

| | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| Item No. 5. | Classification OPEN | Decision Level Planning Committee | Date 5/4/04 |
| From Interim Development & Building Control Manager | | Title of Report DEVELOPMENT CONTROL | |
| Proposal (03-AP-2285) Demolition of existing three storey building and construction of a part ground/mezzanine plus 6 storeys and part ground/mezzanine plus 3 storey building, comprising A1 (Retail), A3 (Hot Food and Drink) and/or B1 (Office) at ground and mezzanine levels and 75 flats (22 x 1 bed and 53 x 2 bed) above, with associated cycle parking (car-free) | | Address Land at the corner of Queen Elizabeth Street and Tower Bridge Road and fronting Potters Fields SE1 Ward Riverside | |

PURPOSE

1. The Council has received two identical applications for the development set out above. This application has been appealed to the Secretary of State on the basis of non-determination by the Council and is due to be considered with the appeal concerning this site and the coach park at a public inquiry starting on 28/4/04. There are also two applications for the demolition of the annex building to Lambeth College, one of which is subject of an appeal and included elsewhere on the agenda.

The duplicate application remains with the Council for determination.

The item is late due to a delayed decision to co-join these appeals with the earlier applications for the entire site. The appeal documents require the Council to submit its case by 14/4/04, this is the earliest Committee for Members to consider and agree the reasons for refusal.

RECOMMENDATION

2. Had the Council been in a position to determine the application LBS Ref 03-AP-2285 permission would have been refused.

BACKGROUND

3. The site includes a 3 storey educational facility formerly occupied as an annex to the Grade II listed Lambeth College. The eastern end of the site is undeveloped and was most recently used for hot air balloon rides in the period January 1999 to March 2001.

It is proposed to construct a part 5 and part 7 storey building on the currently

undeveloped land on the corner of Tower Bridge Road and Queen Elizabeth Street. The lower part of the building lies adjacent to Lambeth College, over the site of the existing three storey building which is proposed to be demolished. The higher part of the building extends along Tower Bridge Road and curves around the corner with Queen Elizabeth Street. The ground and mezzanine storeys of this building are to be occupied by either retail (A1 use), restaurant/café/pubs (A3 use) and or office/light industrial use (B1 use). The upper floors accommodate 75 flats, 18 of which will be allocated as affordable housing. Double height planar glazing clads the lower floors. Above this, the façade is a steel framed structure made up of stacked glazing panels and inset balconies with glass balustrades. The seventh storey is again clad in full length glazing and is set back to provide a balcony running the length of the street frontage, also utilising glass balustrades.

Planning History

Outline planning permissions covering almost the entire area between the two bridges, the river and Tooley Street, a total of 22 hectares, were granted in June 1984 by the London Docklands Development Corporation (LDDC). This provided for the Riverside Walkway and the laying out of Potter's Field Park. Phase I of the development was completed in 1987, extending as far east as Southwark Crown Court. Phase II, commonly referred to as More London is currently under construction and includes the now-occupied Greater London Authority building (GLA). As part of the permission for More London, which involved the demolition of 155 or so council flats, the coach park site was to be dedicated to the Council for affordable housing.

Outline planning permissions covering almost the entire area between the two bridges, the river and Tooley Street, a total of 22 hectares, were granted in June 1984 by the London Docklands Development Corporation (LDDC). This provided for the Riverside Walkway and the laying out of Potter's Field Park. Phase I of the development was completed in 1987, extending as far east as Southwark Crown Court. Phase II, commonly referred to as More London is currently under construction and includes the now-occupied Greater London Authority building (GLA). As part of the permission for More London, which involved the demolition of 155 or so council flats, the coach park site was to be dedicated to the Council for affordable housing.

An application was made in May 1994 for the development of the Potter's Field site for 135 flats within a 9 storey building. The design by Alsop & Störmer was dubbed the „Worm on Stilts“. It was called in by the Secretary of State but a decision was deferred pending a decision on a second application for a theatre application on the same site. A decision on the residential development was never issued.

The theatre application was put forward by the Royal Opera House to provide alternative accommodation while their Covent Garden premises were being redeveloped. The proposed building designed by Ian Ritchie had a seating capacity of approximately 2,300 people, with an orchestra capacity for 90 musicians. It included a main stage, two side stages, a fly-tower, and ancillary facilities including a periodicals library and café. The design was simple and box-like, constructed of two principal surfaces of glass and stone bound in stainless steel mesh. The application site corresponded with what is now the coach park and part of Potter's Field Park.

