

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| RECOMMENDATION..... | 3 |
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | 3 |
| BACKGROUND INFORMATION..... | 4 |
| Site location and description | 4 |
| The surrounding area..... | 4 |
| Details of proposal | 5 |
| Planning history..... | 5 |
| KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION..... | 5 |
| Summary of main issues..... | 5 |
| Legal context..... | 6 |
| Planning policy | 6 |
| Consultation responses from members of the public | 9 |
| ASSESSMENT | 11 |
| Principle of the proposed development in terms of land use..... | 11 |
| Tenure mix, affordable housing and viability | 12 |
| Dwelling mix including wheelchair housing | 13 |
| Density | 13 |
| Quality of residential accommodation | 13 |
| Design, layout, heritage assets and impact on borough and London views..... | 18 |
| Transport..... | 19 |
| Landscaping, trees, outdoor amenity space and children’s play space..... | 19 |
| Impact of proposed development on amenity of adjoining occupiers and surrounding area | 20 |
| Noise and vibration | 24 |
| Energy and sustainability | 24 |
| Ecology and biodiversity | 24 |
| Air quality | 25 |
| Ground conditions and contamination..... | 25 |
| Water resources and flood risk..... | 25 |
| Planning obligations (S.106 undertaking or agreement) | 26 |
| Mayoral and borough community infrastructure levy (CIL)..... | 28 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Community involvement and engagement | 28 |
| Consultation responses from internal and divisional consultees | 28 |
| Consultation responses from external consultees..... | 29 |
| Community impact and equalities assessment | 29 |
| Human rights implications | 30 |
| Positive and proactive statement | 30 |
| Positive and proactive engagement: summary table..... | 31 |
| Other matters | 31 |
| Conclusion | 31 |
| BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS..... | 32 |
| APPENDICES | 32 |
| AUDIT TRAIL | 33 |

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|----------------------------------|--|
| Item No. 7.1 | Classification: Open | Date: 17 November 2020 | Meeting Name: Planning Sub-committee A |
| Report title: | Development Management planning application: Application 20/AP/1390 for: Full Planning Application Address: SOUTHWARK PARK DAY CENTRE 345 SOUTHWARK PARK ROAD LONDON SOUTHWARK SE16 2JN Proposal: Full planning permission for the demolition of 345 Southwark Park Road and all site preparation works, for a residential-led mixed use development comprising 22 new social rent homes and 24 new private homes (containing a mix of 1, 2 and 3 bedroom apartments), associated cycle and wheelchair car parking, 340 sqm flexible ground floor office and community use floorspace (B1/D1); associated hard and soft landscaping and public realm works. | | |
| Ward(s) or groups affected: | North Bermondsey | | |
| From: | Director of Planning | | |
| Application Start Date | 20/05/2020 | Application Expiry Date | 19/08/2020 |
| Earliest Decision Date | 07/10/2020 | | |

RECOMMENDATION

1. a) That the application is granted subject to conditions and the completion of a s106 agreement.
- b) In the event that the s106 agreement is not completed by the 1 February 2021 that the director of planning be authorised to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in paragraph 93 of this report.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. The application is for a part six, part seven-storey building that would provide a flexible use (B1 office/D1 community use) at ground floor and 46 residential units above. 22 of the dwellings would be provided as affordable social rented units and 24 units for private sale.
3. The proposal would not result in any significant amenity impacts on the

surrounding properties in terms of daylight, sunlight or overlooking. In terms of the scale of the building it is considered appropriate in scale given the stand alone site on a corner with open space surrounding it. The proposal would also not result in any significant transport impacts.

Overall the proposed development would be consistent with the relevant planning policies and would help provide new homes of which a significant proportion would be affordable homes. As such subject to the imposition of conditions and the agreement of a S106 the proposal is considered acceptable and planning permission is recommended to be granted.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Site location and description

4. The Site measures approximately 0.2 hectares in area and it comprises of a single storey brick pitched roof building, associated soft landscaping and car parking. The existing building was previously in use as a day centre (D1). It is currently disused after being vacated in 2017 and has since been under the management of Southwark Council and The Global Guardians. The site is located on the corner of Layard Road and Southwark Park Road.

The site is located within the Urban Density Zone, Flood Risk zone 3 and is within a Air Quality Management Area. There are no heritage assets within the site boundary and there are no heritage assets in the immediate context of the site. There are however a number of very large mature street trees fronting onto Southwark Park Road.

The surrounding area

5. The surrounding area is of a mixed character, with residential properties to the north along Layard's Road and to the south there is a residential terrace along Southwark Park Road. To the east of the site is a residential care home with a petrol filling station beyond that. To the east of the site is the access road leading into the Southwark Park Road Estate which consists of 4-storey residential buildings as well as the Bede Housing association office opposite.
6. The general scale of the immediate surrounding area is buildings of 3 to 4 storeys, however further to the north, east and south of the site, taller buildings are present up to 7 stories within the nearby residential estates, however much taller buildings are proposed within the 'Biscuit Factory' development to the east of the site off of Drummond Road.
7. There are two designated assets located within 200m of the Site. The Grade II listed Southwark Park School is located 150m to the north-east and the Grade II listed park and garden Southwark Park is located just beyond.

Details of proposal

8. The proposal is for a part 7, part 6 storey residential apartment block which would provide 46 homes together with flexible ground floor office and community use floorspace (B1/D1). The proposal would provide 22 social rented units alongside 24 private dwellings.
9. The development would have residential access off of Layard Road which would lead to a shared entrance lobby for all residents with two separate commercial pedestrian access points from Southwark Park Road. The proposals include provision for 102 cycle spaces. This comprises 88 for the residential component in two separate stores accessed from Layard Road and 14 spaces for the flexible community and office use. Separate refuse stores would also be provided for the commercial and residential uses.
10. Outdoor private amenity space for the residential units would be provided to the rear and side of the proposed building at ground level and Children's playspace to the rear of the site as well. Two disabled parking spaces would be provided at the rear of the site with access off of Layard Road.

