

Item No. 7.1	Classification: Open	Date: 28 February 2017	Meeting Name: Planning Sub-Committee B
Report title:	Development Management planning application: Application 16/AP/2173 for: Full Planning Permission Address: 1 HAVEN WAY, LONDON SE1 3DT Proposal: Construction of a roof-top extension to existing building to provide 3no. 3-bed residential units.		
Ward(s) or groups affected:	Grange		
From:	Director of Planning		
Application Start Date	15/06/2016	Application Expiry Date	10/08/2016
Earliest Decision Date	22/07/2016	Target Decision Date	03/03/2017

RECOMMENDATION

1. Grant planning permission, subject to conditions.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. This application was originally presented to the Committee on 14 December 2016. At that meeting members passed a motion to defer taking a decision until a visit to the site could be undertaken and members and officers duly visited the site on 14 February 2017. During this time revised plans were also submitted by the applicant in response to some of the concerns that were discussed at the December meeting.
3. These changes are as follows;
 1. Increasing the size of the roof terrace for Flat 6.2 to 11sqm from 8.9sqm as originally proposed. This would be achieved by recessing the glazed window/door opening to the living/kitchen/dining room by about 0.6m.
 2. The number of windows in the south elevation has been reduced from six to five and the remaining five would be substantially reduced in size, they would now be uniformly approximately 1m wide whereas previously two of the six were 1m wide, with another two 2m wide and another two 3m wide. The new windows would also be recessed into the elevation by 1m thereby increasing the separation distance between them and the nearest north-facing windows of the closest existing dwellings in the neighbouring block at 2 Haven Way by the same distance.
 3. The smallest bedroom in Flat 6.1 has been increased to 11.1sqm from 9.5sqm as previously proposed.

Site location and description

4. The subject building, 1 Haven Way (formerly known as Block A), is a 6-storey pavilion building which fronts onto Grange Walk. It now sits between two new developments; one complete, to the east of the site on land formerly referred to as Bermondsey Spa Site C5 by Notting Hill Home Ownership Ltd. (planning ref. 10/AP/3010), and one currently under construction to the west of the site by Linden Homes, (planning ref. 14/AP/2102).
5. The site is situated to the south side of Grange Walk. It was formerly known as 'Larnaca Works' which, following permission in 2007 (ref. 06/AP/2272), has been redeveloped into a residential-led (90 units) scheme known as 'Grange Gardens' arranged in three blocks. The Grange Gardens development originally accommodated 90 residential units and 1100sqm of commercial space (flexible Use Class A1, A2, A3, B1 and D1 floorspace) to the ground floor in three blocks between five and seven storeys in height. The development includes a basement car park with direct ramped access from Grange Walk.
6. The immediate context surrounding the site is predominantly residential, however there are a number of commercial uses to the south and west of the site. The built form surrounding the site is varied at between 2 and 7 storeys in height.
7. The site is not in a conservation area and there are no statutorily listed buildings on or adjacent to the site. It is within an Archaeology Priority Zone, the Urban Density Zone, an Air Quality Management Area and Flood Zone 2.

Details of proposal

8. The proposal seeks to add another floor to the existing building which would provide an additional three three-bed flats. The additional floor would be smaller in scale and be set in from the building's existing elevations by 1.57m from the front Grange Walk façade (north elevation), approx. 2m from the east elevation, approx. 1m from the rear façade (south elevation), the set-back on its west side would vary from 1.7m at the south-west corner to almost 3m at the north west corner.
9. The new flats would be centred around the building's existing stair/lift core which means the core would simply be extended upwards. The existing top floor comprises three two-bed units, two one-bed units and one three-bed unit. All of the proposed new three-bed units would be dual-aspect.
10. The existing elevations are finished using a black brick, a glazed green brick and black framed aluminium windows. The green glazed brick has been used as a lighter visual accent to off-set the predominant black brick that covers the bulk of the building and has been applied to the ground floor, the top floor and is incorporated in the detailing of the window bays in the front elevation. The proposed new floor would be clad in the same green glazed brick as the existing top floor and so will appear as a seamless enlargement of the existing top floor.
11. The existing building is approximately 20.55m high. The building as extended would be 24.07m to the parapet. The extended lift shaft over-run would project above this by a further 450mm.

Planning history

15/EQ/0375

12. Pre-Application Enquiry: Extension to 1 Haven Way to accommodate x4 residential units
Advice issued on 20/04/2016, please see Appendix 4.

14/EN/0149

13. Enforcement Investigation:
Breach of condition, non-compliance with approved plans, ground floor layout/entrance door.
Decision: No breach involved as the alteration does not amount to development.
Case closed on 15/03/2016.

