

Contents

RECOMMENDATIONS	2
BACKGROUND INFORMATION.....	2
Site location and description	2
Details of proposal	3
Consultation responses from members of the public and local groups	3
Planning history	3
Planning history of the site and adjoining or nearby sites.....	4
KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION	4
Summary of main issues	4
Legal context	5
Planning policy.....	5
ASSESSMENT	5
Principle of the proposed development in terms of land use	5
Impact on the openness of MOL.....	6
Design.....	7
Impact of proposed development on amenity of adjoining occupiers	8
Environmental considerations.....	8
Ecology	8
Flood Risk.....	8
Transport	8
Consultation responses from external and statutory consultees	9
Consultation responses from internal consultees	9
Community impact statement / Equalities Assessment	9
Human rights implications.....	10
Positive and proactive statement.....	10
CONCLUSION	11
BACKGROUND INFORMATION.....	11
BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS.....	11
APPENDICES	11
AUDIT TRAIL	12
Appendix 1: Recommendation.....	13
Appendix 2: Planning policy.....	16
Appendix 3: Consultation undertaken	18
Appendix 4: Consultation responses received.....	20

Item No. 7.1	Classification: Open	Date: 16 March 2021	Meeting Name: Planning Sub-Committee A
Report title:	Development Management planning application: Application 20/AP/2949 for: Planning Permission Address: THE PAVILLION, 65 GREEN DALE, LONDON, SOUTHWARK SE5 8JZ Proposal: Construction of an additional floor to provide an increase in nursery (D1 use class) floor space.		
Ward(s) or groups affected:	Champion Hill		
From:	Director of Planning		
Application Start Date	12/10/2020	Application Expiry Date	07/12/2020
Earliest Decision Date	19/02/2021		

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That planning permission is granted, subject to conditions.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Site location and description

2. The application site is the Mother Goose Nursery at 65 Green Dale (E(f) use class).
3. The site area is 1756sqm and is occupied by single-storey building (247sqm) set back from the road. The building is surrounded by various outdoor play spaces and sheds and an area of hardstanding at the front. At the rear is a wildlife garden. The entire site is surrounded by a 2.7m tall mesh fence.
4. The site is bound by:
 - 44 Wanley Road, a four-storey residential block to the north
 - 17 Wanley Road, a three-storey residential block to the north east
 - Greendale Play Field Metropolitan Open Land to the east and south
 - 73-79 Green Dale, comprising of two semi-detached pairs of two-storey residential dwellings to the west.

Details of proposal

5. The proposal is to install an extension to introduce a first floor to the rear part of the building, which is currently single storey with a flat roof. The extension would have a pitched green roof. It is also proposed to add a section of green roof to the existing building. The measurements of the proposed extension are as follows:
6. The proposed measurements of the extension are as follows:
 - Maximum height of 3.6m (total height from ground level would be 6.9m)
 - Maximum depth of 11.3m (full building depth)
 - Maximum width of 12.0m (full building width)
 - Materials to consist of timber cladding to walls, a green roof, four double glazed windows, and three roof lights.
7. The existing ground floor area is 276sqm and includes:
 - 66sqm staff space (staff room, office, toilets and storage space)
 - 108sqm pre-school space (3-5 years)
 - 35sqm toddler space (2-3 years)
 - 34sqm baby space (0-2 years)
8. The proposal would provide 92sqm of new floor space on the first floor, increasing the total educational floor space within the building to 368sqm. All first floor space would be for staff use and storage. The proposal would result in an increase in pre-school space on the ground floor to 132sqm (24sqm additional space), allowing an additional 9 children to attend the nursery and bringing the maximum pupil number to 68.

Consultation responses from members of the public and local groups

9. Details of consultation and any re-consultation undertaken in respect of this application are set out in Appendix 2.
10. One public objection was received to the application. The objection raises the following points, which have been addressed in the associated paragraphs:
 - Inappropriate use of Metropolitan Open Land
 - Impact on amenity including from noise, traffic and loss of privacy.

Planning history

11. The planning history of the site is as follows:

Reference: 08/AP/1143

Description: Extension to existing children's nursery comprising ground floor extensions.

