



COMMUNITY COUNCILS
A voice for your community



Borough and Bankside Community Council Planning Agenda

Date: Monday 21st November 2005

Time: 9.15pm

**Place: The Cathedral School of St. Saviour & St. Mary Overie,
Redcross Way, Southwark London SE1 1TD**

- 1. Welcome and introductions**
- 2. Apologies**
- 3. Notification of any items which the Chair deems urgent**
- 4. Disclosure of Members' interests and dispensations**

Matters from the previous meeting

None

5. Development Control Items

Planning Applications for Decision:

**Item 1/1 – Full planning permission: Former St Michael's Church
site Lant Street SE1**

**Item 1/2 - Full planning permission: 12 Whitehorse Mews,
Westminster Bridge Road SE1 7QD**

8. Closing comments by Chair

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Borough and Bankside Community Council Membership

Daniel McCarthy (Chair)
Dr Abdur-Rahman Olayiwola (Vice Chair)
Catriona Moore
Mark Pursey
Richard Thomas
Lorraine Zuleta

Carers' Allowances

If you are a Southwark resident and have paid someone to look after your children, or an elderly dependant or a dependant with disabilities, so that you can attend this meeting, you may claim an allowance from the Council. Please collect a claim form from the clerk at the meeting.

Deputations

For information on deputations please ask the clerk for the relevant hand-out.

Exclusion of Press and Public

The following motion should be moved, seconded and approved if the Community Council wishes to exclude the press and public to deal with reports revealing exempt information.

“That the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of information as defined in paragraphs 1-15, Access to Information Procedure Rules of the Constitution.”

Transport Assistance for Disabled Members of the Public

Members of the public with a disability who wish to attend Community Council meetings and who require transport assistance in order to access the meeting, are requested to call the meeting clerk at the number below to give his/her contact and address details. The clerk will arrange for a driver to collect the person and provide return transport after the meeting. There will be no charge to the person collected. Please note that it is necessary to call the clerk as far in advance as possible, at least three working days before the meeting.

Wheelchair access

Wheelchair access to the venue is available through the main entrance to the hall

For further information, please contact the Borough and Bankside Community Council clerk:

Beverley Olamijulo
Phone: 0207 525 7234
E-mail: Beverley.olamijulo@southwark.gov.uk
Council Website: www.southwark.gov.uk

Language Needs

If you want information on the Community Councils translated into your language please telephone 020 7525 57514

To inform us of any special needs or requirements, such as transport or signer/interpreter, please telephone 020 752 57514

আপনি যদি আপনার ভাষায় কমিউনিটি কাউন্সিল সম্বন্ধে তথ্য চান তাহলে অনুগ্রহ করে 020 7525 0640 নম্বরে টেলিফোন করুন

কোন বিশেষ প্রয়োজন সম্বন্ধে যদি আমাদের জানাতে চান যেমন ট্রান্সপোর্ট অথবা সংকেত দ্বারা অনুবাদক/ইন্টারপ্রেটার তাহলে 020 7525 0640 নম্বরে টেলিফোন করুন

Bengali

Kendi dilinizde Toplum meclisleri hakkında bilgi almak için 020 7525 7514'nolu telefonu arayınız.

Özel gereksinimlerinizi bize bildirmek için 020 7525 7514'nolu telefonu çeviriniz.

Turkish

Haddii aad doonayso warbixin ku saabsan qoraalka Kawnsalkada Bulshada oo ku turjuman af Soomaali fadlan tilifoon u dir 020 7525 7514

Si aad noogu sheegto haddii aad leedahay baahi gaar ama wax gooni kuu ah sida gaadiid, af celiyaha dadka indha la' fadlan tilifooni 020 7525 7514

Somali

如果你需要有關社區委員會的訊息翻譯成中文，請致電提出要求，號碼：020 7525 0640

欲想通知我們你有的特別需求或需要，例如接送車輛或手語/傳譯員，請致電通知，號碼：020 7525 0640

Chinese

Se voce quiser informações nos conselhos comunitários traduzidas em sua língua por favor ligue para 020 7525 7514

Para-nos informar de quaisquer necessidades especiais ou requisitos , tipo transporte, linguagem dos sinais/ intérprete, por favor ligue para 020 7525 7514.

Portuguese

Si vous désirez avoir l'information sur les Conseils de la Communauté (Community Councils) traduite en votre langue téléphonez SVP au 020 7525 7514 Pour nous informer de tout besoin ou condition spéciale, telles que le transport ou le signataire / interprète, téléphonez SVP au 020 7525 7514

French

Si precisa información traducida a su idioma, sobre los concejos del Comunidad (Community Councils) por favor llame al número de teléfono 020 7525 7514 Si tiene necesidades o requisitos específicos, como es el transporte especial o un intérprete, por favor llame al número de teléfono 020 7525 7514

Spanish

Lati bēre fun itumọ irohin nipa Council agbegbe re (Community Council) ni ede abini rẹ, jọwọ pe telifoonu 020 7525 7514.

Yoruba

Item No.	Classification Open	Date: 21 November 2005	Meeting Name: Borough and Bankside Community Council
Report title:		Development Control	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		Cathedrals	
From:		Strategic Director of Regeneration	

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the determination of planning applications, or formal observations and comments, the instigation of enforcement action and the receipt of the reports included in the attached items be considered.
2. That the decisions made on the planning applications be subject to the conditions and/or made for the reasons set out in the attached reports unless otherwise stated.
3. That where reasons for decisions or conditions are not included or not as included in the reports relating to an individual item, they be clearly specified.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

4. The Council's powers to consider planning committee business detailed in Article 8 under Role and Functions of the Committee which were agreed by the Constitutional Meeting of the Council on 24th February 2003. This function was delegated to the Planning Committee.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

5. Members are asked to determine the attached applications in respect of site(s) within the borough.
6. Each of the following items are preceded by a map showing the location of the land/property to which the report relates. Following the report, there is a draft decision notice detailing the officer's recommendation indicating approval or refusal. Where a refusal is recommended the draft decision notice will detail the reasons for such refusal.
7. Applicants have the right to appeal to the Secretary of State for the Environment against a refusal of planning permission and against any condition imposed as part of permission. If the appeal is dealt with by public inquiry then fees may be incurred through employing Counsel to present the Council's case. The employment of Counsel is generally limited to complex inquiries or for very major proposals.

8. The sanctioning of enforcement action can also involve costs such as process serving, Court costs and of legal representation.
9. Where either party is felt to have acted unreasonably in an appeal involving a public inquiry or informal hearing the inspector can make an award of costs against the offending party.
10. All legal/Counsel fees and costs as well as awards of costs against the Council are borne by the Regeneration budget.

EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGES ON THOSE AFFECTED

11. **Equal opportunities considerations are contained within each item.**

SUPPLEMENTARY ADVICE FROM OTHER OFFICERS

Borough Solicitor & Secretary

12. A resolution to grant planning permission shall mean that the Development & Building Control Manager is authorised to grant planning permission. The resolution does not itself constitute the permission and only the formal document authorised by the Committee and issued under the signature of the Development & Building Control Manager shall constitute a planning permission.
13. **A resolution to grant planning permission subject to legal agreement shall mean that the Development & Building Control Manager is authorised to issue a planning permission subject to the applicant and any other necessary party entering into a written agreement in a form of words prepared by the Borough Solicitor and Secretary, and which is satisfactory to the Development & Building Control Manager. Developers meet the Council's legal costs of such agreements. Such an agreement shall be entered into under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 or under another appropriate enactment as shall be determined by the Borough Solicitor and Secretary. The planning permission will not be issued unless such an agreement is completed.**
14. Section 70 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 requires the Council to have regard to the provisions of the development plan, so far as material to the application, and to any other material considerations when dealing with applications for planning permission. Section 54A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 provides that where, in making any determination under the planning Acts, regard is to be had to the development plan, the determination shall be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan is currently the Southwark Unitary Development Plan adopted by the Council in July 1995.

15. Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 introduced the concept of planning obligations. Planning obligations may take the form of planning agreements or unilateral undertakings and may be entered into by any person who has an interest in land in the area of a local planning authority. Planning obligations may only:

1. restrict the development or use of the land;
2. require operations or activities to be carried out in, on, under or over the land;
3. require the land to be used in any specified way; or
4. require payments to be made to the local planning authority on a specified date or dates or periodically.

Planning obligations are enforceable by the planning authority against the person who gives the original obligation and/or their successor/s.

16. Government policy on planning obligations is contained in the Department of the Environment's circular 1/97. Provisions of legal agreements must fairly and reasonably relate to the provisions of the Development Plan and to planning considerations affecting the land. The obligation must also be such as a reasonable planning authority, duly appreciating its statutory duties, can properly impose, i.e. it must not be so unreasonable that no reasonable authority could have imposed it. Before resolving to grant planning permission subject to a legal agreement Members should therefore satisfy themselves that the subject matter of the proposed agreement will meet these tests.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Council Assembly Agenda 29 th May 2002	Constitutional Support Services, Southwark Town Hall, Peckham Road SE5 8UB	Beverley Olamijulo 020 7525 7222

APPENDIX 1

Audit Trail

<i>Lead Officer</i>	Deborah Holmes, Borough Solicitor & Secretary	
Report Author	Glen Egan, Assistant Borough Solicitor Beverley Olamijulo, Constitutional Support Officer (Executive)	
Version	Final	
Dated	11/02/03	
Key Decision	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / EXECUTIVE MEMBER		
<i>Officer Title</i>	Comments Sought	Comments included
Glen Egan Asst Borough Solicitor & Secretary	No	Yes
Paul Evans Strategic Director of Regeneration	No	No
Anne Lippitt Interim Development & Building Control Manager	No	Yes

ITEMS ON AGENDA OF THE BOROUGH AND BANKSIDE CC

on Monday 21 November 2005

Appl. Type Full Planning Permission
Site Former St Michael's Church site, Lant Street SE1

Reg. No. 05-AP-0872
TP No. TP/1460-D
Ward Cathedrals
Officer Karli Flood

Recommendation GRANT SUBJECT TO LEGAL AGREEMENT

Item 1/1

Proposal

Erection of a five storey and a part six part seven storey building with ground floor link and fourth floor access bridge link to provide a nursery at ground floor level with 16 flats above and 15 basement car parking spaces with lift access from Trundle Street. (Modified version of previously approved scheme).

Appl. Type Full Planning Permission
Site 12 Whitehorse Mews, Westminster Bridge Road SE1 7QD

Reg. No. 05-AP-1185
TP No. TP/1334-37
Ward Cathedrals
Officer Susannah Pettit

Recommendation GRANT

Item 1/2

Proposal

Erection of an extra storey to existing building to provide additional office accommodation.

Item No.	Classification	Decision Level	Date
1	OPEN	COMMUNITY COUNCIL	21/11/2005
From DEVELOPMENT & BUILDING CONTROL MANAGER		Title of Report DEVELOPMENT CONTROL	
Proposal (05-AP-0872) Erection of a five storey and a part six part seven storey building with ground floor link and fourth floor access bridge link to provide a nursery at ground floor level with 16 flats above and 15 basement car parking spaces with lift access from Trundle Street. (Modified version of previously approved scheme).		Address Former St Michael's Church site, Lant Street SE1 Ward Cathedrals	

PURPOSE

- 1 To consider the above application which is for Committee consideration because of the number of neighbour letters received and the fact that the proposal is linked to the funding for the refurbishment of St George the Martyr Church.

RECOMMENDATION

- 2 Grant permission subject to the signing of a legal agreement to secure the transfer of additional money on top of what has already been paid by the developer pursuant to the S106 agreement that is linked to the previous planning permission (02-AP-0603) and released to the church at an appropriate time to be spent on the refurbishment of St George the Martyr.

BACKGROUND

- 3 The application site is a rectangular shaped property that has a frontage to the north side of Lant Street and is bounded to the north and west by Trundle Street. The site is relatively flat and is surrounded by properties that are developed and used for a variety of different purposes. Immediately to the east is Trundle House, which is a three storey block of flats. To the north is the Mint Street Park and to the west, across Trundle Street is a single storey prefabricated building used as a youth club. To the north west is a four storey warehouse building. Opposite the site, on the south side of Lant Street are three and four storey buildings used for a mixture of commercial and residential purposes.
- 4 The site currently has planning permission (02-AP-0603) for two new buildings - a five storey building comprising a nursery on the ground floor with flats on the upper floors with roof terraces and a six storey building comprising an office on the ground floor and lower ground floors with flats above and roof terraces. There are 16 flats in total that are proposed in both buildings. The proposed development also has a basement car park with the provision of 10 car spaces.

- 5 Both the approved buildings would have a modern, predominantly glazed design and will be linked by glazed walkways from first to fourth floor level and there will be an internal courtyard between them. The uppermost floor of the five storey building would be recessed and a shallow roof terrace will be formed around the edge of the building. A balustrade will be constructed around the roof of the six storey building and access will be possible onto this roof area via external stairwell areas.
- 6 This scheme was approved on the 29th October, 2004 and was also subject to the signing of a legal agreement to secure the transfer of money equivalent to the cost of 4 affordable housing units to the Council, with this money then to be released to the church at an appropriate time to be spent on the refurbishment of St George the Martyr.
- 7 Before the site was cleared, a church and attached two storey hall occupied the land. Application 02-AP-0603 was submitted jointly by the Diocese of Southwark and Squarefoot Properties. Supporting information submitted with the application indicated that the proposal is linked to the refurbishment and enlargement of the crypt at St George the Martyr Church (StGM) in Borough High Street, a Grade II* Listed Building, approximately 350m to the east of the site.
- 8 The church has been able to obtain a Heritage Lottery Fund grant of £2 million for the works to StGM. The total cost of the works is estimated at £3.2 million and the remaining amount will be generated from the sale of the application site with planning permission. The church have entered into a legal agreement to ensure that the money generated from this development will be spent on StGM.
- 9 The Council granted planning permission for external alterations to StGM in connection with the crypt and renovation works in May 2002. The rest of the proposal is covered by the ecclesiastical exemptions in the planning legislation. The works to StGM have since commenced and the amount specified in the S106 agreement has been paid by the developer.
- 10 This scheme that is currently under consideration, is largely identical to that already approved in terms of scale, mass, footprint, materials and finishes, and the number of units, but with the following alterations:
- 11 Built form, height and scale:
 - one of the buildings on the site would be five storeys and the other building would be six and seven storeys which are provided with a ground floor link and a fourth floor access bridge link;
 - relative footprints of the two buildings have been adjusted to provide a range of flat types and sizes;
 - the elevations, will be very similar to the previously approved scheme, with the exception of rearranging the window locations to reflect the internal floor plans;
- 12 Internal arrangement:
 - The previously approved scheme proposed primarily 2 bed flats of similar sizes, whereas this scheme proposes 1, 2 and 3 bed flats;
 - the internal arrangement has been altered to omit double and triple heights, voids and vertical circulation, resulting in an increase in overall accommodation floor areas. The approved scheme: 1, 380m² over 16 units; this scheme: 1, 468m² over

