

Contents

RECOMMENDATION	2
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
BACKGROUND INFORMATION	2
BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS	22
APPENDICES	22
AUDIT TRAIL	22

Item No. 7.3	Classification: Open	Date: 21 October 2020	Meeting Name: Planning Sub-Committee B
Report title:	Development Management planning application: Application 18/AP/4195 for: Full Planning Application Address: Antony House and Roderick House, Raymouth Road, London SE16 2DJ Proposal: Construction of two 5 -storey extensions at the end of Roderick and Antony House. The construction of a two storey roof extension above both Antony and Roderick House creating two 6 storey blocks together with the infilling of the existing central gap with a 5 storey building linking the two blocks over every floor, to create an additional 30 new dwellings (2 x Studio. 16 x 1 bed and 12 x 2 bed). The proposal would also provide a new central lift core and enhanced landscaping and associated ancillary works		
Ward(s) affected:	North Bermondsey		
From:	Director of Planning		
Application Start Date	18/01/2019	Application Expiry Date	19/04/2019
Earliest Decision Date	Extension until		

RECOMMENDATION

1. Grant Planning Permission subject to a legal agreement being signed
2. In the event that the legal agreement is not signed, by 30 October 2020, the Director of Planning be authorised to refuse planning permission for the reason detailed in paragraph 88 of this report.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

3. Planning permission is sought for a roof top, book end and side extension to provide an additional 30 units within these two separate blocks of 32 existing units. It is proposed that 26 or 85% of the habitable rooms would be for London affordable rent, an intermediate affordable product with 15% available for social rent. A GLA grant has been secured on this basis.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

4. The proposal first submitted was for all of the new dwellings to be London Affordable Rent but During the course of the application the applicant was

asked to make 15% of the habitable rooms available for social rent. This was agreed and the proposal was amended to include 4 units for social rent. Details of these units are set out within paragraph 29 of the report.

5. The proposal is made on behalf of the Lambeth and Southwark Housing Association who have provided the additional units to address housing need for their residents, the proposed studio units would be limited to 2 units both would exceed the minimum standards and would have access to private space. It is considered that they would be suitable as an intermediate housing product.
6. The proposal would provide slight shortfalls to the minimum room size standards for some units within the development. It is noted that the type of construction proposed would restrict the room sizes, but the overall flat sizes would be compliant.

Site location and description

7. Anthony and Roderick House are two separate mid-rise blocks, with Abbeyfield Estate to the east, Pedworth Estate to the south, Bradley House to the north and railway viaducts with industrial arches on the opposite side of Raymouth Road which lies to the west. Anthony and Roderick House comprise two, 4 storey flatted blocks accommodating 16 flats within each block. The buildings were constructed in 1953 as part of the post war house building. They are part of the portfolio of Lambeth and Southwark Housing Association, with all of the 32 current homes let to tenants.

Details of proposal

8. Planning permission is sought to extend the existing buildings by increasing the footprint of both blocks, by adding 5 storey extensions to the ends of each block and by infilling the central gap that separates the two blocks with a further 5 storey extension. It is also proposed to increase the height of the building by adding an additional two floors above. The proposal would provide a total of 30 new homes, these would be constructed using a modular construction technique.
9. The proposal includes the provision of an external lift core in addition to the following unit mix.

Unit Size	Existing	Proposed	Total (%)
Studio	0	2	2 (3%)
1-bed	0	16	16 (26%)

2-bed	16	12	28 (45%)
3-bed	16	0	16 (26%)
All units	32	30	62

Planning history

11. See Appendix 1 for any relevant planning history of the application site.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Summary of main issues

12. The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:
 - Principle of the proposed development in terms of land use
 - Tenure mix, affordable housing and viability
 - Dwelling mix including wheelchair housing
 - Density
 - Quality of residential accommodation
 - Design, layout, heritage assets and impact on Borough and London views
 - Landscaping and trees
 - Outdoor amenity space, children's playspace and public open space
 - Impact of proposed development on amenity of adjoining occupiers and surrounding area
 - Transport and highways
 - Noise and vibration
 - Energy and sustainability
 - Air quality
 - Water resources and flood risk
 - Planning obligations (S.106 undertaking or agreement)
13. These matters are discussed in detail in the 'Assessment' section of this report.

Legal Context

14. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) requires planning applications to be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this instance the development plan comprises the London Plan 2016, the Core Strategy 2011,

and the Saved Southwark Plan 2007.

15. There are also specific statutory duties in respect of the Public Sector Equalities Duty which are highlighted in the relevant sections below and in the overall assessment at the end of the report.