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;
 - Ecology and biodiversity;
 - Air quality;
 - Water resources and flood risk;
 - Archaeology;
 - 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

16. Section 2 – Achieving sustainable development
Section 5 – Delivering a sufficient supply of homes
Section 6 – Building a strong and competitive economy
Section 7 – Ensuring the vitality of town centres
Section 8 – Promoting healthy and safe communities
Section 9 – Promoting sustainable transport
Section 11 – Making efficient use of land
Section 12 – Achieving well designed places
Section 14 – Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
Section 15 – Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
Section 16 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

London Plan 2016

17. Policy 2.9 – Inner London
Policy 2.15 - Town Centres
Policy 3.1 - Ensuring Equal Life Chances For All
Policy 3.3 - Increasing housing supply
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 3.12 - Negotiating affordable housing on individual private residential and mixed use schemes
Policy 3.16 - Protection and enhancement of social infrastructure
Policy 4.2 - Offices
Policy 4.3 - Mixed use development and offices
Policy 4.12 - Improving Opportunities for All
Policy 5.1 - Climate Change Mitigation

Policy 5.2 - Minimising Carbon Dioxide Emissions
 Policy 5.3 - Sustainable Design and Construction
 Policy 5.5 - Decentralised Energy Networks
 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 5.21 - Contaminated land
 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 7.5 - Public Realm
 Policy 7.6 - Architecture
 Policy 7.14 - Improving Air Quality
 Policy 7.15 – Reducing and managing noise, improving and enhancing the acoustic environment and promoting appropriate soundscapes
 Policy 7.19 - Biodiversity and Access to Nature
 Policy 7.21 - Trees and woodlands
 Policy 8.2 - Planning obligations

Core Strategy 2011

18. Strategic Policy 1 – Sustainable development
 Strategic Policy 2 – Sustainable transport
 Strategic Policy 4 – Places for learning, enjoyment and healthy lifestyles
 Strategic Policy 5 – Providing new homes
 Strategic Policy 6 – Homes for people on different incomes
 Strategic Policy 7 – Family homes
 Strategic Policy 10 – Jobs and businesses
 Strategic Policy 11 – Open spaces and wildlife
 Strategic Policy 12 – Design and conservation
 Strategic Policy 13 – High environmental standards

Southwark Plan 2007 (July) - saved policies

19. 1.1- Access to employment opportunities
 1.4 – Employment sites outside preferred office locations and preferred industrial locations
 2.1 – Enhancement of community facilities
 2.2 - Provision of new community facilities
 2.5 - Planning obligations
 3.2 - Protection of amenity

- 3.3 - Sustainability assessment
- 3.4 - Energy efficiency
- 3.6 - Air quality
- 3.7 - Waste reduction
- 3.9 - Water
- 3.11 - Efficient use of land
- 3.12 - Quality in design
- 3.13 - Urban design
- 3.14 - Designing out crime
- 3.28 - Biodiversity
- 4.2 - Quality of residential accommodation
- 4.3 - Mix of dwellings
- 4.4 - Affordable housing
- 4.5 - Wheelchair affordable housing
- 5.2 - Transport impacts
- 5.3 - Walking and cycling
- 5.6 - Car parking
- 5.7 - Parking standards for disabled people and the mobility impaired

Supplementary planning documents

- 20. Sustainable design and construction SPD (2009)
- Sustainability assessments SPD (2009)
- Sustainable Transport SPD (2010)
- Residential Design Standards SPD Technical Update (2015)
- Affordable housing SPD (2008 - Adopted and 2011 - Draft)
- Section 106 planning obligations and community infrastructure levy (CIL) SPD (2015)
- Development Viability SPD (2016)

Emerging planning policy

Draft New London Plan

- 21. The draft New London Plan was published on 30 November 2017 and the first and only stage of consultation closed on 2nd March 2018. Following an Examination in Public, the Mayor then issued the Intend to Publish London Plan, which was published in December 2019. 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.

The draft New London Plan is at an advanced stage. Policies contained in the Intend to Publish (ItP) London Plan published in December 2019 that are not subject to a direction by the Secretary of State carry significant weight. 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

22. For the last five 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.

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.

In April 2020 the Planning Inspectorate provided their initial comments to the New Southwark Plan Submission Version. It was recommended that a further round of consultation take place in order to support the soundness of the Plan. Consultation is due to take place on this version of the NSP between June and August 2020. The final updated version of the plan will then be considered at the Examination in Public (EiP).

It is anticipated that the plan will be adopted in late 2020 following the 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.

Consultation responses from members of the public

23. Summarised below are the material planning considerations raised by members of the public.
24. Principle of the B1/D1 use – There are a number of other empty commercial units nearby, these are not needed.
25. Transport:
- There are significant parking problems in the area, this will not be mitigated by not allowing parking permits.
 - The proposal would result in too many cars, parking is a significant problem within the area.
 - The public transport is at capacity in the area, this proposal will make things worse.