16 units;

13 Basement Level:

- the basement car park will be lowered further into the ground in order to construct a full basement, rather than a semi-basement;
- the basement will provide 15 car parking spaces rather than 10 car parking spaces and B1 offices;
- the vehicle ramp access to the basement carpark has been revised to car lift access.

14 Ground Floor Use:

- the entire ground floor will be used as a nursery as opposed to a nursery being used for half the floor area and two B1 offices occupying the other half;
- the B1 offices have been omitted entirely.

15 Sixth Floor:

- a roof terrace is still proposed at sixth floor level of the west building, however, rather than two undercover access stairwell areas at sixth floor (as approved), part of Apartment 16 and also a lift area, external kitchen and external shower area with the remaining roof area to remain as a communal terrace for residents of the development. The setbacks of Apartment 16 from the building edge are similar to the 2 stairwells of the approved scheme.

It should be noted that construction is currently taking place for the development of this proposed application rather than the approved scheme.

FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION

Main Issues

- 16 The main issues in this case are the acceptability of the proposed changes to the approved proposal on this site in terms of:
- the omission of the office uses and increase in floor space for the nursery;
 - whether the proposed buildings and external alterations to them (particularly at sixth floor level) are in keeping with the street;
 - the impact on the amenities of the occupiers of surrounding properties;
 - the appropriateness of the basement car park area.

Planning Policy

- 17 Southwark Unitary Development Plan 1995 [UDP]:
R.2.2 - Planning Agreements
E.1.1 Safety and Security in the Environment
E.2.1 Layout and Building Line
E.2.3 Aesthetic Control
E.3.1 Protection of Amenity
C.3.1 Retention of Existing Religious Buildings - prior to their demolition, the church and hall were redundant. Community uses provided on site.
H.1.3 New Housing - Proposed site is suitable for residential development.
H.1.4 - Affordable Housing - No affordable housing provided.

H.1.7 Density of New Residential Housing - Proposed density is in keeping with surrounding area.

H.1.8 Standards for New Housing - Proposed units comply with Council standards.

T.1.3 Design of Development and Conformity with Council Standards and Control

Supplementary Planning Guidance No. 5 - Standards, Control and Guidelines for Residential Development

Supplementary Planning Guidance on Affordable Housing (February 2002) - compelling reason not to provide affordable housing.

18 The Southwark Plan [Revised Draft] February 2005

2.2 Provision of new Community Facilities

2.5 Planning Agreements

3.2 Protection of Amenity

3.3 Energy Efficiency

3.11 Quality in Design - The design of the proposal is considered to be of a high quality.

3.12 Design Statements

3.13 Urban Design - The appearance of the proposed building is considered satisfactory.

4.1 Density of Residential Development - 975.81 habitable rooms per hectare, which is compliant with the Emerging UDP, which requires 650-1100 habitable rooms per hectare in the Central Activities Zone.