Planning policy

Adopted planning policy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

16. The revised National Planning Policy Framework ('NPPF') was published in July 2019 which sets out the national planning policy and how this needs to be applied. The NPPF focuses on sustainable development with three key objectives: economic, social and environmental.
17. Paragraph 215 states that the policies in the Framework are material considerations which should be taken into account in dealing with applications.
18. Chapter 2 Achieving sustainable development
Chapter 5 Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
Chapter 9 Promoting sustainable transport
Chapter 11 Making effective use of land
Chapter 12 Achieving well-designed places
Chapter 14 Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
Chapter 15 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

London Plan 2016

19. The London Plan is the regional planning framework and was adopted in 2016. The relevant policies of the London Plan 2016 are:

Policy 1.1 - Delivering the Strategic Vision and Objective of London
Policy 2.9 - Inner London
Policy 3.1 - Ensuring Equal Life Chances for All
Policy 3.3- Increasing Housing Supply
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 3.10 - Definition of Affordable Housing
Policy 3.11 - Affordable Housing Targets
Policy 3.13 - Affordable Housing Thresholds
Policy 5.1 - Climate Change Mitigation
Policy 5.2 - Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions

Policy 5.3 - Sustainable Design And Construction
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 5.20 - Contaminated Land
Policy 6.9 - Cycling
Policy 6.13 - Parking
Policy 7.1 - Lifetime Neighbourhoods
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 7.14 - Improving Air Quality

Core Strategy 2011

20. The Core Strategy was adopted in 2011 providing the spatial planning strategy for the borough. The strategic policies in the core strategy are relevant alongside the saved Southwark Plan (2007) policies. The relevant policies of the core strategy 2011 are:

Strategic Policy 1 - Sustainable Development
Strategic Policy 2 - Sustainable Transport
Strategic Policy 4 - Places for Learning and Enjoyment
Strategic Policy 5 - Providing New Homes
Strategic Policy 6 - Homes for People on Different Incomes
Strategic Policy 7 - Family Homes
Strategic Policy 11 - Open Space and Wildlife
Strategic Policy 12 - Design and Conservation
Strategic Policy 13 - High Environmental Standards
Strategic Policy 14 - Implementation and Delivery

Southwark Plan 2007 (saved policies)

21. In 2013, the council resolved to 'save' all of the policies in the Southwark Plan 2007 unless they had been updated by the core strategy with the exception of Policy 1.8 (location of retail outside town centres). Paragraph 213 of the NPPF states that existing policies should not be considered out of date simply because they were adopted or made prior to publication of the Framework. Due weight should be given to them, according to their degree of consistency with the Framework. The relevant policies of the Southwark Plan 2007 are:

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 3.9 - 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 3.28 - Biodiversity
 Policy 4.1 - Density of Development
 Policy 4.2 - Quality of Residential Development
 Policy 4.3 - Mix of Dwellings
 Policy 4.4 - Affordable Housing
 Policy 4.5 - Wheelchair Affordable Housing
 Policy 5.1 - Locating Developments
 Policy 5.2 - Transport Impacts
 Policy 5.3 - Walking and Cycling
 Policy 5.6 - Car Parking

Area based AAPs or SPDs

22. Sustainable Design and Construction (SPD, 2009)
 Sustainable Transport (SPD, 2010)
 Affordable Housing (SPD, 2008)
 Draft Affordable Housing (SPD, 2011)
 Design and Access Statements (SPD, 2007)
 Development Viability (SPD, 2016)
 Section 106 Planning Obligations / Community Infrastructure Levy (SPD, 2015)
 Sustainability Assessment (SPD, 2009)
 2015 Technical Update to the Residential Design Standards (SPD, 2011)

Emerging planning policy

Draft New London Plan

23. The draft New London Plan was published on 30 November 2017 and the first and only stage of consultation closed on 2 March 2018. Following an Examination in Public, the Mayor then issued the Intend to Publish London Plan. The Secretary of State responded to the Mayor in March 2020 where he expressed concerns about the Plan and has used his powers to direct changes to the London Plan. The London Plan cannot be adopted until these changes have been made. Until the London Plan reaches formal adoption it can only be attributed limited weight. Nevertheless paragraph 48 of the NPPF states that decision makers may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to the stage of preparation of the emerging plan, the extent to which there are unresolved objections to the policy and the degree of consistency with the Framework.