Permission for the theatre was granted following a Public Inquiry. In his decision the

Inspector commented that:

"It is not disputed that the...site is in need of regeneration and visual improvement: it is one of the sites specifically identified (No. 22) in both the Thames Strategy and the draft Strategic Guidance (for the Thames). Whilst accepting that an imaginative housing design could exploit the site's potential, I find considerable merit in the Council's argument that this high profile site next to Tower Bridge and opposite a World Heritage Site is uniquely well suited to a major public building. This is a "trophy" site of London-wide significance, and it calls for a building of special character and high architectural quality... There is particular merit in an evening use which contributes to the life and attractiveness of the area at a time when the surrounding office uses are dormant."

FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION

4. Main Issues

The main issues in this case are

- The principle of the loss of the use of the annex building and surrounding land as an educational / D1 facility.
- The design of the proposed new development in respect of its location within the Tower Bridge Conservation Area and its affect upon the setting of a Grade II listed building.
- The servicing and parking implications of the proposed development.
- The level of affordable housing provision.
- The implications for the potential redevelopment of the remainder of the site.
- The standard of accommodation provided.

Planning Policy

5. Southwark Unitary Development Plan 1995 [UDP]

The entire site lies within a designated Regeneration Area, Central Area of Community Need, the Archaeological Priority Zone and the Strategic Views Protected Viewing Corridor and Backdrop Consultation Zone, an Area of District Park Deficiency. The coach park is designated for Housing (Proposals Schedule Number 13).

Policy R.1.1 [Central Area of Community Need] This policy welcomes proposals which benefit residential communities and provide community services and facilities subject to protection of existing housing, shopping provision, and employment generating floorspace.

Policy R.2.1 [Regeneration Areas] This policy welcomes investment, and proposals which generate employment, meets needs of local residents, improves the

environment and brings vacant buildings/sites back into use.

ENVIRONMENTAL POLICIES

Urban Design

Policy E.1.1 [Safety and Security in the Environment]: This policy seeks to insure that the design of buildings, streets, housing estates and parks enhance the sense of safety and security experienced by people who use them.

Policy E.2.1 [Layout and Building Line]: This policy seeks to ensure that new developments respect the established character of the surrounding area in terms of scale and layout, as well as in quality of detailing and materials.

Policy E.2.3 [Aesthetic Control]: This policy seeks to ensure that sites are developed with good and imaginative design that pays regard to the surrounding environment therefore creating high quality and coherent urban form.

Policy E.2.5 [External Space]: This policy seeks to ensure that new development enhances the quality of the environment through the design of landscaping, the conservation of trees and other features of merit, the choice of materials for hard surfaces, fences, walls and the design of signposting and street furniture. These aspects need to be co-ordinated with one another and with the design and layout of new buildings.

Environmental Quality

Policy E.3.1 [Protection of Amenity]: This policy seeks to protect the amenity of an area and of people living, or working in, or visiting the area.

Policy E.3.5 [Vacant Sites and Buildings]: This policy seeks to bring back into use vacant land to enhance the environment for those that live and work in Southwark.

Conservation Areas

Policy E.4.2 [Proposals Affecting Conservation Areas]: This policy seeks to ensure that any new developments that are located within or would impact upon a Conservation Area preserves or enhances the character or appearance of that or those Conservation Areas.

Policy E.4.6 [Proposals Affecting Listed Buildings]: This policy seeks to ensure that planning permission for listed buildings and for developments that affect the setting of listed buildings is only granted where the character of the listed building(s) is preserved.

Archaeology

Policy E.5.1 [Sites of Archaeological Importance]: This policy seeks to ensure the protection of Southwark's Archaeological heritage.

River Thames

Policy E.7.1 [Riverside Townscape, Thames Path and Public Access to Thames Frontage and Shoreline]: This policy seeks to ensure that new riverside developments are implemented with the maximum recreational, visual, and wildlife benefit, preserving the south bank of the Thames as a valuable resource in terms of townscape and public access.