13/EN/0093

14. Enforcement Investigation:
Building works not in accordance with the plans approved under 11/AP/2136, specifically in relation to the failure to construct the balconies granted as part of this variation of condition / minor material amendment application.
Decision: No breach involved as there is no requirement for any of the amendments granted by this application to be implemented. Case closed on 27/06/2016.

13/AP/3174

15. Full Planning Permission: Provide new glazing to the existing and consented commercial unit in Block A. (Permission under LBS Reg. Number 06-AP-2272)
Granted: 21/11/2013

13/AP/2695

16. S.73 Vary/remove conds/minor alterations: Variation of condition 8 (Approved drawings) of planning permission ref:12/AP/3987 for "Change of use of 454sqm of vacant ground floor commercial floorspace (flexible Use Class A1, A2, A3, B1 & D1 floorspace) to residential (Use Class C3) and associated elevational changes. The proposed residential use comprises 7 residential units (4 x 1 Bed, 2 x 2 Bed & 1 x 3 Bed)". This current application relates to amended window openings and types and seeks to replace Drawings: A(PL)300/P2 with A(PL)300/P3 A(PL)301/P3 with A(PL)301/P4 B(PL)301/P4 with B(PL)301/P5 B(PL)302/P4 with B(PL)302/P5 C(PL)300/P1 with C(PL)300/P2.
Granted: 30/10/2013

12/AP/3987

17. Full Planning Permission: Change of use of 454sqm of vacant ground floor commercial floorspace (flexible Use Class A1, A2, A3, B1 & D1 floorspace) to residential (Use Class C3) and associated elevational changes. The proposed residential use comprises 7 residential units (4 x 1 Bed, 2 x 2 Bed & 1 x 3 Bed). The application also proposes additional door openings to the ground floor commercial unit located in block C (adjacent to Grange Yard).
Granted: 21/05/2013

12/AP/1626

Full Planning Permission: Retrospective planning permission for an additional door on the west elevation of Block B and planning permission for a new shop front on the east elevation
Granted: 09/08/2012

11/EN/0255

18. Enforcement Investigation:
Departure from parent planning permission 06/AP/2272 and the shopfront details approved under application ref. 07/AP/2610 in respect of a door being inserted into the west elevation in the single storey element between blocks B and C on elevation drawing 00 23 C.
Decision: Breach regularised by the subsequent submission and approval of planning application ref. 12/AP/1626. Case closed on 11/07/2011.

11/AP/2136

19. S.73 Vary/remove conds/minor alterations: Variation of condition 19 (Approved drawings) to allow for minor material amendments to the existing planning permission 06/AP/2272. Amendments consist of:

Within Block B:

- Introduction of 14 balconies to the south and east elevations
- Reduction in the number of residential units from 38 to 35.
- Amended housing mix from 15x1 bed, 22x2 bed, 1x3 bed to 8x1 bed, 25x2 bed, 2x3bed.

All amendments relate to planning permission 06/AP/2272 for the demolition of existing buildings and canopy structure and redevelopment to provide three buildings of between five (18m) and seven (24m) storeys in height comprising 1105m² of floorspace for either A1, A2, A3, B1 or D1 Use Class and 90 flats (comprising 31 x 1 bed; 49 x 2 bed; 9 x 3 bed; 1 x 4 bed), plus car and cycle parking, amenity and public open space.

Granted: 29/03/2012

11/EN/0485

20. Enforcement Investigation:
Alterations to parent planning permission 06/AP/2272 including alteration to the internal layout of Blocks A and B and external alterations including additional balconies and alterations to the shop fronts of the commercial units at ground floor.
Decision: Breach regularised by the subsequent submission and approval of planning application ref. 11/AP/2136. Case closed on 16/05/2012.

06/AP/2272

21. Demolition of existing buildings and canopy structure and redevelopment to provide three buildings of between five (18m) and seven (24m) storeys in height comprising 1105m² of floorspace for either A1, A2, A3, B1 or D1 Use Class and 90 flats (comprising 31 x 1 bed; 49 x 2 bed; 9 x 3 bed; 1 x 4 bed), plus car and cycle parking, amenity and public open space.
Granted with a legal agreement: 25/06/2007

Planning history of adjoining sites

10/AP/3010

22. 'The Exchange'
Bermondsey Spa Site C5, Grange Walk (Site bounded by Spa Road, Neckinger and Grange Walk)

Full Planning Permission: Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 4 buildings ranging from 4 to 7 storeys in height (4 storeys fronting Grange Walk, rising to 5, 6 and 7 storeys at the centre of the site and 4 to 5 storeys fronting Spa Road) to provide 205 residential units (Use Class C3). The proposal includes 796sqm of flexible commercial space either for retail (Use Class A1), office (Use Class B1) or community use (Use Class D1). Within the site, the proposal includes the construction of new roads, pedestrian and cycle routes and new access to the public highway; together with associated works including the provision of 39 car parking spaces, 252 cycle parking spaces, 12 motorcycle parking spaces, servicing, landscaping and plant areas.