26. Design:
- The scale of the building is overbearing in the context.
 - At 7 stories the building is too tall as the adjacent buildings are 3 stories.
 - Building is much taller than all of the surrounding buildings.
 - The proposal is not sympathetic to local character.
27. Amenity
- The proposal would result in significant impacts on daylight and sunlight.
 - The submitted daylight assessment does not provide the No Sky Line analysis to assess the impacts of the proposed development in more detail. Furthermore it does not assess the impacts of the development on the amenity spaces within Southwark Park Road estate.
- Officer comment: Officers agreed with the concerns of residents in relation to the lack of information with the daylight and sunlight assessment and as such requested that further information was provided. This has been provided and will be addressed in the amenity section of the report.*
- Impact on air quality during construction.
28. Landscaping:
- Object to the removal of two mature trees fronting Southwark Park Road.
29. Other matters:
- Concerns were raised over the consultation process being undertaken during the lock down following the COVID-19 outbreak.
30. Following the submission of further information clarifying the daylight impacts, transport impacts and landscaping arrangements a further re-consultation was undertaken on 16/09/2020 and a total of seven responses were received.
31. Daylight and sunlight – Comments have been received questioning the accuracy of the submitted daylight and sunlight addendum as they note that the top floor of the property at no.326 Southwark Park have not been assessed as they are not vertical windows.
- Officer response: This response is noted and additional information was requested from the applicants to assess these windows. The results of this note that both would pass the VSC test with VSC's of over 27. Whilst it is noted that these rooms would fail the NSL test, these derogations are minor with a ratio of 0.69 of their former value. Given the high VSC result, overall it is considered that these windows would receive a good quality of daylight.*
32. A response also notes that the daylight report outlines that some rooms within the property at 326 Southwark Park Road are deeper than 5m, however again the comments outline that this is not the case.
- Officer comment: This response is noted and additional information was requested from the applicants to assess these windows. The response notes that this was a narrative error within the report rather than the calculations*

which did use the depths for the bedrooms as outlined in the objection.

33. A response also notes there are only 2 houses that are disproportionately impacted upon as a result of the development and as such these occupiers of these properties are discriminated against.

Officer comment: When assessing daylight and sunlight impacts, the BRE guidance is principally It is noted that the two properties on Southwark Park Road are impacted upon beyond the BRE guidance, however it is the officer's opinion that these windows would still receive good access to daylight when considering the location within a central London location with VSC levels in excess of 20. Furthermore, the BRE guidance is clear that it should be applied flexibly as developments do not always 100% comply with this guidance. This is covered in more detail below.

34. Overbearing Design: Comments note that they still consider the building to be overbearing in terms of scale.

Officer comment: This matter is addressed in detail in the case officer report.

35. Noise from construction: The noise would last for over 2 years during construction of the development.

Officer comment: A construction management plan condition is attached to the recommendation which will require measures to mitigate against potential construction noise.

ASSESSMENT

Principle of the proposed development in terms of land use

36. The proposal is for the redevelopment of the site for a mixed use of B1/D1 at ground floor with residential use on the upper floors. The surrounding area is generally characterised by residential uses and the existing single storey building is not an efficient use of the site, as such a residential led redevelopment of the site is acceptable on the site.

37. However, the proposal would result in the loss of the existing community floor (Class D1) if a B1 office use were to be implemented. Saved Policy 2.1 Enhancement of Community Facilities outlines that planning permission for a change of use from D class community facilities will not be granted unless:

i. The applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the LPA that the community facility is surplus to requirements of the local community and that the replacement development meets an identified need; or
ii. The applicant demonstrates that another locally accessible facility with similar or enhanced provision can meet the identified needs of the local community facility users.

38. As noted within the submission, the previous D1 use of a day-care centre has been vacant since 2017 and has been occupied by guardians since this point.

The proposal would still potentially result in the D1 use being re-provided on site; however in the event that the site would come forward as a B1 office use, it would be lost. The submission has outlined that the previous facility was surplus to requirements and as result has been empty for some time. Furthermore there are other day-care centres close by to the site including along Drummond Road and further along Southwark Park Road.

39. With regards to a potential office use, this would also be considered acceptable given the good access to public transport and would also help increase the employment on site with the submitted details outlining that the site would potentially employ between 33 and 43 people depending on the type of B1 use.
40. Overall, the proposal would provide a much improved efficiency of the site providing new commercial/community space as well as 46 new dwellings, of which 22 would be affordable social rented homes and as such the proposed development is considered appropriate in principle.

Tenure mix, affordable housing and viability

41. The proposal would provide 22 affordable units and 24 private sale units with the following split:

| Unit size | No. of Social rent | No. of intermediate (sh/ownership) | Total |
|------------------|--|---|--------------|
| 1-bedroom | 6 x 1bed, 2 person | N/A. | 6 |
| 2-bedroom | 6 x 2bed, 3person, 5 x 2bed, 3 person wheelchair units, 1 x 2bed,4person | N/A. | 12 |
| 3-bedroom | 4 x 3bed, 5person units. | N/A. | 4 |
| All units | 22 | 0 | 22 |

42. In terms of the percentage of the units that are affordable, this would equate to 47.8% which would exceed the 35% requirement for affordable housing. However it is worth noting that the Mayors Housing SPG outlines that 50% of publically owned land should be provided as affordable housing across the portfolio. In this instance, it would fall slightly below this requirement, however this is as a result of providing all wheelchair accessible housing units as social rented properties. Given the significant need for accessible social rented dwellings, this is considered to be an appropriate justification in this instance. There are a number of other Council properties located nearby to the site which are providing 100% social housing and as such the overall average across the

local portfolio would exceed the 50% requirement and thus would meet the Mayors Housing guidance.