COMMUNITY AND SOCIAL FACILITIES POLICIES

Policy C.1.1 [Premises for Community Facilities]: This policy seeks to encourage the development of such facilities whilst ensuring that their creation is appropriate within the context of the surrounding neighbourhood and has no negative implications for the amenity of neighbouring users.

Policy C.1.3 [Retention of Existing Community Facilities and Public Buildings]: This policy seeks to protect existing community facilities that are suitable for such a use.

Policy C.2.2 [Health, Social and Educational Facilities]: This policy seeks to promote ensure that health, social and educational facilities should benefit all Southwark residents, be well located with respect to their users and be accessible to all members of the community.

Design and Security

Policy C.7.1 [Accessibility]: This policy seeks to ensure that all community, social, leisure, recreational and cultural facilities provide adequate access, facilities and information for all members of the community.

Policy C.7.2 [Safety and Security]: This policy seeks to ensure that new community, social, leisure, recreational and cultural facilities are designed to maximise safety and security for users.

HOUSING POLICIES

Policy H.1.3 [New Housing]: This policy seeks to encourage the identification of appropriate sites for housing development and that these developments comply with provisions of other relevant plan policies.

Policy H.1.4 [Affordable Housing]: This policy seeks to ensure that all new housing developments of 15 or more units will contain a proportion of affordable housing.

Policy H.1.5 [Dwelling Mix of New Housing]: This policy seeks to ensure that new housing developments include a mix of dwellings that cater for both family and non-family households.

Policy H.1.7 [Density of New Residential Development]: This policy seeks to ensure that the suitable density for a residential development is found for its location.

Policy H.1.8 [Standards for New Housing]: This policy seeks to ensure that new housing developments, extensions and improvements result in satisfactory units of accommodation for those who occupy them.

Policy H.1.10 [Provision of Housing to Mobility and Wheelchair Standards]: This policy seeks to ensure that new housing caters for people with a range of disabilities.

BUSINESS, INDUSTRY AND STORAGE

Policy B.2.3 [Class B1 Business Proposals]: This policy seeks to encourage the provision of appropriately located and functionally efficient Class B1 Business development that are fully accessible to all members of the community and have no negative implications for neighbouring users.

Policy B.3.1 [Access for People with Disabilities]: This policy seeks to ensure new Class B1 business and Class B2 general industrial developments are designed to allow access for those with disabilities and mobility difficulties.

Policy B.3.2 [Employment Facilities and Conditions]: This policy seeks to ensure that appropriately sized Class B developments provide training and childcare facilities to facilitate better employment opportunities for local people.

SHOPPING POLICIES

Policy S.3.3 [Shopfront Design]: This policy seeks to ensure that new shop fronts contribute positively to the visual amenities of the neighbourhood in which it is located.

Policy S.1.6 [Hot Food Outlets]: This policy seeks to control the potential negative impacts of A3 uses such as litter, traffic and parking, noise and activity and fumes and odours.

TRANSPORT POLICIES

Policy T.1.2 [Location of Development in Relation to the Transport Network]: This policy seeks to ensure that all new developments is appropriately located in relation to the transport network.

Policy T.1.3 [Design of Development and Conformity with Councils Standards and Controls]: This policy seeks to ensure that any new development complies with the Council's standards and controls for off-street parking including disabled spaces and cyclists as well as servicing, refuse storage and removal.

Policy T.2.1 [Measures for Pedestrians]: This policy seeks to continue to introduce new measures to improve pedestrian safety, security, convenience and accessibility.

Policy T.6.3 [Parking Space in New Developments]: This policy seeks to ensure that new developments have adequate space for their essential parking needs.

Southwark adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance [SPG]:

SPG [Affordable Housing]: This guidance gives the Council's requirements in relation to securing the affordable housing provision referred to in Policy H.1.4 above.

SPG1 [Design And Layout Of Developments]: This document expands on the Urban Design policies in the UDP, and also gives advice regarding materials, outlook, daylight and sunlight and the layout of the public highway.

SPG2 [Shopfront Design and Materials]: This document is less relevant as it relates to traditional shopping frontages, however advice on accessibility and safety remains relevant.

SPG3 [Crime and Security]: This guidance gives key advice on means to avoid the creation of crime-generating areas, and ensuring new developments provide for the safety of occupiers and other users of the site and its environs.

SPG4 [Access and Facilities for People with Disabilities and People with Mobility Difficulties]: This gives advise on practical measures to ensure buildings are accessible to all.