New Southwark Plan

24. For the last 5 years the council has been preparing the New Southwark Plan (NSP) which will replace the saved policies of the 2007 Southwark Plan and the 2011 Core Strategy. The council concluded consultation on the Proposed Submission version (Regulation 19) on 27 February 2018. The New Southwark Plan Proposed Submission Version: Amended Policies January 2019 consultation closed in May 2019. These two documents comprise the Proposed Submission Version of the New Southwark Plan.
25. These documents and the New Southwark Plan Submission Version (Proposed Modifications for Examination) were submitted to the Secretary of State in January 2020 for Local Plan Examination. The New Southwark Plan Submission Version (Proposed Modifications for Examination) is the council's current expression of the New Southwark Plan and responds to consultation on the NSP Proposed Submission Version. This version will be considered at the Examination in Public (EiP).
26. It is anticipated that the plan will be adopted in late 2020 following an EiP. As the NSP is not yet adopted policy, it can only be attributed limited weight. Nevertheless paragraph 48 of the NPPF states that decision makers may give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans according to the stage of preparation of the emerging plan, the extent to which there are unresolved objections to the policy and the degree of consistency with the Framework.

ASSESSMENT

Principle of the proposed development in terms of land use

27. The proposed development, which is entirely C3 (residential), is compatible with the site's existing residential use. As such, the application presents no land use issues.

Environmental impact assessment

28. The proposal is not required to provide an EIA as it does not fall within the EIA assessment criteria.

Tenure mix, affordable housing and viability

29. The proposal is for London Affordable Rent, which is an intermediate housing product. The housing association have written to confirm that the proposal would be a GLA compliant affordable rent product and that the rent levels will be below 80% market rents. The benchmark rents for 2019 /20 are:

1 bed £155.13
2 bed £164.24

30. Policy P4 Private Rented Homes of the New Southwark Plan gives some allowance for solely for rent developments with a minimum 35% level of affordable housing with a 15% social rent provision. The application would

make the 15% contribution with the provision of 4 units for social rent comprising 10 habitable rooms;

- 1 x 2 bed UNIT TYPE E 5th Floor Flat over Roderick House
- 1 x 1 bed UNIT TYPE F 3rd Floor Flat over Roderick House
- 1 x 2 bed UNIT TYPE E 4th Floor Flat over Antony House
- 1 x 1 bed UNIT TYPE F 2nd Floor Flat over Antony House

31. A viability assessment was submitted and demonstrated that the development has a deficit of £1.23m. However the scheme has funding from the GLA allowing them to proceed with the development.

Dwelling mix including wheelchair housing

32. Roderick House and Anthony House presently contain a large proportion of three-bedroom units and so the entire scheme (i.e. new and existing accommodation) would meet the minimum policy requirement for larger units. As such, the scheme would provide a good mix of unit sizes, making a valuable contribution towards achieving mixed and balanced communities. The provision of larger 3 bedroom units was considered however due to flood risk issues, the need to reduce the size of the bookend units and the lack of direct access to amenity space, the proposed units would be better suited to smaller households.

33. The proposed and existing units would provide the following dwelling mix;

Unit Size	Percentage	Core Strategy Requirement
Studios x 2	3%	No more than 5%
1 bed x 24	39%	Max 40%
2 bed x 4 (+16 existing)	32%	To exceed 60% when combined with 2+ units
3 bed x 16 existing	26%	Min 20%

34. The proposed dwelling mix would when combined with the existing units be close to meeting policy requirements with 3% studio units, 39% 1 bed and 58% rather than 60% 2+ bedroom units in total. It is not considered that this small shortfall would unduly compromise the objectives of the policy in terms of dwelling mix.

Wheelchair accommodation

35. The London Plan Policy 3.8 requires 10% of new housing to be designed to be wheelchair accessible or easily adaptable for residents who are wheelchair users. Saved Policy 4.3 of the Southwark Plan support this, requiring 10% of new dwellings to be suitable for wheelchair users, except where this is not possible due to the physical constraints of the site. All new homes will be designed to meet M4 (2) but there will be no provision of fully accessible homes M4 (3) as the site is currently within Flood Risk Zone 3a and based on

the findings of the FRA new property would have to be built with significantly higher Finished Floor Levels to the existing properties, which would result in an unacceptable design of the fenestration. Additionally with the forthcoming development within the area there will be nine wheelchair units within the area. Given that this may result in less demand for further wheelchair units an off-site payment may be considered acceptable in this instance.

36. The 30 dwellings proposed by this application would comprise a total of 68 habitable rooms. As 10% of the proposed development (equating to 6.8 habitable rooms) would not be wheelchair accommodation, this triggers a contribution of £68,000 (indexed). This will be secured through a Section 106 Agreement. The money to contribute towards funding adaptations to existing housing in the borough. The lack of wheelchair units is due to the current lack of lift to the existing flats, whilst the infill element is able to provide a lift core, it would not be able to accommodate the two lift requirement for wheelchair homes. The size and configuration of the ground floor maisonettes were considered unsuitable for wheelchair users due to their size and differing levels.