Status: Granted.

Reference: 07/AP/1971

Description: Erection of a two-storey rear extension (incorporating the shed and disused water tower) to provide additional accommodation for existing nursery.

Status: Refused and dismissed at appeal.

Reference: 07/AP/0492

Description: Erection of single storey extensions across the full width of the rear (south elevation) and front (north elevation) and extension of the existing first floor to provide additional accommodation for the existing nursery; together with an increase in parking to the front from 5 spaces to 8 spaces.

Status: Withdrawn.

Reference: 96/254B

Description: Change of use from sports changing facility to children's nursery.

Status: Granted.

12. Application 07/AP/1971 went to appeal and was dismissed. The Inspector found the development to be inappropriate in the MOL and considered that the benefits offered by the removal of the water tower and internal improvements to the nursery were not enough to outweigh the harm to the openness of the MOL. This is a significant material consideration though since this decision, the context of the site has changed which is explained below.

Planning history of the site and adjoining or nearby sites

13. 44 Wanley Road London SE5 8AT

Reference: 12/AP/1630

Description: Demolition of disused public house and construction of a part two/part three/part four storey block of 20 flats comprising 6 x one bed, 10 x two beds, 4 x three beds, together with associated amenity space, 9 car parking bays and 26 cycle parking spaces

Status: Granted

14. This development which is not on MOL has been completed and is behind the nursery when seen from Green Dale. It changed the setting of the nursery site in relation to the MOL.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Summary of main issues

15. The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:
 - a) Principle of the proposed development in terms of land use
 - b) Design
 - c) Impact of proposed development on amenity of adjoining occupiers
 - d) Environmental considerations
 - e) Transport
 - f) Community impact and equalities assessment
 - g) Human rights, and

- h) Positive and proactive statement.

Legal context

16. 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. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires decision-makers determining planning applications for development within Conservation Areas to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. Section 66 of the Act also requires the Authority to pay special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings and their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess.
17. 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

18. The statutory development plans for the Borough comprise the London Plan 2021, Southwark Core Strategy 2011, and saved policies from The Southwark Plan (2007 - July). The National Planning Policy Framework (2019) and emerging policies constitute material considerations but are not part of the statutory development plan. A list of policies which are relevant to this application is provided at Appendix 1. Any policies, which are particularly relevant to the consideration of this application, are highlighted in the report.
19. The site is located within:
- Flood Zone 1 (low risk)
 - A Critical Drainage Area
 - Greendale Playing Fields Metropolitan Open Land.

ASSESSMENT

Principle of the proposed development in terms of land use

20. The proposal would create additional educational establishment floor space. In terms of land use saved policy 2.3 (Enhancement of Educational Establishments) of the Southwark Plan 2007, states:

‘Planning permission for a change of use from D class educational establishments will not be granted unless:

- i) Similar or enhanced provision within the catchment area is secured; and

- ii) Opportunities are taken wherever possible to ensure that provision is made to enable the facility to be used by all members of the community.'
21. The proposal is also located within Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) and Saved policy 3.25 (Metropolitan Open Land (MOL)) of the Southwark Plan 2007 states:
- There is a general presumption against inappropriate development on Metropolitan Open Land. Within Metropolitan Open Land, planning permission will only be permitted for appropriate development which is considered to be for the following purposes:
- i) Agriculture and forestry or
 - ii) Essential facilities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation, for cemeteries, and for other uses of land which preserve the openness of MOL and which do not conflict with the purposes of including land within MOL; or
 - iii) Extension of or alteration to an existing dwelling, providing that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building; or
 - iv) Replacement of an existing dwelling, providing that the new dwelling is not materially larger than the dwelling that it replaces.
22. Both the London Plan and the NPPF provide a high degree of protection on MOL and Green Belt respectively. The London Plan directs that Green Belt Policies apply to MOL and says proposals that would harm MOL should be refused. The NPPF says inappropriate development is by definition harmful to Green Belt (and in this case MOL) and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. It goes on to say that very special circumstances will not exist unless the harm from inappropriateness and other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations.
23. The application site was previously used as sports changing facility. A change of use was granted on 13 June 1996 under planning application 96/254B. The site has operated as a nursery continuously since this date. Neither the NPPF nor the London Plan makes reference to the suitability of nurseries (now within E(f) use class) as a land use within MOL. However, given that the nursery is a pre-existing use within the MOL, and the application simply proposes to extend this use within the footprint of the existing building, it is not considered that this test is strictly relevant in this instance. Paragraph 145 of the NPPF allows for the extension of existing buildings without specific reference to their land use as does emerging policy P56 Open Space of the New Southwark Plan provided it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. The extension would not be seen as disproportionate and is therefore the expansion of the nursery is considered to be appropriate development on MOL.