SPG5 [Standards, Controls and Guidelines for Residential Development]: This guidance expands on the policies relating to housing and gives specific advice on matters including minimum floor areas, outdoor amenity space, daylight and sunlight.

SPG6 [Pollution]: Guidance is given regarding land contamination, noise pollution and the adverse impacts related to the construction process.

Draft Southwark Plan [agreed for Deposit November 2002]:

The entire site is designated within the Air Quality Management Area, Protected Viewing Corridor, Thames Special Policy Area, London Bridge Opportunity Area, Preferred Office Location, Central Density Zone and Archaeological Priority Zone. The Lambeth College site also lies partially within the Tower Bridge Conservation Area.

TACKLING POVERTY AND ENCOURAGING WEALTH CREATION

Policy 1.1 [Access to Employment Opportunities]:

Policy 1.3 [Preferred Office Locations]

LIFE CHANCES

Policy 2.4 [Provision of Community Facilities]:

Policy 2.5 [Planning Obligations]:

CLEAN AND GREEN

Policy 3.2 [Protection of Amenity]:

Policy 3.3 [Energy Efficiency]:

Policy 3.4 [Waste Reduction]:

Policy 3.5 [Water Efficiency]:

Policy 3.6 [Heritage Conservation]:

Policy 3.7 [Archaeology]:

Policy 3.10 [Other Open Space]:

Policy 3.12 [The Thames Special Policy Area]:

Policy 3.13 [Sustainability Appraisal]:

Policy 3.14 [Quality in Design]:

Policy 3.15 [Urban Design]:

Policy 3.16 [Safety in Design]:

Policy 3.17 [Design Statements]:

HOUSING

Policy 4.1 [Housing Density]:

Policy 4.2 [Residential Design Standards]:

Policy 4.3 [Combining Residential and Complementary Uses]:

Policy 4.4 [Affordable Housing Provision]:

Policy 4.6 [Mix of Dwellings]:

TRANSPORT

Policy 5.1 [Transport Impacts]:

Policy 5.3 [Pedestrians and Cyclists]:

Policy 5.5 [Density]:

Policy 5.6 [Parking]:

Other Material Considerations:

The draft London Bridge Framework

The London Plan

CABE/English Heritage Guidance for Tall Buildings

PPG 1 General Policies and Principles, PPG 3 Housing, PPG 13 Transport, PPG 15

Planning and the Historic Environment, PPG 16 Archaeology, PPG Designing Out

Crime

Consultations

6. Site Notice: Press Notice:

16/3/2004

19/2/2004

Consultees:

A separate list of consultees is appended to the report

Replies from:

Transport For London - We would not want to see an improvement of the access implemented to meet current proposals if shortly afterwards it needs to be improved further to cater for further demand. It is noted that no car parking provision for residents is to be provided on site, this is acceptable but there should be provision for visitors. There is no on street car parking capacity on the red route network or the adjacent local roads if nothing is provided on site that is where it will occur. I think it is impossible to say that no visitors will arrive by car, even if other modes of transport available are good.

Due to the short timeframe of the consultation process a number of replies remain outstanding. Any further responses received will be reported at the meeting.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

7. Loss of the D1 / education use

The proposed development is for a predominately residential scheme, unlike the coach park site at the rear, this site was not previously zoned within the Adopted UDP as it was in use as an educational facility. Whilst the earlier scheme for the whole of the site also resulted in the loss of this building the proposed development incorporated a replacement D1 use. The scheme currently under consideration makes no provision for the replacement of the D1 floorspace in an area already identified as lacking in community facilities.

The 2nd Deposit Draft designates the site for D1 purposes, (excluding use as a place of worship) with a priority for an education use. Furthermore the Council's Education Department have identified the entire Lambeth College site, (the annex and the listed building) as the location for a new Primary school to replace the existing Snowfields and Tower Bridge Primary School's.

The submission fails to address the loss of the educational facility indeed the planning statement accompanying the application makes no acknowledgement of the designation of the area as one of community need policy R.1.1 or the fact that the development would be contrary to policy C.1.3 resulting in the loss of an educational facility.