Granted with a legal agreement: 25/01/2011

14/AP/2102

23. 'Corio'

Site bounded by Grange Walk, Grange Yard and The Grange

Full Planning Permission: Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment to provide 167 residential units with basement car and cycle parking, amenity space, plant and associated works. The proposed height will be part-4, part-6 and part-7 storeys.

Granted with a legal agreement: 06/10/2014

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Summary of main issues

24. The main issues in this case are considered to be:

- a) The principle of development (in terms of land use and conformity with strategic policies)
- b) The impact of the development on the amenity of neighbouring residential occupiers.
- c) Design issues
- d) Quality of accommodation
- e) Car / cycle parking, servicing and refuse arrangements.
- f) Sustainable development implications
- g) Other matters - Affordable Housing
- h) Other matters - Community Infrastructure Liability
- i) All other relevant material planning considerations.

Planning policy

National Planning Policy Framework (Published 27 March 2012)

25. Of specific relevance are the following sections:

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 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

26. The London Plan (2016)

Policy 3.3 Increasing housing supply

Policy 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments

Policy 3.8 Housing Choice

Policy 5.3 Sustainable Design And Construction
Policy 5.13 Sustainable Drainage
Policy 5.17 Waste Capacity
Policy 6.3 Assessing the impacts 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 7.6 Architecture
Policy 7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology
Policy 7.14 Improving Air Quality
Policy 7.15 Reducing Noise And Enhancing Soundscapes

Mayor of London: Housing SPG (March, 2016)

27. Southwark Core Strategy (Adopted 6 April 2011)

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

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

28. The council's cabinet on 19 March 2013, as required by para 215 of the NPPF, considered the issue of compliance of Southwark planning policy with the National Planning Policy Framework. All policies and proposals were reviewed and the council satisfied itself that the policies and proposals in use were in conformity with the NPPF. The resolution was that with the exception of Policy 1.8 (Location of retail outside town centres) 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.

3.1 - Environmental Effects
3.2 - Protection of Amenity
3.6 - Air Quality
3.7 - Waste Reduction
3.8 - Waste Management
3.11 - Efficient use of land
3.12 - Quality in Design
3.13 - Urban Design
3.18 - Setting of listed buildings, conservation areas and world heritage sites
4.1 - Density of residential development
4.2 - Quality of residential accommodation
5.2 - Transport impacts
5.3 - Walking and cycling
5.6 - Car parking

Supplementary Planning Document: Sustainable Design and Construction (2009)
Supplementary Planning Document: Residential Design Standards (2015)
Supplementary Planning Document: Sustainable Transport (2008)

29. Summary of consultation responses

Total number of representations:	48				
In favour:	0	Against:	48	Neutral:	0
Petitions in favour:	0	Petitions against:		0	

Details of responses

30. Against:

- It will be necessary to infill the rooflights on the existing roof – this will cause an unbearable level of discomfort.
- The development is contrary to Protocol 1, Article 1 of the Human Rights Act (1998)
- Loss of evening sunlight
- Additional overshadowing to the courtyard areas.
- Further pressures on already inadequate public amenities in the locality
- Impact on views
- Overlooking
- Design quality
- Not in keeping with the existing building and the whole Grange Gardens development.
- Over-development
- The site is already over-developed
- Nuisance from construction
- No justification to add an additional floor having regard to the height of the Linden Homes 'Corio' development which is approximately the same height as the current building.
- Poor public transport in the area
- Will cause on-street overspill car parking
- Contributes to the claustrophobic feel of the area
- Loss of daylight due to the loss of the rooflights to the existing top floor flats.
- The existing services in the building are already near breaking-point. The additional ground floor flats have already caused numerous issues to the central boiler and it was designed to serve so many flats.

Transport Planning Team

31. No objection – The surround area has a limited number of available CPZ parking bays and therefore the new units should be exempt from eligibility from for parking permits within the CPZ.

Environmental Protection Team

32. No objection – subject to applying the standard residential internal noise levels condition.

The principle of the proposed development in terms of land use

33. The provision of additional residential units to an existing pre-dominantly residential building in a pre-dominantly residential neighbourhood does not conflict with any strategic policies or proposals in the current Development Plan for the borough and therefore is acceptable.

Environmental impact assessment

34. The likely impacts of the proposed development are not so significant that the application falls within the scope of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations) 2011 and as such there is no requirement for an EIA.