Dwelling mix including wheelchair housing

43. The proposed mix is detailed below, however in summary, in excess of 73% of units would be 2 or more bedrooms and 21.7% would be 3 or more and as such would accord with saved policy 7 'Family Homes' and as such the mix is considered acceptable.

| Unit size | No. of open market | No. of social rent | No. of intermediate (sh/ownership) | Total |
|------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| 1-bedroom | 6 (25% of all O.M) | 6 (27.3% of all S.R) | 0 | 12 (26.19% of total) |
| 2-bedroom | 12 (50% of all O.M) | 12 (54.5% of all S.R) | 0 | 24 (52.17% of total) |
| 3-bedroom | 6 (25% of all O.M) | 4 (18.2% of all S.R) | 0 | 10 (21.74% of total) |
| All units | 24 (52.17% of total) | 22 (47.83% of total) | 0 | 46 (100%) |

44. In terms of the proposed wheelchair units, the proposal would provide 5 x units all of which would be 2-bed, 3 person units. In terms of units this would equate to 10.89% and as such would exceed the required 10%.

Density

45. The application site is approximately 0.2 hectares and the proposal would provide 136 habitable rooms. As such the proposed density would be 680 habitable rooms per hectare which would be within the urban density range of 200-700 and as such the density of the proposed development is considered appropriate.

Quality of residential accommodation

46. The proposal would provide 46 new residential dwellings, all of which would generally meet the minimum space standards, both in terms of the overall dwelling sizes and individual room sizes. Of the 46 units, the vast majority of

them would be dual aspect (34 units). All single aspect units would be west facing and as such would still have good access to both daylight and sunlight. All units would have access to outdoor amenity space with a minimum of 6sqm, however the majority of them would fall slightly below the 10sqm requirement. This is not uncommon in flatted developments and all balconies would be a good size with the remainder provided as communal amenity space, which is considered acceptable.

47.

| Schedule of accommodation for dwelling type 1B,2P | | | |
|--|---------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| Room | Floor area (sq. m) | Minimum floor area requirement (sq. m) | Complies(YES / NO)? |
| Lounge/dining/kitchen | 30 | 24 | Yes |
| Double bedroom | 12 | 12 | Yes |
| Bathroom | 4.1 | 3.5 | Yes |
| Built-in storage | 2 | 1.5 | Yes |
| Dwelling | | | |
| Gross Internal Floor Area | 51 | 50 | Yes |
| Private outdoor space | 6 | 10 | No |

48.

| Schedule of accommodation for dwelling type 2B, 3P | | | |
|---|---------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| Room | Floor area (sq. m) | Minimum floor area requirement (sq. m) | Complies(YES/NO)? |
| Lounge/Kitchen/Diner | 28 | 27 | Yes |
| Double bedroom | 13 | 12 | Yes |

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------|---|--------------------------|
| Single bedroom | 9 | 7 | Yes |
| Bathroom | 4.1 | 3.5 | Yes |
| Built-in storage | 2 | 2 | |
| Dwelling | Area (sq. m) | Minimum area requirement (sq. m) | Complies(YES/NO)? |
| Gross Internal Floor Area | 66 | 61 | Yes |
| Private outdoor space | 7 | 10 | No |

49.

| | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| Schedule of accommodation for dwelling type 2B,4P | | | |
| Room | Floor area (sq. m) | Minimum floor area requirement (sq. m) | Complies(YES/NO)? |
| Lounge/Kitchen/Diner | 28 | 27 | Yes |
| Double bedroom | 13.5 (17 Inc 3.5sqm en-suite) | 12 | Yes |
| Double bedroom | 12 | 12 | Yes |
| Bathroom | 4.5 | 3.5 | Yes |
| Built-in storage | 2 | 2 | Yes |
| Dwelling | Area (sq. m) | Minimum area requirement (sq. m) | Complies(YES/NO)? |
| Gross Internal Floor Area | 76 | 70 | Yes |
| Private outdoor space | 7.5 | 10 | No |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|

50.

| Schedule of accommodation for dwelling type 2B,3P Wheelchair unit | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| Room | Floor area (sq. m) | Minimum floor area requirement (sq. m) | Complies(YES/NO)? |
| Lounge/Kitchen/Diner | 28 | 27 | Yes |
| Double bedroom | 17 | 12 | Yes |
| Single bedroom | 10 | 7 | Yes |
| Bathroom | 6 | 4.5 | Yes |
| Built-in storage | 2 (Plus wheelchair storage) | 2 | Yes |
| Dwelling | Area (sq. m) | Minimum area requirement (sq. m) | Complies(YES/NO)? |
| Gross Internal Floor Area | 76 | 75 | Yes |
| Private outdoor space | 7.5 | 10 | No |

51.

| Schedule of accommodation for dwelling type 3B,5P Social | | | |
|---|---------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| Room | Floor area (sq. m) | Minimum floor area requirement (sq. m) | Complies(YES/NO)? |
| Lounge/Diner | 21 | 18 | Yes |
| Kitchen | 8 | 8 | Yes |

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------|---|--------------------------|
| Double bedrooms | 15.8 and 12 | 12 | Yes |
| Single bedroom | 8.6 | 7 | Yes |
| Bathroom | 4.9 | 4.5 | Yes |
| Built-in storage | 3 | 2.5 | |
| Dwelling | Area (sq. m) | Minimum area requirement (sq. m) | Complies(YES/NO)? |
| Gross Internal Floor Area | 92 | 86 | Yes |
| Private outdoor space | 11 | 10 | Yes |

52. **Schedule of accommodation for dwelling type 3B,5P private**

| Room | Floor area (sq. m) | Minimum floor area requirement (sq. m) | Complies(YES/NO)? |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| Lounge/Kitchen/Diner | 30.4 | 30 | Yes |
| Double bedroom | 15.8 and 12 | 12 | Yes |
| Single bedroom | 8.6 | 7 | Yes |
| Bathroom | 4.9 | 4.5 | Yes |
| Built-in storage | 3 | 2.5 | Yes |
| Dwelling | Area (sq. m) | Minimum area requirement (sq. m) | Complies(YES/NO)? |
| Gross Internal Floor Area | 92 | 86 | Yes |
| Private outdoor space | 11 | 10 | Yes |