4.2 Residential Design Standards

4.4 Affordable Housing Provision - No provision

4.6 Mix of Dwellings - Proposal provides 1, 2 and 3 bedroom dwellings of varying sizes.

5.6 Parking

Bankside and the Borough Action Area

Consultations

19 Site Notice: 21/06/05

Press Notice:16/06/05

20 Consultees:

Archeology Officer

Pollution Control, Noise Etc

Traffic Group

Access Officer

Mr J Biddlecombe, 46 Lant House Lant Street London SE1 1PJ

Mr J Biddlecombe, 46 Lant House Lant Street London SE1 1PJ

Southwark Cyclists, Unit 228 30 Great Guildford Street London SE1 0HS

Osborne, 64 Farrow Lane London SE14 5DB

Farries, Block R No. 2 Peabody Square Blackfriars Road London SE1 8JF

W H Cuff, 4 Cadbury Way Yalding Road London SE16 3XB

W H Cuff, 4 Cadbury Way Yalding Road London SE16 3XB

Revd. A S Lucas, St Georges Rectory Manciple Street London SE1 4LW

Revd. A S Lucas, St Georges Rectory Manciple Street London SE1 4LW

Taylor, The Royal Oak 64 Tabard Street London SE1 4JU

Mrs V Jarvis, 55 Falmouth Road London SE1 4JN

Mrs V Jarvis, 55 Falmouth Road London SE1 4JN

Mr K Hayes, 10 Pakeman House Pocock Street London SE1 0BH
Mr K Hayes, 10 Pakeman House Pocock Street London SE1 0BH
Ms E Prescod, 14 Nutt Street London SE15 6LD
Ms E Prescod, 14 Nutt Street London SE15 6LD
Rev David Pape, 10 Stopher House Webber Street London SE1 0RE
Ms D E Webb, Flat 6 Block B Peabody Estate Southwark Street London SE1 0TP
Mr A Alkhersan, 6 Trundle Street London SE1
Forge Architects, 6-8 Cole Street London SE1 4YH
Mr J Biddlecombe, 46 Lant House Lant Street London SE1 1PJ
Mr J Biddlecombe, 46 Lant House Lant Street London SE1 1PJ
Southwark Cyclists, Unit 228 30 Great Guildford Street London SE1 0HS
Osborne, 64 Farrow Lane London SE14 5DB
Farries, Block R No. 2 Peabody Square Blackfriars Road London SE1 8JF
W H Cuff, 4 Cadbury Way Yalding Road London SE16 3XB
W H Cuff, 4 Cadbury Way Yalding Road London SE16 3XB
Revd. A S Lucas, St Georges Rectory Manciple Street London SE1 4LW
Revd. A S Lucas, St Georges Rectory Manciple Street London SE1 4LW
Taylor, The Royal Oak 64 Tabard Street London SE1 4JU
Mrs V Jarvis, 55 Falmouth Road London SE1 4JN
Mrs V Jarvis, 55 Falmouth Road London SE1 4JN
Mr K Hayes, 10 Pakeman House Pocock Street London SE1 0BH
Mr K Hayes, 10 Pakeman House Pocock Street London SE1 0BH
Ms E Prescod, 14 Nutt Street London SE15 6LD
Ms E Prescod, 14 Nutt Street London SE15 6LD
Rev David Pape, 10 Stopher House Webber Street London SE1 0RE
Ms D E Webb, Flat 6 Block B Peabody Estate Southwark Street london SE1 0TP
Mr A Alkhersan, 6 Trundle Street London SE1
Forge Architects, 6-8 Cole Street London SE1 4YH
Flats 1-49 Lant House, Lant Street SE1 1PJ
Flat 39A Lant House, Lant Street SE1 1PJ
1, 3 Bittern Street SE1 1PL
4-12 Bittern Street SE1 1PL
2-12 (cons) Gaitskell Way SE1 1EF
23, 55 Lant Street SE1 1QP
12 Lant Street SE1 1QH
8-10 Lant Street SE1 1QR
10A Lant Street SE1 1QR
FFF, GFF, SFF 10A Lant Street SE1 1QR
53-55 Lant Street SE1 1QN
Charles Dickens Primary School, Lant Street SE1 1QP
85-91 (cons) Mint Street SE1 1QX
Southwark Fire Station, 94 Southwark Bridge Road SE1 0EG
The Goldsmiths, 96 Southwark Bridge Road SE1 0EF
161 Southwark Bridge Road SE1 0EY
Flats 1-4 (cons), 175 Southwark Bridge Road SE1 0ED
The Equinox, 177-179 Southwark Bridge Road SE1 0ED
94A Southwark Bridge Road SE1 0EX
8 Sudrey Street SE1 1PG
12-13, 14 Trundle Street SE1 1QE
Castle Printers London Ltd, Sudrey Street SE1 1PF
12 Gable Cottages Sudrey Street SE1 1PF
Flats 1-9, Trundle House, Trundle Street SE1 1QS
Ground Floor, Second Floor and Third Floor, 12 - 15 Trundle Street SE1 1QT
14-15 Weller Street SE1 1LQ
Flats 1-5 (cons), 2 Weller Street SE1 1LQ

Letters sent 26/06/05

Replies from:

21 Traffic Group - No objection, subject to the following alterations that would be required to be made to the basement car parking area:

- Cycle parking would need to be provided for nursery staff, residents and visitors. It was suggested that cycle parking facilities should be provided within the basement car park for residents and that visitor and staff cycle parking could be provided outside the building (within the site's property boundary) near the nursery entrance. It is considered that the bicycle parking outside the building would be secure as most of the ground floor building is glazed windows, allowing high visibility to the cycle parking area.
- Changing facilities would need to be provided within the nursery to enable staff to shower after cycling.
- The basement car park does not propose any disabled car parking spaces. Council would require 2-3 car parking spaces. It is considered that the internal configuration of the basement could be altered to meet this requirement. Given the location of the site, and its access to public transport etc, Council is not concerned if the number of on site car parking spaces are reduced.
- Council was content with the car lift arrangement and considers that the sight lines etc are adequate and should not create any further traffic issues.

It is considered that the above issues could be addressed by way of condition that requires submission of further details regarding car parking and cycle facilities, which is to be approved by the Local Authority.

22 Pollution Control - Concern was raised regarding bedrooms 1 and 2 of Apartment 15 being located above the living room of Apartment 12. A condition would need to be included on any permission issued requesting soil contamination reports as well as details in respect of the mechanical ventilation and plant for the basement car park.

23 It is considered that the location of bedrooms above a living area are not a great concern, given that the development is a new build and would provide appropriate sound insulation. Also, bedrooms above living rooms are not considered to cause significant amenity impacts below as they are not used for the purpose of entertainment as living rooms often are. Therefore, any noise generated from above would be minimal.

24 Archeology Officer - Further archaeological works are not required and it is not necessary to attach conditions should content for this application be granted.

25 Access Officer - Issues relating to Access have been fully considered and this proposal is deemed to be acceptable on access grounds.

26 Drs Celia and Roy Palmer, objected to the proposal for the following (summarised) reasons:

The proposed development would:

- reduce community space including a reduction in the size of the private nursery;
- increase in size and bulk of the existing scheme;
- reduce the light to Mint St Park and the sports pitch;

- 27
- private residential accommodation and car parking will be increased to the detriment of the local community, without provision of affordable housing;
 - likely adverse effect on surrounding traffic flows;
 - loss of the old Church Hall and community centre is unacceptable.

Bankside Residents Forum of 185 Park Street objected to the proposal for the following (summarised) reasons:

- 28
- proposal does not include any affordable housing units;
 - reduction in community space as the approved nursery has reduced in size;
 - the previously approved B1 units have been removed and replaced with an extended car park for 15 cars.

Open Spaces Trust of 5 Kings James Street SE1 objected to the proposal for the following (summarised) reasons:

- 29
- loss of community space;
 - increase in car parking spaces despite the loss of office space, which goes against current planning guidance in regard to car dependence;
 - no affordable housing proposed;
 - private residential apartments are not particularly appropriate to be located next door to a multi-sports pitch with floodlighting operating till 10pm;

TJW Wood of 8-10 Lant Street objected to the proposal for the following (summarised) reasons:

- many fundamental flaws on previous scheme, and this is why an amended scheme is required to be submitted;
 - vision splay from the car lift is inadequate;
 - no waiting space for a vehicle if the lift is in use;
 - vehicle access point is too close to the road junction with Lant Street;
 - car park in the basement fails to show the correct size and position of columns and structure and therefore the arrangement does not work;
 - cars will not be able to manoeuvre in a forward gear;
 - no direct fire escape from the basement;
 - nursery has been reduced in size;
 - 'seventh' storey is oppressive, dominating, out of scale with its surroundings and completely out of context, and far too densely developed with inadequate amenity;
 - roof terraces will create an unacceptable level of overlooking into adjoining residential properties;
 - increase in car parking numbers has led to reduction in nursery and removal of B1 element;
- 30
- proposed scheme shows windows on the flank elevation to Trundle House, which are positioned on a boundary and as such affect development rights of the adjoining property;

- 31
- Niall Devlin Goldsmiths Bar of 96 Southwark Bridge Road were in support of the application because the proposal would be good for local businesses and regeneration of the area.

Charles Jamieson and James Biddlescombe of 46 Lant House, Lant Street
Mr A Burakoski of 45 Lant House, Lant Street
Alisar Alkhersan of 6 Trundle House, Trundle Street
Timothy Screed, 108 St Guildford
Kaxukiro Murayama, Fox and Hounds, St Guildford Street

All the above residents objected to the proposal for the following (summarised) reasons:

- 32
- the seven storey building will have a visual impact on the local townscape;
 - sanction of the previous scheme has ensured the necessary funding mechanism is now in place, so there should be no reason to increase the height of the scheme further;
 - no surrounding developments have been permitted to extend above 6 storeys and a precedent should not be set for future developments.

GL Hearn of 20 Soho Square W1D (under instruction of clients, Bankside Open Spaces Trust) objected to the proposal for the following (summarised) reasons:

- 33
- 34
- the proposed development will increase the area of shadow considerably from that caused by the existing building on the site;
 - please note that the submitted analysis relates to the previously submitted scheme, the latest submission which is an extra storey in height will have an even greater impact on the sunlight sports pitch receives.

