

Item No. 7.1	Classification: OPEN	Date: 5 November 2019	Meeting Name: Planning Committee
Report title:	Addendum report Late observations and further information		
Ward(s) or groups affected:	Old Kent Road		
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. Members note and consider the late observations, consultation responses and information received in respect of each item in reaching their decision.

FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION

Item 7.1 – Application 18/AP/3284 for: Full Planning Application – 596-608 OLD KENT ROAD AND LAND AT LIVESEY PLACE LONDON SE15 1JB

3. The following corrections, clarifications and amendments are proposed to the Case Officer's report:
4. For clarity, paragraph 200 should note that, that in accordance with the Mayor's SPG, the proposal is classified as a 'Fast Track' application given the policy compliant 35% Affordable Housing proposed and no net loss of industrial floorspace. The SPG specifically states that late review mechanisms are not required for 'Fast Track' applications.
5. In paragraph 263, the fourth bullet point states that the 38th floor roof terrace would be accessible to residents of the Topps building. This is an error, it should say Civic Tower.
6. There are some minor corrections to paragraph 345, which should read as follows:

“Of the 136 single aspect homes, none would face directly north, but 67 (49%) would face northeast or northwest. Of these, 37 would be in the Topps building, mostly looking directly northwest over the proposed linear park, with 3 looking northeast towards Old Kent Road. One would be in the Livesey building looking north west towards the new linear park. The remaining 29 would be in the Civic tower looking north west. There are no single aspect apartments in Civic facing NW lower than the roof of the Topps building so all of these would look out over the proposed linear park and beyond.”

7. The daylight and sunlight results presented focus on the comparison between the existing position and the cumulative position. For clarity, paragraph 420 should have noted that this means that the results include the impact of all seven cumulative schemes considered. Were the Proposed Development to come forward after the other 6 schemes have been developed, the relative reductions in daylight and sunlight would be less.
8. In paragraphs 441 and 472 the report states that where a window loses more than 4% APSH, the BRE Guidelines state that the room will feel less cheerful and appear colder. For clarity, it should be noted that the BRE Guidelines state that “sunlighting may be adversely affected if less than 25% APSH is retained and the window receives less than 0.8 times its existing sunlight level and a reduction of APSH of greater than 4% occurs.” A window must experience all three of the above criteria in order for it not to comply with BRE Guidance.
9. P572 to P577 are duplicate paragraphs.
10. In paragraph 692, there would be five bays to provide off street servicing and short stay for resident services, not six as stated. Three would be short stay parking bays at ground floor level to predominately accommodate pick up /drop off activity and two would be in the basement for longer stay parking.
11. The DSP baseline figures reported in paragraph 703 should be as per the table below. Please note, the financial contributions remain the same, but the number of trips has increased to allow for motorcycle trips.

	All phases	£
Residential	372 units	37,200
Non residential	2,693 sqm (excluding church)	538.60
	Total	37,738.60
Baseline	motorised vehicle trips per day	94 (excluding church)

12. Since completing the report, the applicant has provided details of an email from TfL confirming that, at this stage, they are satisfied with the information sent concerning the BLE tunnel provisions, subject to the inclusion of an appropriate condition relation to foundation design. Condition was included in the draft decision notice to address this, but this should be revised to reflect TfL’s preferred wording, as set out below:

“Prior to the commencement of works relating to any part of the development (excluding any works such as site preparation, laying and diversion of infrastructure and services, demolition and access works or works subject to separate agreements under s184 or s278), a detailed design and construction method statement(s) for all of the ground floor structures, foundations and basements and for any other structures below ground level, including piling and any other permanent installations relevant to the development, shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Transport for London which:

- (i) Accommodate the proposed location of the Bakerloo Line Extension tunnels and other Bakerloo Line Extension structures in the vicinity of the site; and
- (ii) Accommodate ground movement arising from the construction of the proposed Bakerloo Line Extension;
- (iii) Mitigate the effects of noise and vibration arising from the operation of Bakerloo Line Extension within its tunnels and other structures; and
- (iv) Detailed design of the internal parking and servicing arrangements to take into account any changes the ground floor and basement subsequent to satisfying the above 3 points.

The development shall be carried out in all respects in accordance with the approved design and method statements. All relevant structures and works comprised within the development hereby permitted and required by this condition shall be completed prior to the occupation of the development. No alteration to these aspects of the development shall take place without the approval of the Local Planning Authority in consultation with Transport for London”