Design, layout, heritage assets and impact on borough and London views

53. The proposal is for a part seven, part six-storey apartment block with either offices or community use on the ground floor. Although there are equally tall buildings in the vicinity, it is accepted that this is above the prevailing three storey streetscape along Southwark Park Road. However, the building will stand on a side of the street which is relatively open. It will also be located at a corner and at a junction into the main estate behind. The site is therefore at a point of townscape significance where a higher townscape marker could be justified. This status further reinforced by proposed the community/ commercial use of the ground floors of the building, in contrast to the private residential use of the majority of buildings along the street. In addition, large mature London plane and lime trees will partially screen the upper floors of the building and help to ease it into its surroundings.
54. The form of the building, will serve to soften its impact. To this extent, the six storey element is designed to be conspicuously smaller and less bulky than the adjoining element such that proposed building will be broken down into two very distinct parts, thus mitigating the overall bulk of the building. The parts are to be staggered relative to each other and set back from the boundaries of the site to create distinct entrance spaces to the building and to allow some separation from adjacent buildings. This separation is effective with regard to both the estate buildings along Fenner Close and the adjacent Bede Community office (a three storey early Victorian with a dramatic wedged shaped corner / chamfer onto Southwark Park Road).
55. The architecture of the building will follow the classical precepts of a base, a middle and top separated by classical plat bands. The grouping of windows in elongated vertical bands will give it an almost art-deco feel. If the detailing is followed through to completion it will produce a building of some elegance. It is noted however that the balconies of the 2b3p flats over the main south entrance will be very close to one of large street trees. The plan form of these flats should be handed to avoid this conflict.
56. The placement of the building on the site leaves space for landscaping all around it. This again will help to ease the building into the street scene. The open boundaries to the main street elevation will create more active and welcoming frontages to the commercial uses. This is supported. The high 2.5m metal railing boundary treatment to the proposed car park will need careful treatment if it is not to appear utilitarian, however details of this can be secured via condition in order to ensure that a high quality treatment is provided.
57. Overall the scale and massing is considered appropriate given the corner site location and open character of the site and surrounding area. It is accepted that the proposed building is taller than the immediately adjacent buildings but is not out of character with the wider area which has buildings of similar and larger scales, particularly given the upcoming nearby developments. The detailed design is considered to be of a high quality, subject to the submission of

material samples.

Transport

58. The site has a PTAL of 3 and is located within a Controlled Parking Zone. The development is located at approximately 850 metres from Bermondsey underground station with Jubilee line services and is located 850 metres from the Thames Path. Cycle routes are available within 700 meters.
59. Vehicle access to the two disabled bays within the site are provided on Layard Road, where the existing vehicular access is and this is considered an acceptable provision given the relatively good PTAL rating. Refuse bin locations are within 10 metres of the kerb and therefore acceptable for collection from on street. In terms of other servicing, these vehicles would access the car park area by reversing in to drop off any deliveries. Given the predominant residential use, it is not expected that there would be a significant number of servicing trips, with two servicing vehicle trips per day plus one commercial refuse collection expected. The proposal is also predicted to have approximately seven vehicular trips per day which is a low number would not impact on the traffic or highway safety within the area.
60. In terms of cycle storage, there would be 88 spaces within the cycle stores for the residential use and 14 within a separate storage area for the commercial use. The number of spaces would meet the requirements of the New London Plan, the majority of the spaces are two-tier stacker with 4 Sheffield stands, however the plans do not fully show the detailed layouts for cycle storage, as such a condition is recommended for further details to be provided. The refuse storage areas are separate for both the commercial and residential uses and would provide sufficient capacity for the proposed number of flats and commercial areas.
61. In terms of car parking, the proposal is car-free with the exception of the two disabled bays provided within the site. The site is located within a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) and as such any future occupiers with the exception of blue badge holders would be exempt from applying for parking permits. The closest area which is not subject to parking permits is over 250m to the south of the site, south of Lynton Road and given this distance, it is not expected that there would be any overspill onto on-street parking here. Furthermore, the developer will be required to provide access to a car club bay and membership for all residents for a period of 3 years, this will be secured via the S106 agreement.

Landscaping, trees, outdoor amenity space and children's play space

62. The proposed building would result in the loss of two B category Whitebeam trees, however this is more than compensated for by the proposed new planting, so that there is no loss to amenity and an overall increase in canopy cover. The initial landscape plan is broadly acceptable, however further details

will be required in terms of the detailed planting measures. Amendments have been to move the proposed location of the playspace and outdoor amenity space to make these respective spaces more useable, this is welcomed.

63. Based on the GLA's population Yield calculator, the proposal would result in the introduction of 26.5 children within the development. As such, with a requirement of 10sqm of playspace per child, there would be a total requirement of 265sqm of playspace. A total of 102sqm has been provided on site and as such there would be a shortfall of 163sqm which would be required to be off-set via a payment in lieu. The payment would be £24,613. Given the site constraints, officers are of the view that there is a need to provide a balance to ensure that there is both generous and useable communal amenity space for the overall residents as well as children's playspace are provided on site. Furthermore, given the very close access to Southwark Park and its array of facilities, in particular to cater for older children, this is considered an appropriate on-site provision.
64. The applicants have not outlined that there would be any green roofs provided within the development, however officers are of the opinion that there is scope for some green or brown roof planting within the site and as such a condition is recommended for further details to be provided.