The impact of the development on the amenity of neighbouring residential occupiers.

Privacy – Relationship to 2 Haven Way (aka Block B) to the south

35. The nearest (and highest) neighbouring dwellings are two two-bed/four-person flats on the top (7th storey) of Block B immediately to the rear (south) of the proposed extension. Both of these flats have their principal living areas on the north side, but these rooms benefit from being dual aspect with arguably better views also available to the east and west respectively.
36. The minor material amendment application, ref. 11/AP/2136, gave consent for alterations to the rear elevation of the host building (Block A) namely, (i) the protrusion of the glazed stairwell out from the rear elevation (it was originally flush), (ii) the infilling/removal of small recessed balconies, two per floor, with the windows brought forward to be flush with the elevation and, (iii) the alteration of the projecting large square bay windows which were originally approved as being obscure-glazed, albeit with clear-glazed side returns, but which have been constructed as clear-glazed windows with solid side returns.
37. This same minor material amendment application, ref. 11/AP/2136, also permitted a modest extension on the north side of the top floor of Block B, thereby allowing it to encroach closer, in part, to the rear elevation of Block A.
38. However, notwithstanding these consented alterations to both blocks, the rear (south) elevation of the proposed extension (which would be recessed behind the building's existing rear elevation by approximately 1m) would leave window-to-window separation distances of between 12.4m-14.1m between the bedrooms of the proposed new flats at 1 Haven Way and the nearest north-facing windows of the closest existing dwellings within the neighbouring block immediately to the south at 2 Haven Way.
39. The proposed separation distance between the rear bedroom windows of the proposed development and the living/kitchen/dining rooms of the nearest existing top floor flats in Block B is therefore in line with the recommended 12m minimum separation distance between windows across a street in the Residential Design Standards SPD. This distance is what is considered appropriate to mitigate any unacceptable impact with respect to privacy or overlooking. In addition, as explained in full at the top of the report, the bedroom windows in the south elevation of the proposal are now much smaller (narrower) than previously proposed. It is therefore considered that current proposal would not cause any significant loss of privacy to the existing flats within 2 Haven Way and that no further mitigation is required, i.e., there is no longer any need for a planning condition to be imposed specifying the submission for approval of a scheme of partial obscure-glazing for these windows.

Privacy – Relationship to the Linden Homes development ('Corio') to the west

40. There is concern from objectors that the size and proximity of windows in the west elevation of the extension could have a detrimental impact on the privacy of the future occupiers of the nearest flats in the adjacent residential development by Linden Homes to the west of the site.
41. However, while these windows would be of a significant size and would have an elevated advantage of one floor over the highest flats in the nearest part of this adjacent development, the relationship would be an oblique one with an angle of at least 45 degrees. The window-to-window separation distances to the nearest flats in this neighbouring development to the west would range between 16.5m and 22m. With some partial obscure glazing being applied (e.g., obscuring the nearest rear third of the window nearest the south-west corner of the extension) and secured by a planning condition, together with the oblique relationship involved it is considered that sufficient mitigation would be in place to ensure that these future neighbours will not have an unacceptably poor standard of privacy imposed on them. Again, the separation distances are in line with the guidance in the Residential Design Standards SPD.

Privacy – Relationship to the Notting Hill Home Ownership development ('The Exchange') to the east

42. Currently there is a distance of 15.3m between the east elevation of the host building Block B and the west elevation of what was then referred to as Block D of the Bermondsey Spa Site C5 development approved in early 2011. The buildings are separated by a shared surface thoroughfare which has been named Park Way. This neighbouring Block D development is a four-storey C-shaped building arranged around an internal communal courtyard garden. It fronts onto Grange Walk to the north and Park Way to the west.
43. Having regard to the fact that all of the windows in the east elevation of the host building (there are four per floor between the first and fifth floors) are clear-glazed and serve habitable room windows (i.e., bedrooms and living/kitchen/dining rooms) it is considered that the two additional windows in the east elevation of the proposed extension (one serving a bedroom and another serving a living/kitchen/dining room) would not significantly worsen the existing situation particularly when one has regard to the fact that they would be set back by a further 2m and when one considers that there would be unlikely to be any direct line of sight due to the outlook from this side of the extension looking over the top of the Block D given that it would form a seventh storey, while Block D is 4 storeys high. As such, it is considered that residents of this adjacent development to the east of the site would not suffer any unduly significant loss of privacy.