Density

37. The proposed site area is 0.286 ha, the combined habitable rooms from the existing and proposed units equals 180, which would give the proposal a density of 629 habitable rooms per hectare. This is within the urban density range of 200 – 700.

Quality of residential accommodation

38. Saved Policy 4.2 of the Southwark Plan asserts that planning permission will be granted provided the proposal achieves good quality living conditions. This policy is reinforced by the nationally described minimum space standards and the council's 2015 Technical Update to the Residential Design Standards SPD 2011 (incorporating the National Housing Standards).
39. Provided below is the schedule of accommodation for the various unit types.

40. **Schedule of accommodation for dwelling type Bookend 2 bedroom 4 P Maisonette x 4**

Room	Floor area (sq. m)	Minimum floor area requirement (sq. m)	Complies (YES/NO)?
Lounge/Dining	16.5	17	N (-0.5)
Kitchen	9.8	7	Y
Double bedroom	12.3	12	Y

Double bedroom	11.5	12	N (-0.5)
Bathroom	4.6	3.5	Y
Built-in storage	2.2	2	Y
Dwelling	Area (sq. m)	Minimum area requirement (sq. m)	Complies (YES/NO)?
Gross Internal Floor Area	79.8	79	Y
Private outdoor space	10 - 35	10	Y

41. **Schedule of accommodation for dwelling type Middle infill Block 1B 2P Flat Type F x 8**

Room	Floor area (sq. m)	Minimum floor area requirement (sq. m)	Complies (YES/NO)?
Lounge/Dining/Kitchen	23.1	24	N (-0.9)
Double bedroom	11.5	12	N (-0.5)
Bathroom	4.4	3.5	Y
Built-in storage	1.9	1	Y
Dwelling	Area (sq. m)	Minimum area requirement (sq. m)	Complies (YES/NO)?
Gross Internal Floor Area	51.6	50	Y
Private outdoor space	4	10	N (-6)

42. **Schedule of accommodation for dwelling type 1B2P Flat (Floors 4th and 5th) Type D x16**

Room	Floor area (sq. m)	Minimum floor area requirement	Complies (YES/NO)?
------	--------------------	--------------------------------	--------------------

		(sq. m)	
Lounge Dining Kitchen	23.7	24	N (- 0.3)
Double bedroom	12.8	12	Y
Bathroom	4.2	3.5	Y
Built-in storage	2.6	1.5	Y
Dwelling	Area (sq. m)	Minimum area requirement (sq. m)	Complies YES/NO)?
Gross Internal Floor Area	51.4	51	Y
Private outdoor space	4	10	N (6)

43. **Schedule of accommodation for dwelling type 1B1P Flat Type A x2**

Room	Floor area (sq. m)	Minimum floor area requirement (sq. m)	Complies (YES/NO)?
Lounge Dining Kitchen	N/A	N/A	N/A
Double bedroom	N/A	N/A	Y
Bathroom	3.8	3.5	Y
Built-in storage	1.0	1.	Y
Dwelling	Area (sq. m)	Minimum area requirement (sq. m)	Complies (YES/NO)?
Gross Internal Floor Area	40.4	39	Y
Private outdoor space	4.4	10	N (6)

44. As these schedules show, all flat types would provide overall accommodation of a compliant size, with minor shortfalls in respect of some of the individual room sizes. Each flat is logically laid out, with the principal living spaces benefiting from access onto a terrace or balcony. All rooms are practically-shaped and each flat incorporates adequate built-in storage and private amenity space.

Daylight and sunlight within the proposed development

45. Within the proposed maisonettes all of the kitchens, living/dining spaces and bedrooms achieve the recommended value of 2% Average Daylight Factor (ADF). The majority of the flats achieve the recommended Vertical Sky Component (VSC) and No Sky Line (NSL) values. The units on the first, second and third floors on the central infill connecting the two buildings will experience some lower ADF values with the kitchen /dining / living spaces do not achieve the suggested value of 2 %. However, they all achieve a minimum of at least 1.5% which is the recommendation for living/dining rooms. Some of these rooms (units 3, 6 and 9) achieve NSL values slightly below the minimum target of 80%. However 70% of their area achieves a direct view of the sky which for the urban context, is considered acceptable. The bedrooms of these units would also not meet the recommended values of 1% and range between 0.6% and 0.7%. Given these are bedrooms the shortfall may be acceptable.
46. Overall, the proposed units achieve reasonable lighting levels as 83 % of the tested rooms achieved or exceed the recommended values. The results of the sunlight assessment show that 5 of the 32 windows tested failed the annual probable sunlight hours. It is considered that within the context this would be acceptable.