Design of the proposed building/Impact on Listed Buildings

The building proposed on the corner site fails to knit the urban grain back together. The surrounding area is made up of isolated listed buildings separated by undeveloped sites. It is agreed that the development of the corner site will provide a context for these important buildings, however this is

simply a result of developing the site, unrelated to the proposal itself. Further, it is considered that the proposed corner building does not achieve this satisfactorily.

Traditionally, development along Tooley Street and Tower Bridge Road has been composed of solid, smaller scale street frontages. By introducing primarily glass and metal construction into a key position in this street frontage, the urban grain is considerably undermined. Lambeth College, Bridgemaster's House and the NatWest Bank are all similar in terms of scale, materials, and even detailing. The proposal unaccountably varies the established form and therefore fails to 'complete' the street frontages into a cohesive townscape. The choice of materials is entirely inappropriate, and primarily glazed frontages have been resisted for all street frontage developments in the More London development for this reason. A solid building, of a similar scale to the buildings it should be linking, which will provide a defined gateway to Tower Bridge and a solid edge to Queen Elizabeth Gardens, is critical to the reinstatement of the urban grain. In detail, the architecture of this building is mediocre at best. There is no precedence for balconies, which weaken the street frontage, and would appear out of place as well as contribute to clutter which would further detract from the appearance of the building. The change in height is awkward, and the scale of development relates poorly to the listed buildings. Regardless of what occurs on the coach park site, this aspect of the proposal requires a considerable rethink.

Demolition of the annex building

The proposal includes the demolition of the 1930's annex building on the Lambeth College site. This is considered unacceptable, not least because of the unsatisfactory quality of the proposed replacement. This will be dealt with in detail as part of the listed building consent consideration. However it is sufficient to note at this stage that the demolition of this building is considered grounds for refusal of the full application.

Archaeology

The assertion that there will be little of archaeological value on the site is not valid until tested by field evaluation. Full archaeological evaluation will most certainly be required subsequent to the geo-technical investigation. The need for preservation *in situ* of archaeological features will be addressed after the results of the evaluation are known. However, it is inappropriate to draw parallels with the More London site, as the majority of this development area was cleared of archaeology in an unfortunate manner prior to the issue of PPG16 in 1990. Had this not been the case, it is most likely that the remains of the medieval manor house and tidal mills, themselves probably of national importance, would have been preserved *in situ*. Archaeological remains on the application site may need to be preserved *in situ*. Therefore archaeology considerations can not be fully assessed or satisfied without further archaeological investigation

Transport

There is no indication that the Potters Field access at its junction with Tooley Street is capable of handling the size of service vehicle likely to be servicing the proposed development. Larger vehicles must be capable of turning left into the site without using more than half the width of Tooley Street, particularly since it has returned to two way working.

No swept path analysis has been provided to indicate that this is possible, if it is not a preliminary design for the junction improvement needs to be provided. It should be borne in mind that Potters Field will also be the main access to any development that proceeds on the old coach and car park site located on the north side of this proposal and for any future use of the existing college site. The Potters Field/Tooley Street junction must be capable of meeting the requirements of these developments as well. Further development will increase the use of the access and it is recommended that swept path analysis is undertaken on the proviso that a vehicle is waiting to exit Potters Field as the service vehicle is entering, this will avoid obstruction occurring on the TLRN network.

Affordable Housing

The Council is mindful of not only its own policies but also that of the Mayor in the London Plan. The scheme would provide 18 units for affordable housing; this would equate to 24% of the total no. of units. This is below the threshold of 50% that the Mayor is suggesting in the London Plan. The Council's SPG on affordable housing requires „the maximum reasonable proportion of affordable housing having regard to all circumstances and any compelling reasons for not providing affordable housing“. There are no compelling reasons given for the level of affordable housing proposed, the land currently has a non- residential land value and any residential accommodation in this location would provide higher than average profits for residential development in London. In light of the mayor's target of 50%, a significantly higher affordable housing provision is expected.

Implications of the proposed development for the remainder of the site
The proposal could potentially compromise the objectives of the Council for the rear part of the site as insufficient consideration of the means of pedestrian and vehicular access is provided for within the proposed development.

The forward to the Council's draft London Bridge Planning Framework, October 2002, states that;

Opportunities for change could bring many benefits to the [London Bridge] area. However we need to ensure that the right planning guidance and policies are in place to maximise the potential benefits for the people who live, work and visit the area.

New developments need to be considered in terms of their individual and collective impact.