Impact on the openness of MOL

24. The proposal is to add a first floor to the rear part of the building. The total building height at the rear would be 6.8m, which is only 1.1m higher than the highest point of the existing roof. A pitched roof would be used to minimise the bulk of the extension. The maximum width of the extension would be 12.0m, and the maximum depth would be 10.3m.
25. A previous application 07/AP/1971 was refused and dismissed at appeal for the erection of a two-storey rear extension to the building. Paragraph 11 of the appeal decision states that: 'In terms of views from the residential area to the north and west, the bulk and increased height of the proposed upper floor will result in failure to maintain the openness of this part of the Metropolitan Open Land.'
26. However, since that decision was issued, application 12/AP/1630 was granted at 44 Wanley Road for the construction of a part two/part three/part four storey block of 20 flats. This address is sited just outside of the MOL boundary. The building has been completed and has greatly increased the development bulk to the immediate north of the application site. The view of the MOL from the north is now largely blocked by the flats, and views of the application site from the south are dominated by the flats. In the view from the west and east, the taller block of flats dwarf the low scale nursery building. Although the flats are outside of the MOL boundary, the scale of that building is important in views across the open space.
27. It is also notable that there is an existing three storey block of flats to the north east of the application site. Taken cumulatively, these two buildings nearly completely block all views of the MOL from the north and north east, meaning that the sense of openness of the MOL in long views from the north is limited.
28. At the time that the appeal decision was issued for application 07/AP/1971, guidance regarding the management of Green Belt (and by association MOL) was provided within Planning Policy Guidance Note 2: Green Belts (1995). The note states in paragraph 3.4 that the construction of buildings is inappropriate unless it for specific purposes including the limited extension of existing dwellings. This guidance is quoted in paragraph 6 of the appeal decision notice as a reason for refusal. However, Planning Policy Guidance Note 2: Green Belts has now been superseded by the NPPF. So, where PPG2 allowed extensions only to dwellings, the NPPF allows, as stated within paragraph 145, 'the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building'. The proposed extension is considered to be acceptable in terms of scale, massing and bulk and would be proportionate to the original building. As previously stated, it does not increase the site coverage, and the addition of a second storey to this part of the building would not appear as a disproportionate addition.
29. The extent to which the proposed extension could be said to affect the enjoyment of the openness of the MOL is very limited. The extended building sits at the edge of the designated area, and is experienced in the context of higher and more substantial buildings in the immediate backdrop of the nursery. In long views across the open area, the nursery would be closer to the

viewer than the flats at Wanley Road, and in that sense has the potential to reduce the sense of openness. However, the extension would appear subservient in scale to the taller flats, and as such the impact would be minimised.

30. It is therefore considered that the proposed development would not impact the openness of the MOL. Overall, the proposed development would be an appropriate development on MOL.

Design

31. The proposed extension would be to a flat roof at the rear of the building. The extension would be the full width and depth of the flat roof, and would be 3.6m in height, or 6.9m in height from ground level. This maximum height would only be 1.1m higher than the highest point of the existing roof.
32. The proposed extension would use materials to match the existing, including timber cladding to the walls. It would have two small windows on the northern elevation and one window each on the eastern and southern elevations, as well as three rooflights. The extension would have a pitched green roof and would unify the existing roof slopes, improving the appearance of the building. It is also proposed to add a section of green roof to the existing building, which would further unify the proposed extension with the existing building.
33. The extension would be of an appropriate scale, bulk and massing, and would appear subservient to the existing building. The extension would therefore meet the requirements for extensions set within the Residential Design Standards SPD, and would be considered acceptable in terms of design.