Daylight and sunlight impacts

44. The applicant has commissioned and submitted a technical daylight and sunlight report to accompany the application. This has been prepared by CHP Surveyors Ltd. with reference to the established industry guide from the Building Research Establishment (BRE) titled 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: a guide to good practice' (Littlefair, P. 2nd Ed. 2011).
45. The report analyses the impact of the development on all of the immediately surrounding residential properties, in particular those already discussed above in relation to privacy. In undertaking the Vertical Sky Component (VSC), which simply measures the amount of daylight reaching the outside of any window at its centre, it found that only six neighbouring residential windows would be affected to a noticeable degree. These six windows are all in the north end wall of the block immediately to the rear of the application site (2 Haven Way) and are located on the

fourth and fifth floors (the top floor in this development is the sixth floor).

46. However, four out of these six windows (4th floor: W3 and W6 and 5th floor: W3 and W4) are secondary windows serving dual-aspect living/kitchen/dining rooms meaning that these rooms also benefit from daylight received through glazed door/window openings in the west and east elevations. The other two windows both serve secondary double bedrooms on the fourth floor.
47. A daylight distribution test was also undertaken which compares the area of the affected room receiving direct skylight before and after the development. The BRE guide recommends that the area receiving direct skylight will be noticeable if it is reduced by more than 20%. Looking at the results of this test the area receiving direct skylight would be reduced by 20% in one of the bedrooms and by 30% in the other so therefore only one window would fail both the VSC test and the Daylight Distribution test. Having regard to the fact that only one out of many neighbouring residential windows tested would be so affected, that the window serves the second double bedroom in a two-bed flat and that the room would only marginally be affected more than recommended, it is considered that the impact of the development on the current levels of daylight enjoyed by neighbouring dwellings is acceptable.
48. The report also examines the implications of the proposed development for the habitable rooms within the existing top floor flats in the building. The loss of daylight through the loss of these roof-lights is a recurring issue in several of the responses to the statutory neighbour consultation undertaken.
49. However, it should be noted that the existing top floor flats were considered to have been provided with sufficient daylight without roof-lights when the original planning permission for the Grange Gardens development was approved in 2007 as the roof of the building at that time showed no such roof-lights at all. In this vein, it is observed that the existing top floor layout together with the number and size of windows provided would still, by today's standards and guidance, (the Residential Design Standards SPD 2015 and the BRE guidance 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: a guide to good practice' (Littlefair, P. 2nd Ed. 2011)) be considered to be well designed to achieve good levels of natural daylighting without any need of supplementary daylight via roof-lights.
50. In any case, the report details the results of a Daylight Distribution test and an Average Daylight Factor (ADF) test for the existing top floor accommodation at 1 Haven Way. The ADF is the total amount of daylight in a space. Although usually reserved for assessing the amount of daylight available in proposed new dwellings as it can be affected by variables such as the reflectivity of interior surfaces, the type of window glass used, the distance between the window head and the finished floor level and of course the size and layout of the various rooms, it is equally acknowledged that much of this information is known to the applicant.

Average daylight factor analysis of impact of proposal on the daylighting of the principal living space (Living/kitchen/dining room) in each of the six existing flats below.

	BRE guide recommended minimum standard	Assessment results
Room 1 (L/K/D)	2%	5.2%
Room 2 (L/K/D)	2%	2.36%
Room 3 (L/K/D)	2%	4.52%

Room 4 (L/K/D)	2%	3.79%
Room 5 (L/K/D)	2%	2.2%
Room 6 (L/K/D)	2%	2.1%

51. The table above shows the results of an average daylight factor (ADF) analysis for the existing top floor flats (of which there are six) in 1 Haven Way. It shows the quality/extent of natural daylight that would remain in the principal habitable rooms of these existing flats following the construction of the proposed extension and consequent loss of the existing skylights. The table shows that in every flat the residual daylighting factor would exceed the recommended minimum standard. Officers consider that the results demonstrate that the existing top floor flats would continue to enjoy good levels of natural daylight via their windows which would remain unaffected by the proposal.
52. The report also found that no neighbouring residential property would suffer any significant loss of sunlight.
53. Issues of a history of construction programmes on the 'Grange Gardens' development running over and having to endure construction noise and disturbance on both sides of Grange Gardens for a significant period of time (due to the construction of the 'Corio' development to the west, 'The Exchange' development to the east as well as ongoing works to the subject building itself), have been raised in the responses to the statutory neighbour consultation undertaken.
54. The application has been accompanied by a construction management plan (CMP) which covers issues of construction hours and travel, a noise minimization strategy, vehicular access and arrangements, a waste management and refuse strategy, accommodation of scaffolding and storage of building materials, extension of lift, site facilities and accommodation, accident and emergency and neighbourly consultation and relationships. The CMP is considered to detail sufficient appropriate protocols and mitigation, commensurate to the scale and nature of the development, to ensure that the impact of the construction works on existing local residents would be minimised, within reason. The applicant has indicated that they will limit working hours from 8am-6pm, Monday-Friday; an informative is recommended referring to this.
55. In summary, officers consider that the proposed development would have an acceptable impact on the amenity of neighbouring residential occupiers and so would comply with saved policy 3.2 (Protection of amenity) of the Southwark Plan (2007).