Design, layout and heritage

47. The proposed end pavilions (block ends) step down by a storey and have an asymmetric pitched roof form. The design is successful in mitigating the general scale of the buildings and marking the ends of each block. The infill between the two blocks is also successful.
48. The proposed additional two storeys at the top of the buildings would have an asymmetric pitched roof form and are 'castellated' with in sets to break up overall mass. They are clad in red zinc to match the tone of the red brick host buildings below.
49. The asymmetric slightly picturesque roof forms and the castellations soften the otherwise quite tough and utilitarian metal facades. However, this approach is notably more successful on the rear facades where the extension is set back slightly. Along the front elevations, balconies with heavy and solid metal balustrades project forward, hide the castellations behind and result in a top heavy appearance. The balconies would be subject to conditions in

respect of their detailing.

50. The central circulation core of each block is also projected upwards to serve the new floors. These do not have the benefit of being able to be set back from the original façade below and as a result appear somewhat over dominant. Cladding these in brick up to the height of the existing buildings would be an improvement. and a specific materials condition is suggested...
51. There are no heritage assets affected by the proposed development.

Landscaping and trees

52. The landscape plan shows the removal of category B street trees T12 T14, (Maple and Lime) together with an on site category B tree (Cherry). A CAVAT calculation has been made taking account of the 7 small trees proposed within the site on Nelldale Road. The proposal is therefore required to make a contribution of £22,643 to be secured via a Section 106. This will mitigate against the loss of canopy cover via planting elsewhere in the vicinity, potentially as part of the landscaping proposed within the redevelopment of the Abbeyfield Estate.

Outdoor amenity space, children's play space

53. The proposal would not be able to provide any additional communal space. The proposed landscaping of the site is confined to providing an improved planting area from the pavement to the front of the building and a small area behind the infill block where it is proposed to have a small grass space, cycle stores and general storage sheds. The area to the rear of the blocks has already been used to provide gardens for the existing ground floor flats so the provision of communal amenity space or play space is limited.
54. As the majority of units are 1 bed the child yield is too low to require a play space contribution. The 2 bed units would have private space of at least 10 sq metres and it is noted that Southwark Park is a short distance away.
55. The amenity space shortfall is 50sq metres plus 27.6 square metres (77.6sq m). This would equate to a payment of £15,908 for improving public open space near the development.

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

Outlook and sense of enclosure

56. By reason of the footprint of the additional storeys at both Antony and Roderick House matching the footprint of the existing blocks, the new development would not oversail any of the existing flats on the lower floors. Therefore, the outlook and sense of openness currently experienced within these flats would remain largely unaffected by the proposed development.

57. There would be an impact to those units that currently have a window located within the side elevations of the existing buildings, as the new build element would adjoin the existing building with any existing windows would be required to be filled in and relocated. This has been raised by residents but would not affect many properties and the harm to the amenity is not considered to be substantial as the rooms affected would still have a window opening albeit relocated from the side elevation to the front elevation
58. Bradley House to the north west has is a 'Y' shaped block set in a large area of green space. The configuration of this block means that the proposal would not have a significant impact upon outlook by virtue of the habitable windows having views directed away from Antony and Roderick House.
59. 30 Abbeyfield Road lies on the eastern boundary behind Antony House. The outlook from the property is north east at the front and south west to the rear. The windows to the rear closest to Antony and Roderick House will certainly be more aware of the increase in height and this will be more apparent within the garden, however the building is already impacted by these larger blocks and it is not considered that this impact would be significant enough to warrant refusing the application.
60. 57 and 59 Raymouth Road lie on the south west boundary with no. 57 located on the boundary with Roderick House, like 30 Abbeyfield Road the outlook for these properties are south westerly to the front and north easterly to the rear. The impact from the proposal will be more obvious to the rear of these properties, but as with Abbeyfield Road this would not be considered significant.
61. The properties most sensitive to increased sense of enclosure are nos. 2 to 7 (consecutive) Mossington Gardens. This group of 2 storey houses have their front entrances to the north west facing Roderick and Antony House and the existing gap separating the two blocks. The infilling of the gap rather than the additional storeys will have the biggest impact upon the front aspect of these dwellings, as the gap currently offers relief and views through, for the middle dwellings, in particular nos. 4, 5 and 6.
62. However, due to their orientation the rear of the dwellings (2-7 Mossington Gardens) have their aspect away from the blocks and would not be impacted in regard to outlook and enclosure.