Impact of proposed development on amenity of adjoining occupiers

34. Due to the minimal scale of the proposed extension, and the separation distance between the application building and all surrounding neighbouring buildings, there would not be any adverse impact on the amenity of neighbours in terms of loss of privacy, access to light, or reduce outlook or sense of openness.
35. The proposal would intensify the use of the site and would allow floorspace for 9 additional children to attend the nursery, bringing the maximum child capacity to 68. It is not considered that this increase in the number of children on site would create a noticeable increase in noise such that the amenity of neighbouring occupiers would be impacted, as the majority of child play and learning would continue to take place within the building.

Environmental considerations

Ecology

36. The proposed extension would have a green roof, and a further area of green roof is proposed on the existing flat roof of the main building. The Sustainable

Design and Construction SPD states that green roofs should be used where possible to promote biodiversity and to ease drainage.

Flood Risk

37. The application site is located in Flood Zone 1. The proposed works would take place above ground level. It is not considered that the proposed development would introduce any increased localised flood risk.

Transport

38. The application site has a PTAL rating of 3, indicating fair access to public transport. The submitted Transport Assessment shows that 75% of children travel to the nursery by cycling or walking, and that only 22% of journeys are made by car. The submitted Car Parking Survey shows that there is a negligible impact on local car parking capacity at peak nursery drop off and collection times. It is therefore not considered that the intensified nursery use that would result from the proposal would cause any significant impact to local car parking capacity.
39. The existing on site car park provides four car parking spaces for staff use only. As the proposal would introduce less than 100sqm of additional floor space, it would not be necessary to provide any new cycle parking spaces in line with Policy T5 Cycling of the London Plan. A London Cycle Network cycle path runs directly parallel to the site on Green Dale.
40. The arrangement for refuse storage would remain as existing (with bins stored in the front corner of the staff car park) and it is considered that no additional refuse storage would be required to support the proposal.

Consultation responses from external and statutory consultees

41. There was no consultation responses from external or statutory consultees received.

Consultation responses from internal consultees

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

Environmental Protection Team

43. No objection and no further requirements.
44. Noted that the site is too small to impose a construction management plan condition.

Community impact statement / Equalities Assessment

45. 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:

- a) The need to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct prohibited by the Act
 - b) 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.
 - c) 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.
46. The protected characteristics are: race, age, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, disability, sexual orientation, religion or belief, sex, marriage and civil partnership.
47. The council must not act in a way which is incompatible with rights contained within the European Convention of Human Rights
48. The council has given due regard to the above needs and rights where relevant or engaged throughout the course of determining this application. No matters pertaining to the impact of this development on people with protected characteristics have been raised through the consultation and no impact above in that detailed above in the ‘planning assessment’ is expected.
49. Throughout the consultation process no information was received to indicate that any members of the public falling under the protected characteristics would be affected by the development, and thus no specific mitigation measures are required in this regard.

Human rights implications

50. 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.
51. This application has the legitimate aim of providing a extension to a nursery. 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

52. 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.
53. 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.

54. **Positive and proactive engagement: summary table**

Was the pre-application service used for this application?	NO
If the pre-application service was used for this application, was the advice given followed?	N/A
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?	N/A
To help secure a timely decision, did the case officer submit their recommendation in advance of the statutory determination date?	YES

CONCLUSION

55. The proposal demonstrates conformity with the principles of sustainable development. It complies with current policy, respects the amenity of neighbouring properties and is of good design. Accordingly, it is recommended that planning permission be granted.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Site history file: 2137-D Application file: 20/AP/2949 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 0254 Council website: www.southwark.gov.uk

APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	Recommendation
Appendix 2	Relevant Planning policy
Appendix 3	Consultation undertaken
Appendix 4	Consultation responses received

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Simon Bevan, Director of Planning		
Report Author	Freya Cunningham, Planning Officer		
Version	Final		
Dated	25 February 2021		
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		26 February 2021	

APPENDIX 1

Recommendation

This document shows the case officer's recommended decision for the application referred to below.