Design issues

Density

56. When originally approved the density of the entire Grange Gardens development (1, 2 and 3 Haven Way) was estimated to be 805hr/h, thus above the 200-700hr/h Urban Density Zone range. The single-storey roof-top extension now proposed would provide an additional 12 habitable rooms and as such it would only marginally increase this figure.
57. However, as the Mayor's Housing SPG (2016) advises that density is only one measure of the appropriateness of a development and needs to be considered alongside other issues such as the need to secure residential quality, the need to avoid harmful amenity impacts, the need to ensure that the transport impacts can be absorbed and/or mitigated and the need to take due account of local context and character.

58. In terms of the impact of the proposal on the local context and character, having had regard to the heights of the neighbouring 7-storey Woodville and Valois Houses on the north side of Grange Walk and the height of the 7-storey Linden Homes 'Corio' residential development nearing completion immediately to the west of the site it is considered that an additional floor in the form and scale proposed would not be unduly out of step with the prevailing height and scale of buildings in this location. It would only be marginally higher than the now substantially complete 7-storey Linden Homes 'Corio' development to the west which is approximately 22.5m high.
59. Aesthetically, through its reduced size and being set in from the building's existing elevations on all sides by reasonable margins, it is considered to be an appropriate means of extending the building without creating an over-dominant mass. The success of the extension in this regard is aided by the intention to continue the green glazed tile cladding used for the existing top floor and to simply extrude it upwards following the recessed building lines of the north-west corner of the existing top floor. As such it is considered to be a logical extension that will integrate well with the building's established architecture and materials. The green glazed tiles and generally larger full height window openings proposed would combine to give the extension a suitable visually 'lighter' appearance but elsewhere other window openings in the front and rear elevations demonstrate good visual continuity with the established fenestration on the floors below.
60. It is proposed for the 'margins' between the smaller footprint of the proposed extension and the larger footprint of the roof upon which it would sit, to form accessible roof terraces. This is acceptable in principle, however it is recommended that the details of the design and materials to form the balustrades are submitted for approval.
61. It is also considered reasonable and appropriate to apply a condition to ensure that the existing sedum roof on host building would not be lost but would be replicated on the roof of the proposed extension. The condition would seek for detailed construction drawings and planting specifications to be submitted for approval, should the application be granted.

Quality of accommodation

Unit, room size, aspect, head heights, etc

62. All of the proposed 3bed/6person dwellings would exceed the 95sqm minimum unit size standard.
63. Notwithstanding the slightly reduced size of the kitchen/living/dining room for Flat 6.2 (due to the enlargement of the external terrace) the kitchen/living/dining rooms for each flat would still all comply with the 30sqm minimum size requirement in the Residential Design Standards SPD.
64. One of the three double bedrooms in Flat 6.1 measures only 11.1sqm. However, this represents only a very marginal shortfall from the recommended 12sqm double-bed room minimum standard in the SPD and in the context of a large flat containing two other adequately-sized double bedrooms it is not considered to undermine the overall quality of accommodation for this unit.
65. The units would also have good floor-to-ceiling heights and would all be dual aspect and all habitable rooms would be served by a conventional clear-glazed vertical window allowing direct natural light and an outlook.

Outdoor amenity space

66. The Residential Design Standards SPD advises that at least 10sqm of private outdoor amenity space should be provided for dwellings containing 3 or more bedrooms. The proposal would meet this requirement in full as the new flats would all benefit from private outdoor roof terraces of the following sizes:

Flat 6.1 – 12.4sqm

Flat 6.2 – 11.0sqm

Flat 6.3 – 34.6sqm

Car / cycle parking, servicing and refuse arrangements

Car Parking

67. Although the existing building benefits from on site car parking in the basement, no additional car parking spaces are proposed to serve the additional residential units now proposed. The proposal is therefore effectively a 'car-free' scheme, which is acceptable in principle as the site is located within a controlled parking zone (CPZ) and therefore the potential overspill impact on on-street parking can be addressed by the imposition of a planning condition prohibiting new residents from applying for parking permits.

Cycle Storage

68. The proposed units would form part of an existing development and will utilize the existing basement for the cycle storage area, where all other services are located. The application proposes to install an additional 7 cycle parking spaces within the existing basement, accessible from the communal main entrance. This provision would comply with the minimum cycle parking standards in the London Plan (2016).

