that access to the slipway will not be affected.

CONCLUSION OF THE DIRECTOR OF PLANNING

- 3.13 Having taken into account the additional information, the recommendation remains that planning permission be granted subject to Historic England deciding not to List the crane structure, subject to completion of a s106 agreement.

Item 9.3 – Application 16/AP/3503 for: Full Planning Permission – Car Park Site, Copeland Road, London SE15 3SL

- 3.14 Correction to paragraph 44 - the number of habitable rooms proposed is 214 and not 216. The density proposed, based on a site area of 3,315 square metres is 202 dwellings and 647 habitable rooms per hectare.

- 3.15 Correction to paragraph 51 - the affordable housing tenure split in this area according to policy should be 70:30 between shared ownership and social rent ,rather than 50:50 as referred to in the report.
- 3.16 Correction to paragraph 100 - there would be 24 social rent units 18 shared ownership dwellings, not 25 and 17 respectively, as referenced in the paragraph.

Late representations

- 3.17 One late representation has been received regarding the traffic impact on Copeland Road and whether there would be sufficient sound insulation for the proposed dwellings.
- 3.18 The transport implications of this scheme have been addressed in paragraphs 72-77 of the report but to summarise, the scheme would result in lower vehicle movements in the immediate surrounds but not on the area as a whole. Condition 10 would ensure suitable sound insulation from environmental noise.

Amended documentation

- 3.19 An updated daylight and sunlight assessment has been submitted which provides a shadow study of the impact the scheme would have on neighbouring gardens. The decision notice should reference the updated version- issue 4. The expected impact on neighbours has not changed.

REASON FOR URGENCY

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

REASON FOR LATENESS

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

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

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