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

Privacy and outlook

65. A number of objectors have raised concerns about the impact of the development on surrounding properties in terms of overlooking and the subsequent impacts on the privacy of the surrounding residents. The Council's residential design standards SPD outlines that habitable windows should be 12m in distance when across a road or 21m away from existing habitable windows in other situations.
66. To the north of the site lies Fenner Close and habitable windows would be approximately 17.8m away from the closest windows within the proposed development. It is acknowledged that this distance is below the normally required 21m, however the two blocks are separated by an estate access road and car park and as such, officers are of the view that the 12m requirement for overlooking is most relevant here. As the distances would exceed this requirement officers are satisfied that there would not be any significant overlooking into this block.
67. To the east of the site lies the Bede Housing estate offices and as such these are not within a residential use. The distance from the habitable windows within the proposed development to the office building would be approximately 10.2m across the access road, however given that the use opposite is not residential it is not considered that there would be any undue overlooking as a result of the development.

68. To the northeast of the site lies the Southwark Park Road Estate, however all windows within the development would exceed 21m and be at an oblique angle and as such it is not considered that there would be any undue overlooking here. To the South of the site across, the properties on the opposite side of Southwark Road would be approximately 23m from the proposed habitable windows and as such it would significantly exceed the 12m requirement.

Daylight Impacts:

69. A daylight and sunlight report based on the BRE guidance has been provided, and the following daylight tests have been undertaken:
- Vertical Sky Component (VSC) is the amount of skylight reaching a window expressed as a percentage. The guidance recommends that the windows of neighbouring properties achieve a VSC of at least 27%, and notes that if the VSC is reduced to no less than 0.8 times its former value (i.e. 20% reduction) following the construction of a development, then the reduction will not be noticeable.
 - No-Sky Line (NSL) is the area of a room at desk height that can see the sky. The guidance suggests that the NSL should not be reduced to less than 0.8 times its former value (i.e. no more than a 20% reduction). This is also known as daylight distribution, and where windows do not pass the VSC test the NSL test can be used.

Fenner Close:

70. The initially submitted daylight assessment assessed the VSC for the 33 facing windows within Fenner Close, of these, 12 windows would not meet the VSC levels within the BRE guidance. Of these windows that fail the VSC test, they would all retain relatively high VSC levels of 22.86-26.13 which does outline that the windows would still receive a decent access to daylight.
71. Nonetheless, officers agreed with comments from residents that the No Sky Line (NSL) test should have been undertaken where layouts are known and an addendum to the daylight assessment was subsequently provided. The addendum looks at 6 rooms facing the application site which had windows within, which did not meet the VSC test. Of these 6 rooms 5 would pass the NSL test, with only one bedroom failing the NSL test. This room failed marginally with 0.76 of its former value. Whilst it is accepted that there would be a noticeable impact on this room, it would still receive adequate access to daylight when considering its urban location. Furthermore, the room which is affected relates to a bedroom and as such principally used for sleeping. On balance the impacts on these properties is thus acceptable.

Bede Housing association offices:

72. The Bede office is located to the east of the site and has a number of side

windows facing the site. The BRE guidance outlines that offices are not as important in terms of daylight as residential buildings, however the applicants have tested the impact of the development on the windows here. Of the 14 windows tested here 4 would pass the BRE guidance with the remaining windows having VSCs of 17.92-20.86 remaining. Again these windows would still have a relatively good access to daylight in an urban context such as this and as such the impacts here are considered acceptable and would not impact on the usability of the office space.

314-330 Southwark Park Road

73. These properties are all located to the southern side of the proposed development on the opposite side of Southwark Park Road. All of the windows within 314-320 Southwark Park Road would pass the VSC test, all retaining VSC levels in excess of 27 or the resultant impacts would be less than 20% reduction in VSC. For the properties within 322-324 of the 36 tested, 18 would pass the VSC test with the remaining windows all receiving VSC levels of 24 which would only marginally fall below the required level of 27, as such it is not considered that there would be any significant impacts on daylight on these two properties.
74. In relation to the impacts on 326-328 Southwark Park Road, of the 10 windows tested here, all of them would very marginally fail to meet the VSC test, however VSCs would be retained between 24.02 and 26.08 and as such would still have good access to daylight. Looking to the NSL test, the submitted daylight addendum notes that of the 3 rooms within 326 Southwark Park Road, two of the 3 bedrooms would pass the NSL test with the remaining room would marginally fail with an NSL level of 0.71 of its former value.
75. Looking at no.328, the ground floor bedroom within 328A would fail to meet the NSL test as it would marginally fall below the required 0.8 of its formal value (0.75) however the room within no.328B would pass the NSL test. With regards to No 330 all but three windows would meet the VSC test, however again these would have VSC's in excess of 24. Furthermore they appear to all serve one room and overall would not see a significant loss of daylight in the room as a whole. Overall whilst there are a couple of minor digressions here it is not considered that these would be sufficient to warrant the refusal of the planning application.

13-17 Benwick Close

76. All of the windows within these properties would meet the VSC tests and would not see a significant impact in terms of daylight in that regard. The applicants were also able to obtain layouts of no's 13, 16 and 19 Benwick Close and as such were able to undertake the NSL test in which again, all rooms would meet the required standards.

Bluegrove Care Home

77. A total of 25 windows within the adjacent care home have been tested for potential daylight impacts. Of these 25, two windows would fail to meet the BRE standards, however both would retain VSC values of 18 and 19.9 and as such would still benefit from a decent access to daylight. Both windows would also relate to bedrooms for the residents within the care home which, as noted, are principally used for sleeping. Overall the impacts here are thus considered acceptable.