Daylight and sunlight

63. The daylight testing undertaken shows that in respect of Bradley House, and nos 57 and 61 Raymouth Road and Abbeyfield House the proposed development would still receive good levels of daylight compliant with the Building Research Establishment (BRE) Guidance. One window within the proposed new development known as Abbeyfield House would fail the BRE test resulting in 0.51 of its former value, largely due to the window being set back from the existing recessed walls. The room affected is a proposed ground floor living /dining room, which was already obstructed by the existing

flank of Antony House. It is accepted that the proposal would further reduce the levels of light received to this room. However this is due to the orientation and configuration of the proposed Abbeyfield House development. On balance, given the built up urban location the harm to the proposed new living/dining room is not considered so significant such that would warrant refusal of the application.



64. In respect of Mossington Gardens, twelve of the nineteen windows surveyed have a current VSC of 27 or more. As a result of the proposed development all of the windows would fail to meet the BRE guidance with the values falling below 27 or just below 0.8 times the current value. Notwithstanding the resulting VSC generally retains good levels of light with the difference no less than 0.67 of the original value and VSC values of a minimum of 14.5 with the majority of these exceeding 20.
65. Due to the proximity and differences in height of the dwellings on Mossington Gardens to the existing Antony and Roderick House blocks, only a limited amount of access to skyviews was possible to a few of the centrally located houses. The proposal would infill this gap, thus removing any skyviews previously available to these dwellings.
66. Sunlight is assessed only by main windows within 90 degrees of due south. Bradley House has some windows which may be affected but these appear to serve bathrooms.
67. Overall whilst it is acknowledged that there will be some impact to the adjoining buildings, in particular those properties in Mossington Gardens, the level of harm to residential amenity would not be so harmful such that would warrant a refusal of planning permission.

Transport issues

68. Saved Policy 5.2 'Transport Impacts' states that planning permission will be granted for development unless there is an adverse impact on the transport network. Saved Policy 5.3 'Walking and Cycling' requires that provision is made for pedestrians and cyclists within the development and Saved Policies 5.6 and 5.7 relate to car parking. Strategic Policy 2 'Sustainable Transport' of the Core Strategy re-asserts the commitment to encouraging walking, cycling and use of public transport rather than travel by car and requiring transport

assessments with applications to show that schemes minimise their impacts, minimise car parking and maximise cycle parking to provide as many sustainable transport options as possible. The main issues to consider in this case are considered to be in relation to car parking, in particular provision for disabled parking, cycle parking, access and servicing. These matters are addressed below

69. The public transport accessibility level for the site is good and it is within short walking distance of Bermondsey Tube Station and bus routes on Southwark Park Road.

Car Parking

70. The proposed development would be car free. The area is likely to be subject of a CPZ in 2020, and does have relatively good public transport accessibility. The 'car free' nature of the scheme is supported by officers and Transport for London. A condition would be required on any grant of permission to ensure that future residents of the additional 30 flats are, with the exception of blue badge holders, exempt from obtaining on-street parking permits. With this in place, the additional new units would not add strain to local on-street car .

Car Club

71. The nearest car club locations are on Lynton Road, approximately 800 metres from the site. There are further car club bays located about 1 kilometre away. The applicant would be required to fund three years car club membership for the first occupant of each residential unit by a proposed planning obligation.

Cycle Parking

72. Cycle storage would be provided to the land at the rear infill section of the development that would link the two blocks. It is proposed to provide 48 spaces, under the GLA guidance there is a requirement for 42 bicycle storage spaces. It is envisaged that the additional 16 spaces will be available for use by the other residents.
73. It is noted that the proposal is for the cycle storage to be provided would be a Josta two tiered stacking system. Under the new Southwark Plan and the Draft London Plan there is a requirement to include at least 25% of the storage by using Sheffield type stands. It is considered that it would be possible to include 6 Sheffield stands and it is suggested that a condition is added to address this issue.

Refuse, recycling and servicing

74. Three new refuse and recycling stores are proposed for the existing and proposed residents. The ground floor dwellings for both blocks will each have street side bin stores fronting onto Nelldale Road. Within the centre of the site a shared secure store for the remaining units to access. This would largely meet the walking distances to refuse stores, although for the end units would

have to walk beyond the recommended 30 metre distance. The servicing will take place within the site as currently exists.

Energy and sustainability

75. An energy and sustainability statement is submitted with the report, this sets out how the proposal would reduce CO₂ omissions in line with the London Plan. It is proposed to reduce CO₂ emissions to 36.73 % over current Part L Building Regulations 2013. A carbon off-set payment for the remaining 63.27% would be £51,138.