The proposed development, with such heavy emphasis on private housing, fails to maximise the potential benefits of this key site, and will for the most part only be accessible to a few. The impact of such a development would be to compromise the potential for the rear part of the site.

A Planning Brief was prepared for this site, and Adopted by Planning Committee on 1/3/04. The London Bridge Planning Framework and draft Supplementary Planning Guidance refer specifically to this Brief and the principles of the Brief are envisaged within these documents. These principles include maximising the potential of this site through provision of a cultural community use which is also expressed in the architecture of the building.

Standard of residential accommodation

Generally no objection is raised to the standard of accommodation, however there is insufficient consideration to the concept of lifetime homes or for the housing needs of people in wheelchairs.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IMPLICATIONS

8. The development fails to provide adequate affordable housing. There is an established housing need within the Borough as discussed in the SPG Affordable Housing and the proposal fails to adequately contribute towards meeting the considerable housing need.

The development does not make adequate provision for the housing needs of the disabled or larger households.

LOCAL AGENDA 21 [Sustainable Development] IMPLICATIONS

9. The proposal raises a number of issues although it is considered that these could be overcome through discussion with the applicant.

| | | |
|-----------------|--|---|
| LEAD OFFICER | James F Sherry | Interim Development and Building Control Manager |
| REPORT AUTHOR | Sonia Watson | [tel. 020 7525 0502] |
| CASE FILE | TP/26-A | |
| Papers held at: | Council Offices, Chiltern, Portland Street SE17 2ES | |
| | [tel. 020 7525 5402] | |

List of consultees

GLA
CABE
Government Office for London
London Development Agency
English Heritage
English Partnerships
Pool of London Partnership
Port of London Authority
Transport for London
London Wildlife Trust
Friends of the Earth
Tooley Street T & R A Friends of Potters Field Park Butler's Wharf Forum
Butler's Wharf Retailers Association
Bermondsey Street Association
Bermondsey Village Partnerships
Bermondsey & Rotherhithe Association
London Tourist Board
Confederation of Passenger Transport UK
Southwark Heritage Association
Southwark Environment Forum
Southwark Cyclists
Conservation Forum
London Transport Planning
Historic Royal Palaces
Railtrack
The Bridge House Trust
CIT Group
The Photographer's Gallery
Innovision Media Entertainment
London City Mission
English National Opera
All Hallows Business Houses Association
Tower Bridge Centre
Montagu Evans
Kalmars Commercial Estate
St Martins Property Development
Guy's Hospital
Beaumont Property Consulting
West of England Ship Owners
London Borough of Tower Hamlets
London Borough of Camden
London Underground
Environment Agency
Southwark LSP Area 2
Southwark Cathedral
Corporation of London
Tower of London
Simon Hughes MP
Lambeth College Caretaker's Flat
155 - 173 (odd) Tooley Street, and 1st floor for each
1 - 120 Devon Mansions
122/128, 130/132, 134, 136/148, 150/152, 154/164, 166/172, 186, 188
31/37, 39 Barham Street
1 - 61 St Olaves Estate

1 - 32 Lewes House
6, 8 Druid Street
Flats 1 - 18 ,2 Fair Street
194 Tower Bridge Road
196 Tower Bridge Road
Flats 1 - 3, 196 Tower Bridge Road
198/204 Tower Bridge Road
206 Tower Bridge Road
224a Tower Bridge Road
210 - 222 (even) Tower Bridge Road
224 Tower Bridge Court
226 Tower Bridge Court
200 Tower Bridge Road
196 Tower Bridge Road
2 Queen Elizabeth Street
3 Crown Apartments
205 Tooley Street
Nasmith House
The School House, Fair Street
9, 10 Fair Street
The Nursery School, Fair Street
1 - 4 Hartland House
Southwark Police Station 207 Tooley Street
Magistrates Court 209 Tooley Street
1 - 11 Knights House
1 - 41 Admirals Court
30 - 36 Horselydown Lane
1 - 11 Candishe House
2 – 20, 20A Horselydown Lane
1 Gainsford Street
The Public House, Cnr Horselydown Lane & Copper Row
1 - 62 Anchor Brewhouse
Flat 219 Butlers Wharf
23 Albion Street