Ms E Prescod of 14 Nutt Street SE15 was in support of the application.

Arthur Jones, Chair of Lant Tenants Association, 13 Bittern House, Bittern Street SE1 objected to the proposal for the following (summarised) reasons:

- At the last Community Council Meeting, the planning officer disallowed the erection of a seventh floor on the recommendation of Southwark Conservation, however, it seems now that the building is to be increased again to 7 storeys. Why?
- The building will be higher than anything in the area.
- The building will eliminate light, views and be out of scale with its surroundings, affecting the residents of the buildings directly opposite.
- It is not 'set back' for the residents of Trundle house (a 3 storey dwelling below).
- Residents living on upper floors of all surrounding properties will be able to see the 7th floor addition as will users of Mint Street Park.
- There is loss of 'right to light' for flats 3, 6, and 9 of Trundle House and for the Mint Street Park play area.
- The roof terrace will look directly onto balconies of tenants of Trundle House and across the road.
- There has been a loss to the community of community space to be replaced by a private nursery. This will bring increased traffic to Trundle Street which is a tiny street with only 3 resident parking spaces.
- There is a loss of affordable housing and loss of B1 units now removed and replaced with an extended car park for 15 cars.

- The car park lift exit onto Trundle Street is dangerous, particularly as traffic will be increased due to Lant Street closing off from the top end so that all traffic will be forced onto Trundle Street.
- Building work in line with the modified scheme has commenced, which already contravenes the current planning permission. Given the size and scale of the building they are assuming they won't be told to knock it down.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

- 35 The concept and principle of the proposal is similar to the previous application, which has already been considered and approved. As the decision for the previous scheme is quite recent, most of the considerations remain unchanged for this scheme.

Acceptability of proposal in principle

- 36 The proposal in principle has already been considered to be consistent with Government Planning Policy Guidance. The amended proposal provides a mixture of uses on a site including high density residential occupation with good public transport accessibility. The amended proposal also provides a nursery, that is a larger floor space than this facility within the previously approved scheme due to the omission of the office floorspace (245sqm, proposed; 149.3, previous scheme). The amended layout thereby addresses the concerns over loss of community uses on the site.
- 37 Sixteen residential units are to be provided on the site and UDP Policy normally requires that 35% of the units should be for affordable housing. However, the proposal is linked to the refurbishment of St George the Martyr Church whereby funds raised from the redevelopment of this site will make a substantial contribution to this refurbishment.
- 38 As considered in the previous scheme, the preservation of this building is felt to be a sufficiently compelling reason to relax the requirement to provide affordable housing particularly as the scheme is just over the policy threshold and only a small number of affordable units would be provided on the site. The improved community facilities at StGM will also help to offset the reduction in community facilities on the application site. The legal agreement will be required to ensure that an appropriate sum raised from this development is actually spent on St George the Martyr.
- 39 As previously stated, restoration works to St George the Martyr have now commenced, and a sum of £500,000 has been paid by the applicant as required by S106 agreement linked to the previous scheme. In this case, however, even though the number of dwellings has remained the same, the floor space of the residential component of the development has been increased by almost 100sqm. Further, the actual size of some of the apartments are significantly larger in size than 'standard' apartments. This increase in residential floor area is significant enough to justify an increase in restoration costs. Consequently, the developer has offered to pay an additional sum of £20,000, which would be payable prior to the occupation of the development. This amount is less than would usually be sought by the Council in such instances but bearing in mind that the costs of restoration have already been met and also the planning history to this site, it is considered that there are sufficient mitigating factors to support that planning permission be granted for this revised scheme.

Appearance of the proposed development

40 Essentially, the design of the building is very similar to the previous scheme, and therefore, no objection is raised in relation to this. In terms of the height of the building, the maximum overall height is identical to that of the approved scheme (i.e. 20m above natural ground level). A number of residents raised concerns in relation to the significant increase in overall height of the building and the proposal of an additional floor of the northern building. The following points are raised to clarify the proposal:

- The basement in the proposed scheme has been lowered further below ground level and is to be a full basement, rather than a semi-basement, as approved. Consequently, the entire building is lowered and the overall building height is reduced.
- The previously approved scheme has stair enclosures that lead from the sixth floor onto the roof. As these stairs are fully enclosed, these structures form part of the overall height of the building.
- The proposed scheme is still essentially six storeys, however, instead of enclosed stair enclosures, part of unit 16 would be constructed at roof level. The area of the additional floor space of apartment 16 at 'seventh' floor would be 60.16m² (as well as the enclosed lift area, which has an area of 4.84m²) as opposed to 20.24m² which is the area of the two external stair enclosures, which are proposed in the approved scheme.
- The setbacks of the new addition at roof level from the main footprint of the north building, would be similar to the setbacks of the approved stair enclosures. Comparisons are as follows:

	Approved stair enclosures (Min. setback from main building)	Proposed addition at roof level (Min setback from main building)
North side	2.7m	2m
East side	1.7m	3m
West side	2.0m	2.3m
South side	3.2m	1.8m

41 Due to the additional floor being set back from the edge of the footprint of the building, it is not considered that the additional floor area would have a significant impact on the building, the streetscene or surrounding properties.

42 As previously mentioned, the application was referred to Council's Design and Conservation Officer who did not raise any objections to the proposal, subject to the inclusion of conditions that were similar to those that applied to the original scheme.

Impact on the amenities of surrounding residents

43 The church and hall that previously occupied the site projected to the front and rear of Trundle House. The proposed buildings will be larger than the church and hall but the additional impact on the daylight and sunlight to the properties in Trundle House will not be significant and in keeping with the recommendations of the Building Research Establishment Guidelines on Daylight and Sunlight. The proposed alterations to the original scheme will not significantly reduce daylight and sunlight entry to the surrounding properties. Similarly the proposal and alterations to the original scheme

will not make the outlook form the these properties significantly worse.

- 44 A balustrade is still proposed around the edge of the flat roof on the north building. This area would be capable of being used as an amenity area. This is considered to be generally acceptable but access should be restricted to the eastern end of this building to prevent a loss of privacy to the occupants of Trundle House. As previously mentioned, this issue and the actual appearance of the balustrading can be dealt with by means of a condition.

Traffic and parking issues

- 45 The approved car parking area provided 10 car spaces, whereas this scheme proposes 15. This site is in a location which has good accessibility to public transport. The Council's Traffic Officer is satisfied with the car lift in this location and does not consider that a 'waiting area' within the site is necessary due to the relatively low volume of vehicles that use Trundle Street. Sight lines from the basement car park (car lift) are considered to be satisfactory as unobstructed 45 degree visibility splays from the car lift have been provided. It should also be noted that the sight lines have been taken from further within the site and a vehicle would actually be able to be located further forward and closer to the road. Therefore, sight lines will be even greater than what is detailed on the plans.
- 46 The proposed basement car park does not provide any disabled car parking. Given that there is a lift at basement level with doors on each side to enable disabled access, it is considered that there is no reason why disabled parking spaces should not be provided. The number of car spaces will need to be reduced in order for wider car parking bays that will be able to be designed around the structural pillars etc. This is not considered to be an issue, however, as the number of car spaces proposed is more than adequate.
- 47 The applicant has indicated that secure cycle storage is to be provided in the basement with high level cycle racks over the parking spaces as there is 2.65m headroom available. No cycle parking, however, is proposed for staff or visitors to the nursery. As mentioned earlier, cycle parking facilities could be provided near the nursery entrance on Trundle street. Surveillance of this area would be possible due to the full length glazing of the walls. Changing facilities will also need to be provided for nursery staff. A condition is necessary to ensure the above cycle facilities are provided in a satisfactory manner.