Sunlight Impacts

78. This is measured by the Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH) test. This should be considered for all windows facing within 90 degrees of due south (windows outside of this orientation do not receive direct sunlight in the UK). The guidance advises that windows should receive at least 25% APSH, with 5% of this total being enjoyed during the winter months. If a window receives less than 25% of the APSH or less than 5% of the APSH during winter, and is reduced to less than 0.8 times its former value during either period and has a reduction in sunlight received over the whole year of greater than 4%, then sunlight to the building may be adversely affected.
79. In terms of the impacts on the properties within Fenner Close, all windows would receive in excess of 25% of the APSH and 5% winter sunlight and thus would pass this test. Looking at the Bluegrove Care Home, all of the windows that are located within 90 degrees of south of the development site would pass the APSH test. The only windows which would see a reduction in sunlight are located within the Bede Housing Association office, however as the windows serve an office, it is considered that these are less important and the impact on these windows in terms of sunlight would not be considered significant.

Impacts on amenity areas

80. Adjacent to the development there are some areas of green public space and gardens. In accordance with the BRE guidance, to ensure that the development does not have an adverse impact these amenity areas, 50% of that area should receive at least two hours of sunlight on 21st March. In terms of impacts from the development, all amenity areas for the properties within Fenner Close and the amenity areas for the Southwark Park Road estate would receive in excess of 2 hours of sunlight.
81. The only surrounding residential amenity areas that would not receive 2 hours of sunlight are the front gardens of the properties along Southwark Park Road, however given the northerly orientation, they already fail to receive 2 hours of sunlight and as such the proposed building would not have an impact on this. There is a small courtyard within the Bede Housing Association office which however would see an impact on the amount of sun received within its amenity area, however again, given that this is an office use, the amenity area is

generally unlikely to be used throughout the day and as such these impacts are considered acceptable.

82. Overall, the proposed building would have some impacts in terms of daylight and sunlight on the surrounding properties, however officers are of the view that these are not significant as all properties would still retain good access to daylight when considering the urban location.

Noise and vibration

83. The environmental protection team has been consulted on the application and they have reviewed the submitted noise impact assessment. Conditions are recommended in relation to internal noise levels for the dwellings, plant noise as well as a condition to ensure that sufficient insulation between the commercial and residential uses is provided.
84. Subject to a limitation on the commercial/community uses hours of operations, it is also not considered that there would be any significant impact as a result of these uses on the future occupiers of the site or the residents within the existing properties surrounding the site. This is secured by condition.

Energy and sustainability

85. The applicants have provided an energy statement which demonstrates that there would be a energy saving of 35.1% above the building regulations for the residential element of the proposal and 36.2% for the commercial element. As such this meets the minimum on site savings as required by the London Plan, however the remainder of the carbon off-set up to a 100% saving above Building regulations is required to be off-set via a financial contribution of £58,694.
86. In terms of BREEAM, The applicants have provided BREEAM pre-assessment which has outlined that the project is capable of achieving an excellent rating. The Core Strategy requires that new commercial premises should meet an excellent rating and community uses meet the very good rating. As such, it is considered that the proposal can achieve the appropriate rating as required within the Core Strategy and as such it is recommended that a condition is applied to outline how this rating will be achieved.

Ecology and biodiversity

87. The applicants have provided an ecology report and subsequent bat emergence study which has been reviewed by the Council's Ecologist. The Ecologist has outlined that there would not be any significant impacts on the ecology within the site subject to mitigation. They have outlined that conditions are required for further details to include details of bat bricks and swift bricks to be provided on site. These have been included on the recommendation.

Air quality

88. The applicants have provided an Air Quality Assessment which included an Air Quality Neutral assessment and this has been reviewed by the Councils Environmental Protection team. The submitted report finds that the site is not impacted by unacceptable air quality and that the development meets air quality neutral standards. As such the proposal is acceptable in terms of Air Quality. Some concerns have been received from residents about the short term air quality impacts during construction, and it is proposed to include a construction management plan condition to ensure that the applicants provide further details of how this can be mitigated against during the construction period.

Ground conditions and contamination

89. The applicants have provided a ground contamination survey and remediation strategy which have been reviewed by the Councils Environmental Protection team who have confirmed that the findings and remediation strategy are acceptable. They have recommended a condition that requires a verification report that the remediation strategy has been undertaken and a note that if any further contaminants are found during the site works that this would be required to be reported to EPT.

Water resources and flood risk

90. The site is located in Flood Zone 3, benefiting from River Thames flood defences, and is within a modelled breach zone anticipated in the event of a failure of the flood defences. The applicants have provided a flood risk and drainage statement which outlines that the more vulnerable (residential) uses are located on the upper floors above the modelled breach levels. On this basis, the Environment Agency has not objected to the proposed development.
91. With regards to the drainage strategy, the Councils flood and drainage team were satisfied with the proposed drainage strategy, however they requested further details of the attenuation units and details of the permeable paving that would be provided. These details were subsequently provided and there is no objection on that basis. A compliance condition is recommended to ensure that these details are adhered to during construction.