Noise

Inter-dwelling noise disturbance

76. The proposed build on top units would sit above the existing flats, the layout of which would not achieve vertical stacking with the existing dwellings below. In order to mitigate against this it is recommended that conditions be imposed.

Noise disturbance

77. The proposed development would introduce new dwellings to the side, infilling and above the two existing buildings. Noise generated by domestic activities is not considered that existing nearby occupiers would not be subject to undue noise disturbance as a result of the occupation of the proposed new dwellings.

Construction noise and disturbance

78. Local residents have raised concerns that the construction and refurbishment phases will impact on their amenity. With regard to noise, it is inevitable that there will be some disruption and disturbance during the works. It is also recognised that works of the kind proposed are likely to raise level of dust and particulate matter unless there are suitable control measures. These impacts would, however, be for a temporary period and must be balanced with the long-term benefit brought by the provision of additional homes in the borough.
79. In the interests of minimising impacts from noise and dust, it is recommended that a construction management plan be submitted and approved prior to commencement. This will also set out how working practices will uphold health and safety for local residents, ensuring the site is kept clean and well-maintained.

Air quality

80. An air quality report submitted with the application has concluded that the proposal would not give rise to air quality issues from construction. Further it is not considered that building mitigation is required. The council's Environmental Protection Officer has assessed the report and has agreed the recommendations.

Ground conditions and contamination

81. A standard condition is recommended in respect of site contamination.

Water resources and flood risk

82. The development lies within Flood Risk Zone 3 and is therefore at risk from flooding in the event of a breach in the Thames flood defences.
83. The accommodation affected would be the maisonettes on the eastern and western wings of the building. Whilst the FRA originally suggested that the finished floor levels be raised by 2.48m and 2.29m respectively, this was when the proposal had a studio unit on the ground floor. The current scheme would have bedrooms on the first floor and as such the Environment Agency have raised no objections subject to conditions.

Archaeology

84. The application site is not within an Archaeological Priority Zone (APZ). The site was previously occupied by terraced housing, as shown on the historic map series until the 1930s, but suffered extensive bomb damage during the London Blitz in the Second World War. The construction of the terrace housing, combined with the subsequent development phases will have had a significant impact on the potential archaeological resource. The Greater London Historic Environment Record does not have any entries for the site or the surrounding study area, the nearest heritage asset is the former Clare College mission church.
85. Appraisal of this planning application using the Greater London Historic Environment Record (GLHER) and information submitted with the application indicates that, in this instance, it can be concluded that the archaeological resource will not be compromised by these small-scale works. No further archaeological assessment, fieldwork or conditions are required in consideration of this application.

Planning obligations (S.106 undertaking or agreement)

86.	<p style="text-align: center;">Planning obligation</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Mitigation</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Applicant's position</p>
Housing, Viability and Amenity Space			
	Affordable (85% intermediate and 15% social rent) housing	Proposal would provide an entirely intermediate scheme.	Agreed

Provision		
Viability review	Standard	
Wheelchair housing provision	£68,000	Agreed
Outdoor amenity space	£15,908	Agreed
Transport and Highways		
Highway works	Making good public footpath around the site	Agreed
Car club scheme	Membership for eligible residents of new dwellings	Agreed
Parking permit restriction	For forthcoming CPZ	
Energy, Sustainability and the Environment		
Carbon offset fund	£51,138	Agreed
Precautionary tree loss offset	£22,643	Agreed
Administration fee	Payment to cover the costs of monitoring these necessary planning obligations calculated as 2% of total sum.	Agreed

87. Should a Section 106 Agreement not be completed, there would be no mechanism in place to avoid or mitigate the impact of the proposed development in relation to the provision of the infrastructure which would be necessary to mitigate the impacts of the development. As noted above the council will not complete the s106 for the reason that the affordable housing is not considered to be acceptable for reasons identified elsewhere in this report. In the absence of a completed s106 the proposal would be contrary to Saved policy 2.5 Planning obligations of the Southwark Plan 2007 and Strategic Policy 14 Implementation of the Core Strategy, and Policy 8.2 Planning obligations of the London Plan 2016, and should be refused for this reason.

Mayoral and borough community infrastructure levy (CIL)

88. The proposal is exempt from both Mayoral and Southwark CIL as it would provide a 100% intermediate housing product.

Community involvement and engagement

89. The applicant has submitted a statement of community involvement setting out the meetings and open event held with local residents prior to submitting the planning application.