Response to objections

- 48 Some objectors appeared to be confused by the plans, as they thought that the nursery space would be reduced, when it has actually been increased, and also that the additional floor would greatly increase the height of the building, when in fact the overall height would remain unaltered due to the building being lowered further into the ground as a result of a full basement rather than a semi-basement.
- 49 Objections raised with regard to visual bulk/mass, design and appearance, loss of daylight/sunlight and traffic and car parking have already been addressed above.
- 50 Other objections, relating to loss of community space and affordable housing have also been addressed.

51 One objector raised a concern in relation to windows that are proposed to be built on the east property boundary (i.e directly abutting Trundle House). It is considered that the windows proposed to be built on the property's east boundary can be deleted as all rooms are already provided with adequate access to daylight due to the provision of windows in other locations. A condition should therefore be included on any permission granted, which requires windows on the east property boundary to be deleted. An amended elevation would need to be provided to show details of the facade, including materials, finishes, so that Council can ensure that the east facade of both dwellings provides an attractive and interesting interface to Trundle House and beyond.

Conclusion

52 Overall, it is considered from the above assessment that the proposed amendments to the previously approved scheme are reasonable. A number of the components of the scheme are unaltered and planning officers' considerations therefore remain unchanged in these areas. A number of conditions will need to be met in order to ensure that all above concerns are addressed. Similar to the previous application, a S106 agreement will again be required to be entered into to in order to ensure that issues regarding affordable housing and loss of community space are accounted for.

53 On balance, it is considered that the proposal is reasonable and it is recommended that permission is granted.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IMPLICATIONS

54 None. Disabled parking will be required to be provided in the basement. A lift is proposed that enables wheelchair access to all floors.

LOCAL AGENDA 21 [Sustainable Development] IMPLICATIONS

55 Housing is provided in a location accessible to public transport.

COMMUNITY IMPACT STATEMENT

56 This planning application has been judged to have no significant impact on local people and communities other than to provide additional residential accommodation and a nursery for children of the community.

LEAD OFFICER	Anne Lippitt	Interim Head of Development & Building Control
REPORT AUTHOR	Karli Flood	Planning Officer [tel. 020 7525 1137]
CASE FILE	TP/1460-D	
Papers held at:	Regeneration Department, Council Offices, Chiltern, Portland Street SE17 2ES [tel. 020 7525 5402]	

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	Square Foot Lant Street Ltd	Reg. Number	05-AP-0872
Application Type	Full Planning Permission	Case	TP/1460-D
Recommendation	Grant subject to Legal Agreement	Number	

Draft of Decision Notice

Planning Permission was GRANTED for the following development:

Erection of a five storey and a part six part seven storey building with ground floor link and fourth floor access bridge link to provide a nursery at ground floor level with 16 flats above and 15 basement car parking spaces with lift access from Trundle Street. (Modified version of previously approved scheme).

At: Former St Michael's Church site, Lant Street SE1

In accordance with application received on 06/05/2005

and Applicant's Drawing Nos. 00.15/L1, 00.15/E.01, 00.15/E.02, 00.15/E.03, 00.15/E.04, 00.15/PACD1, 00.15/PACD2, 00.15/PACD3, 00.15/PACD4, 00.15/PACD5, 00.15/PACD6, 00.15/PACD7, 00.15/PACD8, 00.15/PACD10, 00.15/PACD11, 00.15/PACD12, 00.15/PACD13

Subject to the following conditions:

- 1 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

- 2 Samples of the facing and roofing materials to be used in the carrying out of this permission shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before any work in connection with this permission is carried out and the development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with any such approval given.

Reason

In order that the Local Planning Authority may be satisfied as to the details of the proposed external materials in the interest of the appearance of the building in accordance with Policy E.2.3 'Aesthetic Control' of the Southwark Unitary Development Plan and Policy 3.14 Quality in Design of the Draft Deposit Unitary Development Plan (DDUDP).

- 3 Details of the treatment of the east side elevation of the building (2 copies) including the deletion of all windows located on the east property boundary shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before any work in connection with this permission is carried out and the development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with any such approval given.

Reason

In order that the Local Planning Authority may be satisfied as to the details of the side elevations in the interest of the appearance of the building in accordance with Policy E.2.3 'Aesthetic Control' of the Southwark Unitary Development Plan and Policy 3.14 of the DDUP and also in order to protect the privacy and amenity of

the occupiers and users of the adjoining premises at Trundle House from undue overlooking in accordance with Policy E.3.1 'Protection of Amenity' of the Southwark Unitary Development Plan.

- 4 Details of balustrading to the proposed roof balcony clearly showing their appearance and the extent of the balcony area on the northern block showing that access is restricted to the eastern end only shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before any work in connection with this permission is carried out and the development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with any such approval given.

Reason

In order that the Local Planning Authority may be satisfied that the roof balcony is will not result in a loss of privacy to neighbouring residents and have a satisfactory appearance in accordance with Policies E.2.3. 'Aesthetic Control' and E.3.1 'Protection of Amenity' of the Southwark Unitary Development Plan and Policies 3.14 and 3.2 of the DDUDP.

- 5 The use hereby permitted shall not be begun before details of the arrangements for the storing of refuse or waste have been submitted to (2 copies) and approved by the Local Planning Authority and the development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with any approval given.

Reason

In order that the Council may be satisfied that the refuse will be appropriately stored and removed from the site, thereby protecting the amenity of the site and the area in general from litter, odour and potential vermin/pest nuisance in accordance with Policy E.3.1: Protection of Amenity and Policy T.1.3: Design of Development and Conformity with Council's Standards and Controls of Southwark's Unitary Development Plan.

- 6 Details of the facilities to be provided for the secure storage of cycles (for future residents, nursery staff and visitors) shall be submitted to (2 copies) and approved by the local planning authority before the development hereby approved is commenced and the premises shall not be occupied until any such facilities as may have been approved have been provided. Thereafter the cycle parking facilities provided shall be retained and the space used for no other purpose without the prior written consent of the local planning authority, to whom an application must be made.

Reason

In order to ensure that satisfactory safe and secure cycle parking facilities are provided and retained in order to encourage the use of cycling as an alternative means of transport to the development and to reduce reliance on the use of the private car in accordance with policy T.4.1 Measures for Cyclists of the Southwark Unitary Development Plan.

