

Item No: 6.1 & 6.2	Classification: Open	Date: 3 March 2020	Meeting Name: Planning Committee
Report title:		Addendum report Late observations and further information	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		London Bridge & West Bermondsey South Bermondsey	
From:		Director of Planning	

PURPOSE

- 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

- 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

Item 6.1 – 17/AP/3281 – 11-13 Spa Road, SE16 3RB

Corrections to draft decision notice

- The recommendation in Appendix 4 lists plan number *2736-MA-00-GF-DR-A-001004 Site _ Roof Plan S4-P01* which should be corrected to read as revision 'P02' i.e. *2736-MA-00-GF-DR-A-001004 Site _ Roof Plan S4-P02*

Additional comments received

- An additional 9 support comments were forwarded on by the applicant since the report was published, in a pro forma letter. Each letter was signed and dated by a local business based the immediate area. The reasons the businesses supported the proposal included the introduction of a new student population providing the opportunity for spend within the local economy, as well as meeting need for student housing in managed accommodation on a currently under-utilised site.
- An additional 6 objection comments were received from members of the public. These comments repeated earlier concerns raised, such as the inappropriate location for student housing, the lack of capacity of transport and community infrastructure. One of the responses objected to both this and the Alscot Road scheme for the reasons above, although focussed on the Spa Road scheme. It raised concerns regarding the impact of the additional population on Spa Gardens, the design being overbearing and out of character, harm to the listed building, harm to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers in terms of daylight and

privacy, lack of affordable student accommodation and concern regarding the accommodation being used for general needs visitor accommodation in the summer.

4. This last point is not addressed directly in the main report however the S106 agreement will include a provision restricting the use of the accommodation to education-related visitors outside of the 43 week academic term time. Otherwise the topics above are covered in the report.

Comment on responses from occupiers of Corio House

5. For completeness explicit reference should be made to a number of comments received from residents in Corio House, a relatively new residential development to the north-west of the site. It is a part 1-, 3-, 4-, 6- and 7-storey building in a C-shaped perimeter block format, with the open portion facing south-east towards the site.
6. Approximately half of the responses received during the most recent reconsultation were from occupiers of Corio House objecting to the proposal. The grounds for objection were reduction in daylight, sunlight and outlook, an increased sense of enclosure, and harm to privacy. Given this building would, at its closest point, be approximately 60m away from the application site, the proposal is considered not to cause harm to the amenity of these properties.

Additional internal daylight and sunlight testing

7. The applicant has provided the results of additional internal daylight testing (using the average daylight factor test) carried out for the proposed second floor of student bedrooms and to reflect the layouts which have been revised since the original testing was undertaken. The figures given in paragraph 150 of the report can be updated as follows:

'An average daylight factor (ADF) of 1.5%, which the BRE recommends is achieved for living rooms in self contained residential units (with kitchens at 2% and bedrooms at 1%) was chosen as the benchmark against which to test the student room's access to daylight. Of the 99 tested, 90 (91%) passed, and 9 (9%) had an ADF of below 1.5%.'

8. Paragraph 150 of the main report continues that the daylight levels across the 185 student rooms are acceptable. With the additional testing results provided, the average ADF value across the rooms that are below the 1.5% benchmark is now 1.1% ADF. With the increase in the percentage of rooms which meet the BRE standard with the design and layout revisions (improved from 75% of rooms tested to now be 91%) the daylight provision remains acceptable.
9. Additional sunlight testing was carried out too. Paragraph 151 of the main report can be updated as follows:

'48 rooms facing within 90 degrees of due south were tested against the BRE recommended sunlight levels (Annual Probable Sunlight Hours) for living rooms. Of these, 43 would meet or exceed the BRE recommended level of sunlight access for the year, while 41 would meet the recommended level across the winter period.'

10. The concluding statement of paragraph 151 of the main report remains valid with these updated figures: *'Given the built up nature of the site, it is considered that the rooms would have a good level of access to daylight and sunlight and which would be acceptable for student accommodation.'*

Secured by Design condition

11. The draft decision notice appended to the main report includes condition 14 regarding Secured by Design certification. The applicant has subsequently requested the removal of this for the same reasons that the Alscot Road scheme has not had a Secured by Design condition included. That is to say it is considered that the required technical standards would be too onerous for a student housing scheme and they would conflict with the intended management regime. For example, compartmentalising each floor would affect the ability for students to socialise with friends on other floors of the building.
12. For the same reasons as set out in para 109 of the Alscot Road scheme report (18/AP/2295), i.e. that given the proposal would add a more active frontage onto the street to increase surveillance of the area compared to the existing building, the rationale for removing condition 14 as presented on the draft decision notice set out in appendix 4 is, on balance, acceptable.

Item 6.2 – 18/AP/2295 – 77-89 Alscot Road, SE1 3AW

Additional information

Additional comments received

13. Further objection comments received from three people, summarised as:
- 3- to 7- floors is a huge variance and needs to be confirmed before a decision is made. The design is over-bearing, out of scale and character for the area.
 - It will impact on the area and its close, quiet community.
 - There is already a significant amount of student housing within a 2km radius and a deficit of affordable housing.
 - The policy requirement for student accommodation to be in town centres is not being adhered to.
 - No affordable student accommodation is included. The site would be used by AirBnB rentals in the summer.
 - Student population will be transient and will not support community cohesion or community development, but undermine it.
 - Increase in people using the park.
 - A cycle hire scheme does not consider when there is bad weather people will use buses/trains which are already full.
 - Infrastructure is already struggling for the number of people living in the area. Services in the area cannot cope with these developments and others planned in the area (e.g. Biscuit Factory).
 - Southwark should invest in the area using council tax for improvements, and not give the developer an advantage as a form of bribery.
 - Payment in lieu for affordable housing will not help this directly-affected locality.
14. Officer response to these comments:

- The design of the scheme is shown in detail on the submitted drawings with the lower 3-storey rear part and main 7 -storey part of the proposed building. It is considered to be of an acceptable scale and high quality design, as set out in paragraph 102 onwards of the report.
- The impacts on neighbour amenity and the Gardens are found to be acceptable, as set out in paragraphs 128, and 149 to 179 of the report.
- As set out in paragraphs 87-89 of the report, the site is approximately 800m from the nearest existing purpose built student housing on Great Dover Street and Tabard Street. Even with the Spa Road scheme 160m to the north also for consideration on the same Committee agenda, the modest amounts of student housing in a mainly residential area is not considered to cause harm. While not in a town centre the site is relatively accessible to a number of HEIs (see paragraph 90 onwards of the report), and it is noted that the location requirements are removed in emerging NSP policy P5.
- No affordable student accommodation is proposed as officers have prioritised the affordable housing payment given the borough's pressing need for general needs affordable housing. The payment in lieu of £5.7m for affordable housing would be put towards the Council's own New Council Homes Delivery Programme as the most effective way to provide affordable housing (see paragraph 146 of the report) to address the borough's need.
- Any planning permission would be subject to securing the planning contributions set out in pages 41-43 of the report towards transport and highway works, park maintenance and improvements, and street trees, and securing the development for student housing use only. The development would also be liable for Southwark and Mayoral CILs (as set out in paragraph 213 of the report). The Council can use the Southwark CIL receipts for infrastructure items on its Regulation 123 list and 25% is made available to local community areas. Payments of CIL and planning contributions are not a form of bribery, but seek to mitigate the impacts of the development.

REASON FOR URGENCY

- 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

- 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	Place and Wellbeing Department 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH	Planning enquiries telephone: 020 7525 5403