Consultation responses, and how the application addresses the concerns raised

Consultation responses from members of the public

90. Summarised below are the material planning considerations raised by members of the public.

A total of 7 have been received, with two from the same address

91. Principle of development and proposed land uses:
- Do not consider development necessary with empty 23 storey block adjoining site
92. Affordable housing and viability:
- This is a money making scheme and would not provide the needed social housing.
93. Quality of accommodation and provision of private/communal outdoor space:
- Object to the removal and repositioning of windows on the flank wall of the buildings.
94. Neighbour amenity impacts:
- Loss of community feel
 - Impact upon local services, schools, GP's etc
95. Transport, parking, highways, deliveries and servicing matters:
- Increased parking problems
96. Environmental impact during the construction phase (noise, dust and dirt etc.):
- Disruption will be unacceptable there are people who do not work

standard 9-5 hours as well as pensioners who will have to endure construction

97. Other matters:

- Contrary to objectives of original builder Charles Gomm
- Changes will not benefit existing residents
- Proposal will create a conflict/divide between the existing and new residents.
- Do not trust the developer

98. These matters are addressed comprehensively in the relevant preceding parts of this report.

Consultation responses from internal and divisional consultees

99. Summarised below are the material planning considerations raised by internal and divisional consultees, along with the officer's response.

100. Environmental Protection Team:

- No objections subject to conditions.

Officer response to issue(s) raised:
Noted.

101. Design and Conservation Team:

- No objections recommend conditions.

Officer response to issue(s) raised:

Noted.

Consultation responses from external consultees

102. Summarised below are the material planning considerations raised by external consultees, along with the officer's response.

103. Environment Agency:

- No objection to the proposed scheme, suggested conditions.

Officer response to issue(s) raised:

Noted.

104. Metropolitan Police:

- Have met with the applicant and believe the scheme can achieve

Secure by Design accreditation subject to a condition.

Officer response to issue(s) raised:

Noted.

105. These matters are addressed comprehensively in the relevant preceding parts of this report.

Community impact and equalities assessment

106. The council must not act in a way which is incompatible with rights contained within the European Convention of Human Rights

107. The council has given due regard to the above needs and rights where relevant or engaged throughout the course of determining this application.

108. The Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) contained in Section 149 (1) of the Equality Act 2010 imposes a duty on public authorities to have, in the exercise of their functions, due regard to three "needs" which are central to the aims of the Act:

1. The need to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct prohibited by the Act.
2. The need to advance equality of opportunity between persons sharing a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. This involves having due regard to the need to:
 - Remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic
 - Take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it
 - Encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low
3. The need to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not share it. This involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to tackle prejudice and promote understanding.

109. The protected characteristics are: race, age, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, disability, sexual orientation, religion or belief, sex, marriage and civil partnership.

Human rights implications

110. 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.
111. This application has the legitimate aim of providing new housing. 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.

Positive and proactive statement

112. The council has published its development plan and core strategy on its website together with advice about how applications are considered and the information that needs to be submitted to ensure timely consideration of an application. Applicants are advised that planning law requires applications to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
113. The council provides a pre-application advice service that is available to all applicants in order to assist applicants in formulating proposals that are in accordance with the development plan and core strategy and submissions that are in accordance with the application requirements.

114. Positive and proactive engagement: summary table

Was the pre-application service used for this application?	YES
If the pre-application service was used for this application, was the advice given followed?	YES
Was the application validated promptly?	YES
If necessary/appropriate, did the case officer seek amendments to the scheme to improve its prospects of achieving approval?	YES
To help secure a timely decision, did the case officer submit their recommendation in advance of the statutory determination date?	NO

Other matters

115. None.

CONCLUSION

116. Particular regard was had to the impacts of the development and to the contribution of the scheme to its local context. It was considered that the

tenure mix of housing was acceptable given the existing units within the two blocks. The provision of a scheme with a solely intermediate housing product was justified by reference to the financial viability assessment that was submitted.

117. The proposal would provide 15% of habitable rooms within the development for social rent, which is in line with the New Southwark Plan Policy P4.
118. Whilst the development will have some impact on the amenities of existing occupiers, particularly on Mossington Close, the scheme is not considered to result in harm to amenities as to justify refusal; despite some impacts arising in relation to sunlight and daylight this is considered to be within acceptable tolerances for this urban location.
119. The proposal is therefore recommended for approval subject to a Section 106 Agreement and the suggested conditions.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Site history file: H24 Application file: 18/AP/4195 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: 0207 525 5434 Council website: www.southwark.gov.uk

APPENDICES

(Note: To follow under a separate cover)

No.	Title
Appendix 1	Consultation undertaken
Appendix 2	Consultation responses received
Appendix 3	Relevant planning history
Appendix 4	Recommendation

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Simon Bevan, Director of Planning	
Report Author	Glenn Ruane, Planning Officer	
Version	Final	
Dated	30 September 2020	
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		5 October 2020