Refuse Storage

69. It is proposed to increase the capacity of one general refuse bin and another one for recycling from 660L to 1000L to meet the additional refuse and recycling storage demand of the three additional units now proposed. These two larger bins would be accommodated within the existing residential bin store area in the north-east corner of the ground-floor. Officers are satisfied that this is an acceptable and practical solution noting that most of the additional storage capacity of the 1000L bins is derived from their additional height (60cm higher), although they would also be 26cm deeper.

Sustainable development implications

70. As mentioned above the proposed development should re-instate the existing sedum roof on the building. This can be secured through an appropriate condition.

Other matters – Affordable Housing

71. The matter of whether this development would trigger a requirement for affordable housing, when viewed cumulatively with planning permission ref. 12/AP/3987 (which granted permission for a change of use of commercial floorspace within the building to create an additional 7 residential units) has also been examined. However, the combination of the 7 residential units granted under this planning permission with the 3 additional units now proposed in this extension would amount to only 10 units and therefore the affordable housing liability threshold, which currently stands at 11 or more units, would not be reached. As such there is no policy requirement for this development to contribute towards the provision of affordable housing in the

borough.

Other matters – CIL Liability

72. Section 143 of the Localism Act states that any financial contribution received in terms of community infrastructure levy (CIL) is a material "local financial consideration" in planning decisions. The requirement for payment of the Mayoral or Southwark CIL is therefore a material consideration, however the weight attached is determined by the decision maker. The Mayoral CIL is required to contribute towards strategic transport investments in London as a whole, primarily Crossrail, while Southwark's CIL will provide for infrastructure that supports growth in Southwark.
73. The application is liable for both the Mayoral CIL and the Southwark CIL because it would create three new dwellings and as such constitutes a chargeable development under the CIL Regulations 2010 (as amended). The contributions would be as follows:

Mayoral CIL: £15,452
Southwark CIL: £75,731

Conclusion on planning issues

74. Amendments have been received that mean the scheme would comply with the guidance in the Residential Design Standards with respect to its impact on neighbours' privacy. All neighbouring dwellings would continue to retain good levels of daylight and sunlight. For the reasons set out above the application is recommended for a approval of planning permission, subject to conditions.

Community impact statement

75. 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.

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

Consultations

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

Human rights implications

77. 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.
78. It is noted that an objection/s to the proposed development has/have been raised on the grounds that it conflicts with Article 1 of Protocol 1 of the HRA, that is, that every natural or legal person is entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of his possessions. The principle that planning proposals that impact upon a person's enjoyment of their home, health or privacy may engage rights under the HRA is accepted. However,

case law has established that the impact must reach a minimum level of severity, i.e., the intensity, duration and the physical and mental effects are all important factors. However, the State may place lawful restrictions on this and any other right under the HRA providing that it has a legitimate aim which may involve the need to balance the interests of society with those of individuals and groups.

79. Given that the proposed development is modest and therefore noise and disturbance arising from construction related activity will not be long-lasting, given that a construction management plan has been prepared, the aim of which is to minimize the noise and disruption visited upon neighbouring residents (particularly those living in the same building) and given that the long-term impacts of the proposed development have been given a thorough and balanced consideration in this report and that planning conditions have been recommended to appropriately control all residual impacts related to planning matters, it is considered that the proposed development does not conflict with the human rights of any of the affected residents as set out in the HRA.
80. This application has the legitimate aim of seeking to extend the existing building to create three additional residential dwellings. 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/115-75 Application file: 16/AP/2173 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 5405 Council website: www.southwark.gov.uk

APPENDICES

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

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Simon Bevan, Director of Planning	
Report Author	Ciaran Regan, Senior Planning Officer	
Version	Final	
Dated	28 February 2017	
Key Decision	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Strategic Director of Finance and Governance	No	No
Strategic Director of Environment and Leisure	No	No
Strategic Director of Housing and Modernisation	No	No
Director of Regeneration	No	No
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team		16 February 2017

Consultation undertaken

Site notice date: 15/06/2016

Press notice date: n/a

Case officer site visit date: 15/06/2016

Neighbour consultation letters sent: 17/06/2016

Internal services consulted:

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

Statutory and non-statutory organisations consulted:

n/a

Neighbour and local groups consulted:

Flat 535 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ	Flat 633 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
Flat 534 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ	Flat 529 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
Flat 533 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ	Flat 425 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
Unit 1 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ	Flat 424 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
Flat 537 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ	Flat 426 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
Flat 536 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ	Flat 528 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
Flat 532 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ	Flat 527 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
Flat 428 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ	Flat 4 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
Flat 427 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ	Flat 3 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
Flat 426 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ	Flat 5 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
Flat 431 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ	Flat 8 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
Flat 430 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ	Flat 6 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
Flat 429 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ	Flat 2 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
61a Grange Walk London SE1 3EL	Unit 4 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
60b Grange Walk London SE1 3EL	Flat 635 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
60a Grange Walk London SE1 3EL	Unit 5 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
79b Maltby Street London SE1 3PB	Flat 1 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
61c Grange Walk London SE1 3EL	Unit 6 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
61b Grange Walk London SE1 3EL	Flat 208 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
79a Maltby Street London SE1 3PB	Flat 107 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
Flat 1 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ	Flat 209 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
Unit 3 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ	Flat 211 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
Unit 2 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ	Flat 210 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
Flat 4 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ	Flat 106 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
Flat 3 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ	Flat 102 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
Flat 2 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ	Flat 101 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
Flat 425 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ	Flat 103 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
Flat 208 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ	Flat 105 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
Flat 107 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ	Flat 104 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
Flat 106 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ	Flat 319 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
Flat 211 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ	Flat 318 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
Flat 210 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ	Flat 420 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
Flat 209 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ	Flat 423 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL

Flat 105 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ
Flat 101 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ
Store Adjacent Woodville House SE1 3EQ
Flat 104 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ
Flat 103 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ
Flat 102 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ
Flat 321 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ
Flat 320 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ
Flat 319 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ
Flat 424 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ
Flat 323 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ
Flat 322 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ
Flat 318 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ
Flat 214 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ
Flat 213 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ
Flat 212 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ
Flat 317 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ
Flat 316 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ
Flat 215 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ
2 Haven Way London SE1 3FL
Flat 315 2 Haven Way Se1 3FL
Flat 631 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
Flat 530 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
Flat 632 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
Flat 634 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL

Flat 421 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
Flat 317 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
Flat 213 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
Flat 212 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
Flat 314 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
Flat 316 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
Flat 315 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
Flat 317 1 Haven Way
Flat 532 1 Haven Way London SE1 3FJ
B422 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
2 Haven Way London SE1 3FL
Flat 208 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ
Flat 533 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ
Flat 532, Block A 1 Haven Way SE13fj
431 Grange Gardens 1 Haven Way SE1 5QB
2 Haven Way London SE1 3FL
10 Limasol Street Flat 45 SE16 3GE
1, Haven Way London SE1 3FJ
Flat 45 Ockham Building 10 Limasol Street SE16 3GE
37 Whitmore 3 Arts Lane Se163gb
48 Ockham Building 10 Limasol Street SE16 3GE
33 Ockham Building 10 Limasol Street SE163GE
27 Ockham Building 10 Limasol Street SE16 3GE
Flat 535, 1 Haven Way London SE1 3FJ
Flat 535, 1 Haven Way London SE1 3FJ
Beechlawn Hurtmore Road GU7 2RA

Re-consultation: n/a

Consultation responses received

Internal services

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

Statutory and non-statutory organisations

None

Neighbours and local groups

Beechlawn Hurtmore Road GU7 2RA
B422 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
Flat 101 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ
Flat 101 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ
Flat 101 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
Flat 103 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ
Flat 104 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
Flat 107 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ
Flat 208 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ
Flat 212 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ
Flat 212 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
Flat 213 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ
Flat 315 2 Haven Way Se1 3FL
Flat 316 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ
Flat 317 1 Haven Way
Flat 317 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ
Flat 424 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ
Flat 428 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ
Flat 430 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ
Flat 431 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ
Flat 45 Ockham Building 10 Limasol Street SE16 3GE
Flat 527 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
Flat 532, Block A 1 Haven Way SE13fj
Flat 532, Block A 1 Haven Way SE13fj
Flat 532, Block A 1 Haven Way SE13fj
Flat 532 1 Haven Way London SE1 3FJ
Flat 532 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ
Flat 533 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ
Flat 533 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ
Flat 535, 1 Haven Way London SE1 3FJ
Flat 535, 1 Haven Way London SE1 3FJ
Flat 535 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ
Flat 536 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ
Flat 537 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ
Flat 537 1 Haven Way SE1 3FJ
Flat 631 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
Flat 632 2 Haven Way SE1 3FL
1, Haven Way London SE1 3FJ
10 Limasol Street Flat 45 SE16 3GE
2 Haven Way London SE1 3FL
2 Haven Way London SE1 3FL
2 Haven Way London SE1 3FL
27 Ockham Building 10 Limasol Street SE16 3GE
33 Ockham Building 10 Limasol Street SE163GE
37 Whitmore 3 Arts Lane Se163gb

431 Grange Gardens 1 Haven Way SE1 5QB
48 Ockham Building 10 Limasol Street SE16 3GE
48 Ockham Building 10 Limasol Street SE16 3GE