Planning obligations (S.106 undertaking or agreement)

92. The required obligations to be secured through the S106 agreement are identified with the table below.

| Planning obligation | Mitigation | Applicant's position |
|---|---|----------------------|
| Housing, Viability and Amenity Space | | |
| Affordable (social rent and intermediate) housing Provision | Deliver 22 units as affordable social rented units. The following units are to be affordable: | Agreed |
| Viability review | N/A. | |
| Wheelchair housing provision | Deliver 5 wheelchair accessible units. Then following units are to be wheelchair units: 2, 10, 18, 26, 34 | Agreed |
| Playspace | £24,613 | Agreed |
| Transport and Highways | | |
| Highway works | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Repave the entire footway including new kerbing fronting the development on Southwark Park Road and Layard Road using materials in accordance to Southwark's Streetscape Design Manual - SSDM (precast concrete slabs and 150mm wide granite kerbs). o Upgrade the existing vehicle crossover on Layard Road in accordance to SSDM standards. o Provide a side raised entry | Agreed |

| | | |
|--|--|--------|
| | <p>treatment on Layard Road junction with Southwark Park Road in accordance to SSDM standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Provide dropped kerbs for refuse collection. o Refresh road markings following kerb installation. o Dedicate the strip of land that will be formed between the widening of the footway and the current public highway boundary as public highway. o Repair any damages to the public highway as a result of the construction of the development. | |
| Car club scheme | Provide one space nearby and free Car Club Membership (for new residents for a period of three years) | Agreed |
| Restriction on the release of the wheelchair parking spaces | Yes | Agreed |
| Parking permit restriction | Yes | Agreed |
| Energy, Sustainability and the Environment | | |
| Connection to (or futureproofing for connection to) district CHP | If one becomes available. | N/A. |
| Carbon offset fund | £58,694 | Agreed |
| Administration fee | Payment to cover the costs of monitoring these necessary planning obligations calculated as 2% of total sum. | Agreed |

93. However, if in the event that the legal agreement is not completed by 01/02/2021, that the director of planning be directed to refuse planning permission on the following grounds:

In the absence of a signed legal agreement, the proposal would fail to provide suitable mitigation in terms of planning gain, contrary to saved policies 2.5 (Planning Obligations) and 4.4 of the Southwark Plan, policies SP6 (Homes for people on different incomes) and SP14 (Implementation and Delivery) of the LB Southwark Core Strategy 2011 policies 3.11 (Affordable Housing Targets) and 8.2 (Planning Obligations) of the London Plan 2016, and Sections 4. Decision-making and 5. Delivering a sufficient supply of homes of the NPPF 2019.

Mayoral and borough community infrastructure levy (CIL)

94. Section 143 of the Localism Act states that any financial contribution received as 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.
95. 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 to support growth. The site is located with Southwark CIL Zone 2 and thus would have a contribution of £218 per square metre.

Community involvement and engagement

96. The applicants have provided a statement of community involvement and an engagement summary in accordance with the Councils Development Charter. The documents set out the consultation undertaken with local stakeholders and public consultation undertaken with the surrounding residents.
97. In summary, they note that their engagement included holding a series of one-to-one meetings with key stakeholders to explain the proposals and to receive feedback as well as holding a three one-day public exhibitions held in January and a further two one-day exhibitions held in March 2020 to give people the opportunity to view the plans and discuss the proposals with the Applicant and the project team that was attended by approximately 20 people. The report also outlines that meetings were held with local ward Councillors. A follow up meeting was also held with Ward Councillors during the application process.

Consultation responses from internal and divisional consultees

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

99. Environmental Protection Team:
- No objections subject to conditions on noise, contamination and construction management.

Officer response to issue(s) raised: Conditions Included within the recommendation.

100. Design and Conservation Team:
- Comments included within the main body of the report.
101. Flood Risk Management Team:
- No objections, however requested further information on the drainage strategy. This has subsequently been provided and no concerns raised.
102. Ecologist:
- No objections subject to conditions on bat and bird boxes.

Consultation responses from external consultees

103. Summarised below are the material planning considerations raised by external consultees, along with the officer's response.
104. Environment Agency:
- Raised no objection to the proposal
105. Thames Water:
- Raised no objection to the proposal.
106. Metropolitan Police:
- No objections subject to the development meeting secure by design

Officer response to issue(s) raised: A condition has been included requiring further details to meet the secure by design requirements.

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

Community impact and equalities assessment

108. The council must not act in a way which is incompatible with rights contained within the European Convention of Human Rights
109. The council has given due regard to the above needs and rights where relevant or engaged throughout the course of determining this application.
110. 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.
111. 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

112. 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.
113. This application has the legitimate aim of providing a new mixed use commercial and residential building. 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.
114. One objection outlines that the impacts of the proposal would have a detrimental impact of a residents in terms of mental health due to an impact on privacy. As noted within the report, the application generally meets all of the required distances to surrounding properties and as such would not result in any undue overlooking or loss of privacy.

Positive and proactive statement

115. 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.

116. 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.

117. **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? | YES |

Other matters

118. None identified.

Conclusion

119. Overall the proposed development would provide the welcome redevelopment of a site which is currently underused and would help provide 46 new homes, including 22 new social rented homes which would help meet the significant housing need within Southwark.

120. The principle of the proposed development is considered appropriate with the re-provision of a community space or office accommodation with residential above. Whilst it is acknowledged that the building would be larger and taller than the surrounding buildings its plot is uniquely located on an open corner site which allows for a taller building. Overall it is not considered out of context when considering the wider area and would result in a high quality design.

121. The proposal would result in some minor digressions in terms of daylight but overall would retain very good light levels within the surrounding buildings and there would not be any significant impacts in terms of overlooking or loss of privacy.

122. Furthermore, it is not considered that there would be any significant impacts on the transport network given the relatively low number of vehicular trips predicted and the fact the site lies within a CPZ and thus residents parking can be controlled through restricting access to permits.
123. To conclude the proposal would provide a much more efficient use of the site providing value new homes and as such it is recommended that planning permission is granted subject to conditions and the completion of a S106 agreement.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

| Background Papers | Held At | Contact |
|--|--|--|
| Southwark Local Development Framework and Development Plan Documents | Place and Wellbeing 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 0254 Council website: www.southwark.gov.uk |

APPENDICES

| 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 | Alexander Cameron, Team Leader | |
| 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 | | 29 October 2020 |