- 7 Details of the changing facilities in the nursery to be provided for cyclists shall be submitted to (2 copies) and approved by the local planning authority before the development hereby approved is commenced and the premises shall not be occupied until any such facilities as may have been approved have been provided. Thereafter the changing facilities provided shall be retained and the space used for no other purpose without the prior written consent of the local planning authority, to whom an application must be made.

Reason

In order to ensure that satisfactory cycle parking facilities are provided and retained in order to encourage the use of cycling as an alternative means of transport to the development and to reduce reliance on the use of the private car in accordance with policy T.4.1 Measures for Cyclists of the Southwark Unitary Development Plan.

- 8 Details of the basement car parking providing space for three (3) disabled car spaces, and including details of any associated manoeuvring area(s), shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority before the development is begun and the development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance

with any approval given.

Reason

In order to that the Council may be satisfied that the proposal will not compromise highway safety in accordance with Policy T.1.3: Design of Development and Conformity with Council's Standards and Controls, Policy T.4.1: Measures for Cyclists and Policy T.2.1: Measures for Pedestrians of Southwark's Unitary Development Plan.

- 9 Detailed plans of the proposed car lift and underground car park to the proposed development, including full details of the visibility of splays, shall be submitted to (2 copies) and approved by the Local Planning Authority before the development hereby permitted is begun and the development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with any approval given.

Reason

In order to that the Council may be satisfied that the proposal will not compromise highway safety in accordance with Policy T.1.3: Design of Development and Conformity with Council's Standards and Controls, Policy T.4.1: Measures for Cyclists and Policy T.2.1: Measures for Pedestrians of Southwark's Unitary Development Plan.

- 10 Details of the number of children to be accommodated at the proposed nursery, the proposed catchment area, and the dropping off times and arrangements shall be submitted to the Council and approved in writing before the nursery use commences. The nursery shall be operated in accordance with these details.

Reason

To ensure that the nursery does not give rise to undue traffic and parking problems in the area is not detrimental to highway safety in accordance with Policies T.1.3 Design of Development and Conformity with Council Standards.

- 11 Details of a survey and investigation of the soil conditions of the site (2 copies), sufficient to identify the nature and extent of any soil contamination, together with a schedule of the methods by which it is proposed to neutralise, seal, or remove the contaminating substances, shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter shall be carried out before any works in connection with this permission are begun.

Reason

In order to protect construction employees and future occupiers of the site from potential health-threatening substances in the soil in accordance with Policy E.1.1: Safety and Security in the Environment of Southwark's Unitary Development Plan.

- 12 The use hereby permitted shall not be begun until full particulars and details (2 copies) of a scheme for the ventilation of the basement car park to an appropriate outlet level, including details of sound attenuation for any necessary plant and the standard of dilution expected, has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and the development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with any approval given.

Reason

In order to that the Council may be satisfied that the ventilation ducting and ancillary equipment will not result in an fume or noise nuisance and will not detract from the appearance of the building in the interests of amenity in accordance with Policy E.3.1: Protection of Amenity of Southwark's Unitary Development Plan, and Planning Policy Guidance 24 Planning and Noise.

Item No. 2	Classification OPEN	Decision Level COMMUNITY COUNCIL	Date 21/11/05
From Interim Development and Building Control Manager		Title of Report DEVELOPMENT CONTROL	
Proposal (05-AP-1185) Erection of an extra storey to existing building to provide additional office accommodation.		Address 12 Whitehorse Mews, Westminster Bridge Road SE1 7QD Ward Cathedrals	

PURPOSE

- 1 To consider the above application. Due to the number of objections received, the case is referable to Borough and Bankside Community Council for determination.

RECOMMENDATION

- 2 Grant planning permission

BACKGROUND

- 3 The application site is located within a two- and three- storey mews development situated off Westminster Bridge Road, and is not located within a conservation area. The entrance to the mews is flanked by four and five storey office blocks which front Westminster Bridge Road. The Mews contains a mix of residential and office uses, some of which have been restored from old coach houses.
- 4 Number 12 Whitehorse Mews, is located at the end of the terrace, close to the entrance to St Georges Mews which lies immediately to the south west of Whitehorse Mews. The premises are two storeys in height, although the adjoining premises number 11 has a higher ridgeline which then continues across the terrace. The development would result in a common ridgeline across the whole terrace.
- 5 The proposal is for the addition of 1.2m to the total height of the building, which would allow an extra storey to the office. The new roof would match the existing and would have two rooflights to the rear, as with the existing.
- 6 The premises are in use as a B1 office, and are owned by the Greater London Fund for the Blind. The reasoning behind the application is that the applicants currently rent an office in the adjacent building, number 11. This proves costly, and these costs could be cut with the addition of an extension to hold the extra office.

- 7 Planning history.
The mews development was granted planning permission on in June 1986. There is no other relevant planning history relating to the application.

FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION

Main Issues

- 8 The main issues in this case are the effect of the proposal on the neighbouring occupants, and its effect on the visual amenity of the area.

Planning Policy

- 9 Southwark Unitary Development Plan 1995 [UDP]:
E.2.3- Aesthetic Control- complies- the set back of the building would mean that the resulting building would remain subordinate to the original building.
E.3.1 Protection of Amenity- complies - although the additional height would obviously cause some loss of light to the neighbouring buildings, it is not considered that it would cause unreasonable overshadowing.
- 10 The Southwark Plan [Revised Draft] February 2005
3.2 Protection of Amenity- complies (*see above*)
3.11 Quality in Design - complies.
3.10 Efficient use of Land- complies - the development would maximise the use of the building and would lead to a sustainable use of land.

Consultations

- 11 Site Notice:2/9/05 (located outside 41-43 Westminster Bridge Road)
Press Notice:N/A

Consultees:

- Peabody Trust 41 Chapter Court, Westminster Bridge Road London, SE1 7JB
- 7 Whitehorse Mews, 37 Westminster Bridge Road London, SE1 7QD
- 8 Whitehorse Mews, 37 Westminster Bridge Road London, SE1 7QD
- Apex House, 37-39 Westminster Bridge Road London, SE1 7JB
- Keychange, 5 St. Georges Mews, 43 Westminster Bridge Road London, SE1 7JB
- M R Recruitment 10 Whitehorse Mews, 37 Westminster Bridge Road London, SE1 7QD
- Voitek Conservation of Works of Art, 9 Whitehorse Mews, 37 Westminster Bridge Road London, SE1 7QD
- MC Xcessories Ltd., 2 St. Georges Mews, 43 Westminster Bridge Road London, SE1 7JB
- Peabody Trust 4 St. Georges Mews, 43 Westminster Bridge Road London, SE1 7JB
- 5 Whitehorse Mews, 37 Westminster Bridge Road London, SE1 7QD
- Greater London Fund for the Blind 11-12 Whitehorse Mews 37 Westminster Bridge Road London, SE1 7QD
- Alexander Walker, 4 Whitehorse Mews, 37 Westminster Bridge Road London, SE1 7QD
- Corus, 6 St. Georges Mews, 43 Westminster Bridge Road London, SE1 7JB
- 22 Belvedere Road SE1 7XU
- Valentine Walsh, 3 Whitehorse Mews, 37 Westminster Bridge Road London, SE1 7QD
- Christine Green Authors Agent, 6 Whitehorse Mews, 37 Westminster Bridge Road London, SE1 7QD
- European Coalition Positive People 2 Whitehorse Mews, 37 Westminster Bridge Road

London, SE1 7QD

12 **Replies from:**

5 St Georges Mews- There will be a loss of light to St Georges Mews, which is already a dark place.

2 St. Georges Mews- the development would be 20feet away from the office and would affect the light, along with major disruption to the business from the construction as the access road to the office is only 20feet wide.