This document is not a decision notice for this application.

Applicant	Mrs K Brown	Reg. Number	20/AP/2949
Application Type	Minor application	Case Number	2137-D
Recommendation	GRANT permission		

Draft of Decision Notice

Planning permission is GRANTED for the following development:

Construction of an additional floor to provide an increase in nursery (D1 use class) floor space.

The Pavillion 65 Green Dale London Southwark

In accordance with application received on 9 October 2020 and Applicant's Drawing Nos.:

Proposed Plans

PROPOSED SITE BLOCK PLAN 268 PR.00 received 12/10/2020

PROPOSED GROUND FLOOR PLAN 268 PR.01 received 12/10/2020

PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR PLAN 268 PR.02 received 12/10/2020

PROPOSED ROOF PLAN 268 PR.03 received 12/10/2020

PROPOSED NORTH AND EAST FACING ELEVATIONS 268 PR.04 received 12/10/2020

PROPOSED SOUTH AND WEST ELEVATIONS 268 PR.05 received 12/10/2020

EXISTING AND PROPOSED NORTH FACING 3D VIEWS 268 VD.03 received 12/10/2020

EXISTING AND PROPOSED SOUTH FACING 3D VISUALS 268 VD.04 received 12/10/2020

Other Documents

VIEWS FROM GREENDALE PLAYING FIELDS 268 VD.01 received 12/10/2020

VIEWS FROM WANLEY ROAD 268 VD.02 received 12/10/2020

3D VISUAL 268 VD.05 received 12/10/2020

PLANNING STATEMENT received 12/10/2020

TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT received 22/01/2021

PARKING SURVEY JANUARY 2021 received 02/02/2021

Conditions:

Permission is subject to the following Approved Plans Condition:

1. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
 - PROPOSED SITE BLOCK PLAN 268 PR.00 received 12/10/2020
 - PROPOSED GROUND FLOOR PLAN 268 PR.01 received 12/10/2020
 - PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR PLAN 268 PR.02 received 12/10/2020
 - PROPOSED ROOF PLAN 268 PR.03 received 12/10/2020
 - PROPOSED NORTH AND EAST FACING ELEVATIONS 268 PR.04 received 12/10/2020
 - PROPOSED SOUTH AND WEST ELEVATIONS 268 PR.05 received 12/10/2020
 - EXISTING AND PROPOSED NORTH FACING 3D VIEWS 268 VD.03 received 12/10/2020
 - EXISTING AND PROPOSED SOUTH FACING 3D VISUALS 268 VD.04 received 12/10/2020

Time limit for implementing this permission and the approved plans

2. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the end of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason:

As required by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended.

Permission is subject to the following Pre-Commencement Condition(s)

3. GREEN ROOFS FOR BIODIVERSITY

Before any above grade work hereby authorised begins, details of the biodiversity (green/brown) roof(s) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The biodiversity (green/brown) roof(s) shall be:

- biodiversity based with extensive substrate base (depth 80-150mm);
- laid out in accordance with agreed plans; and
- planted/seeded with an agreed mix of species within the first planting season following the practical completion of the building works (focused on wildflower planting, and no more than a maximum of 25% sedum coverage).

The biodiversity (green/brown) roof shall not be used as an amenity or sitting out space of any kind whatsoever and shall only be used in the case of essential maintenance or repair, or escape in case of emergency.

The biodiversity roof(s) shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the details so approved and shall be maintained as such thereafter.

Discharge of this condition will be granted on receiving the details of the

green/brown roof(s) and Southwark Council agreeing the submitted plans, and once the green/brown roof(s) are completed in full in accordance to the agreed plans. A post completion assessment will be required to confirm the roof has been constructed to the agreed specification.

Reason:

To ensure the development provides the maximum possible provision towards creation of habitats and valuable areas for biodiversity in accordance with: Policies 2.18 (Green Infrastructure: the Multifunctional Network of Green and Open Spaces), 5.3 (Sustainable Design and Construction), 5.10 (Urban Greening) and 5.11 (Green Roofs and Development Site Environs) of the London Plan 2016; Strategic Policy 11 (Design and Conservation) of the Core Strategy 2011, and; Saved Policy 3.28 (Biodiversity) of the Southwark Plan 2007.