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 | Berkeley Homes PLC | Reg. Number | 03-AP-2285 |
| Application Type | Full Planning Permission | Case Number | TP/26-A |
| Recommendation | Refuse | | |

Draft of Decision Notice

Planning Permission was REFUSED for the following development:

Demolition of existing three storey building and construction of a part ground/mezzanine plus 6 storeys and part ground/mezzanine plus 3 storey building, comprising A1 (Retail), A3 (Hot Food and Drink) and/or B1 (Office) at ground and mezzanine levels and 75 flats (22 x 1 bed and 53 x 2 bed) above, with associated cycle parking (car-free)

At: Land at the corner of Queen Elizabeth Street and Tower Bridge Road and fronting Potters Fields SE1

In accordance with application received on 03/12/2003

and Applicant's Drawing Nos. P03A/101, P03A/104, P03A/105, P03A/201, P03A/202, P03A/203, P03A/204, P03A/205
P03A/206, P03A/207, P03A/208, P03A/209, P03A/301, P03A/302, P03A/303, P03A/304
P03A/401
Design Statement 11/2003 folder
Urban Design & Visual Assessment folder 11/2003
Planning Statement 11/2003
Transport Statement 11/2003
Contextual Report 11/2003

Reasons for refusal:

- 1 The proposed development, by reason of its predominantly residential character, and the absence of any replacement Class D1 accommodation fails to provide a development that meets the regeneration aims of the Council for this site, as such the proposal is contrary to Policies R.1.1 Central Area of Community Need; R.2.1 Regeneration Areas; C.1.1 Premises for Community Facilities; C.1.3 Retention of Community Facilities of the Southwark Adopted Unitary Development Plan and Policy 2.4 Provision of Community Facilities of the First Deposit Unitary Development Plan and the proposal 4P of the Second Deposit Unitary Development Plan.

- 2 The proposed development, by reason of the monolithic corner block, height, use of materials and detailed design of the upper storeys, is considered to be an overly dominant built form on the site that is out of scale and character with the local building context. It would be detrimental to the setting of adjacent listed buildings including Tower Bridge, the Bridgemasters House, Lambeth College, the bank and the statue on the island site, and would fail to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Tower Bridge conservation areas. Therefore the

development is unacceptable in aesthetic terms and detrimental to the visual amenity of the area, and contrary to Policy E.2.3 (Aesthetic Control), E.4.6 (Proposals Affecting Listed Buildings), E.4.3 (Proposals affecting Conservation Areas) and E.3.1 (Protection of Amenity) of the Adopted Southwark Unitary Development Plan 1995 and Policies 3.14 (Quality in Design), 3.15 (Urban Design), 3.6 (Heritage Conservation) and 3.2 (Protection of Amenity) of the Draft Southwark Plan as agreed for deposit November 2002

- 3 The proposed development fails to make an acceptable provision for affordable housing. It fails to meet the policy of the Council that requires new housing development to make an adequate level of contribution to the stock of affordable housing within the borough, and is contrary to Policy H.1.4 (Affordable Housing) of the Adopted Southwark Unitary Development Plan 1995 and Policy 4.4 (Affordable Housing Provision) of the Draft Southwark Plan as agreed for deposit November 2002. It also contrary to policies 3A.7 and 3A.8 of the London Plan.
- 4 The proposal would compromise the objectives of the Council in respect of the land at the rear by promoting uses that are unlikely to attract people into the area, furthermore the access to the rear of the site is compromised as this scheme fails to adequately address access into this site or the potential access for development at the rear. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy T.1.3 of the Adopted Unitary Development Plan and Policies 5.1 of the Deposit Unitary Development Plan and the Draft London Bridge Framework.
- 5 Servicing of the site by lorries and larger vehicles has not been adequately resolved. The presence of servicing vehicles within the public areas at ground floor level would be harmful to the safety of visitors to the site and occupiers of the buildings and would be detrimental to the amenity of all users of the development. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy T.2.1 (Measures for Pedestrians), T.1.3 (Design of the Development and Conformity with Council's Standards and Controls) and E.3.1 (Protection of Amenity) of the Adopted Southwark Unitary Development Plan 1995 and Policies 3.2 (Protection of Amenity), 3.16 (Safety in Design), 5.3 (Pedestrians and Cyclists) and 3.15 (Urban Design) of the Draft Southwark Plan as agreed for deposit November 2002.