2 Whitehorse Mews- objection on aesthetic grounds as the character would change from studio complex to office block, also, the extra height would make the mews darker at the entrance. Also object on traffic safety grounds, as the mews is already crowded with cars.

7 Whitehorse Mews- The development would close the visual break between the buildings fronting Westminster Bridge Road and the mews, and it would reduce the amount of sunlight and daylight reaching the "floor" of the mews.

10 Whitehorse Mews

The extension to the roof would reduce the amount of light reaching the Mews, and would disturb the balance of the skyline and ambience of the Mews. Also feel that there would be increased traffic as a result of the extra office floorspace, and reduced access for emergency vehicles.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

13 Amenity

The properties that would be most affected would be the ones immediately adjacent to the office, which lie directly north west of the site. It is not considered that raising the ridgeline by an extra 1.2m would significantly affect the amount of light reaching the windows of the office uses at 41-43 Westminster Bridge Road. The properties are south facing, and the proposed development would lie to the southeast of the offices in question. It is not considered therefore, that the amenity of 41-43 would be compromised.

14 The properties on St George's Mews to the rear of the development (which all appear to be in office use) would also be affected, but again, it is not considered that their amenities would unreasonably be effected, particularly since the rooms are not habitable rooms in residential use.

15 Aesthetic Appearance.

The extension to the roof would bring the ridge line to match that of the terrace on the south side of Whitehorse Mews. No. 12 was designed so as to be subordinate to the rest of the terrace, in both height and set-back. This would have been designed as such. However, it is considered that even with the additional height, the building would remain subordinate to the rest in the terrace, as it is stepped back approximately 1.5m from the front building line.

16 Objectors have commented on the character of the mews, and have criticised the fact that the proposal would close the gap between the rear of the offices on Westminster Bridge Road, and the mews. However, it is not considered that an extension in height of 1.2m would significantly or detrimentally alter the character of the mews, or set an unwelcome precedent. As the building is already stepped back from the front building line, the increased height would not affect the subordination.

The new roof would have the same dimensions and materials as the existing and it would have roof lights in the same position as existing (to the rear- towards St

Georges Mews.)

17 Traffic Safety

The proposal does not hold any traffic implications. The congestion of the mews cannot be considered as a planning matter, as there were no conditions imposed on the original permission for the mews relating to parking. (ref: TP/1334/37/KPH Granted on 26th June 1986. It is not considered that an extra floor to create one extra room would increase the amount of traffic to detrimental levels in the Mews, or contribute towards congestion.

18 In the light of the above, it is recommended that planning permission should be granted for the proposal.

Community Impact Statement

19 This planning application has been judged to have no impact on local people and communities other than to improve the living conditions of the occupiers of the application properties.

LOCAL AGENDA 21 [Sustainable Development] IMPLICATIONS

20 None

LEAD OFFICER	Anne Lippitt	Interim Head of Development & Building Control
REPORT AUTHOR	Susannah Pettit	Planning Officer [tel. 020 7525 5405]
CASE FILE	TP/1334-37	
Papers held at:	Regeneration Department, Council Offices, Chiltern, Portland Street SE17 2ES [tel. 020 7525 5402]	

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	Greater London Fund For The Blind	Reg. Number	05-AP-1185
Application Type	Full Planning Permission	Case	TP/1334-37
Recommendation	Grant	Number	

Draft of Decision Notice

Planning Permission was GRANTED for the following development:

Erection of an extra storey to existing building to provide additional office accommodation.

At: 12 Whitehorse Mews, Westminster Bridge Road SE1 7QD

In accordance with application received on 09/06/2005

and Applicant's Drawing Nos. Un-numbered drawings.

- 4 x 1 site plans
- 4 x 1 Existing Grnd Flr
- 4 x 1 Adjoining Elevation 1, 2, 3
- 4 x 1 Existing and proposed rooflights plan

Subject to the following conditions:

- 1 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

- 2 The facing materials used in the carrying out of this permission shall match the original facing materials of the building at 11&12 Whitehorse Mews, including matching in type, colour, dimensions, and in the case of brickwork, bond and coursing and pointing.

Reason

To ensure that the new works blend in with the adjacent building in the interest of the design and appearance of the building in accordance with Policy E.2.3 'Aesthetic Control' of the Southwark Unitary Development Plan.

Reasons for granting planning permission.

This planning application was considered with regard to various policies including, but not exclusively:

- a] Policies E.2.3 Aesthetic Control, E.3.1 Protection of Amenity of the Southwark Unitary Development Plan 1995
- b] Policies 3.2 Protection of Amenity, 3.11 Quality in Design, 3.10 Efficient Use of Land of The Southwark Plan [Revised Draft] February 2005.

Planning permission was granted as there are no, or insufficient, grounds to withhold consent on the basis of the policies considered and other material planning considerations.

CIRCULATION LIST**MUNICIPAL YEAR 2005/06****COUNCIL: BOROUGH & BANKSIDE COMMUNITY COUNCIL**Original held by Constitutional Support Unit; amendments to Julian Bassham
(Tel:02075257234)

<u>OPEN</u>	<u>COPIES</u>	<u>OPEN</u>	<u>COPIES</u>
To all Members of the Community Council:		Chief Superintendent Ian Thomas	1
Cllr Danny McCarthy (Chair)	1	Borough Commander	
Cllr Dr Abdur-Rahman Olayiwola (Vice-chair)	1	Southwark Police Station	
Cllr Catriona Moore	1	323 Borough High Street	
Cllr Mark Pursey	1	London SE1 1JL	
Cllr Richard Thomas	1	Valerie Shawcross	1
Cllr Lorraine Zuleta	1	GLA Building	
Cllr Fiona Colley	1	City Hall	
Libraries	6	Queen's Walk	
Local Studies Library	1	London SE17 2AA	
Press:		<u>TRADE UNIONS</u>	
Southwark News	1	John Mulrenan, UNISON Southwark Branch	1
Evening Standard	1	Roy Fielding, GMB/APEX	1
South London Press	1	Alan Milne TGWU/ACTS	1
Borough and Bankside Area Housing Office	1	Tony O'Brien, UCATT	1
MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT		TOTAL DISTRIBUTION	55
Simon Hughes M.P	1	Dated: 11 November 2005	
Constitutional Support Officer	28		
OTHERS			
Geoffrey Bannister			
LBS Audit Manager			
222A Camberwell Road			
London			
SE5 0ED	1		
<u>EXTERNAL</u>			
Pat Tulloch	1		
S.A.V.O.			
Cambridge House			
64 Camberwell Road			
London SE5 OEN			