Permission is subject to the following Compliance Condition(s)

4. MATERIALS TO BE AS SPECIFIED

The materials to be used in the implementation of this permission shall not be otherwise than as described and specified in the application and on the drawings hereby approved unless the prior written consent of the local planning authority has been obtained for any proposed change or variation.

Reason:

To ensure that the new works blend in with the existing building in the interest of the design and appearance of the building in accordance with: the National Planning Policy Framework 2019; Strategic Policy 12 (Design and Conservation) of the Core Strategy 2011, and; Saved Policies 3.12 (Quality in Design) and 3.13 (Urban Design) of the Southwark Plan 2007.

Planning Policy

Planning Policies

National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework):

- Chapter 2 Achieving sustainable development
- Chapter 8 Promoting healthy and safe communities
- Chapter 12 Achieving well-designed places
- Chapter 15 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

London Plan 2021:

- Policy S1 Developing London's social infrastructure
- Policy S3 Education and childcare facilities
- Policy D4 Delivering good design
- Policy G3 Metropolitan Open Land
- Policy T5 Cycling

Core Strategy 2011:

- Strategic Policy 1 Sustainable development
- Strategic Policy 4 Places for learning, enjoyment and healthy lifestyles
- 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:

- Policy 3.2 Protection of amenity
- Policy 3.12 Quality in design
- Policy 3.13 Urban design
- Policy 3.25 Metropolitan open land (MOL)
- Policy 3.28 Biodiversity

Supplementary Planning Documents:

2015 Technical Update to the Residential Design Standards SPD 2011
The Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (2008)

Emerging planning policy

New Southwark Plan

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 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.

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 takes place in order to support the soundness of the Plan. Consultation on the Proposed Changes to the Submitted New Southwark Plan and additional evidence base documents started in August until 2 November 2020.

The Examination in Public (EiP) is expected to take place in early 2021 and the amendments within the Proposed Changes to the Submitted New Southwark Plan will be considered along with the consultation responses received at each stage of public consultation. It is anticipated that the plan will be adopted later in 2021 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 Undertaken

Site notice date: n/a.

Press notice date: n/a.

Case officer site visit date: n/a

Neighbour consultation letters sent: 20/10/2020

Internal services consulted

Environmental Protection

Re-consultation Letters to Internal Consultees: None

Statutory and non-statutory organisations

n/a

Neighbour and local groups consulted:

Apartment 12 67 Green Dale London
Apartment 10 67 Green Dale London
Apartment 9 67 Green Dale London
Apartment 6 67 Green Dale London
Apartment 4 67 Green Dale London
Apartment 1 67 Green Dale London
Apartment 11 67 Green Dale London
Apartment 20 67 Green Dale London
Apartment 7 67 Green Dale London
Apartment 2 67 Green Dale London
Apartment 3 67 Green Dale London
Apartment 18 67 Green Dale London
Apartment 14 67 Green Dale London
Apartment 8 67 Green Dale London
Apartment 5 67 Green Dale London
Apartment 19 67 Green Dale London
Apartment 17 67 Green Dale London
Apartment 16 67 Green Dale London
Apartment 15 67 Green Dale London
Apartment 13 67 Green Dale London
69 Dylways London Southwark
67 Dylways London Southwark
87 Dylways London Southwark
79 Dylways London Southwark
71 Dylways London Southwark
65 Dylways London Southwark
85 Dylways London Southwark
83 Dylways London Southwark

81 Dylways London Southwark
77 Dylways London Southwark
75 Dylways London Southwark
73 Dylways London Southwark
63 Dylways London Southwark
61 Dylways London Southwark

Re-consultation:

Re-consultation Letters to Neighbours and Local Groups: 22/01/2021

Consultation responses received

Internal services

Environmental Protection - No objection or further requirements.

Statutory and non-statutory organisations

n/a

Neighbour and local groups consulted:

Inappropriate use of Metropolitan Open Land

Impact on amenity including from noise, traffic and loss of privacy.