

<b>Item No.</b> 5	<b>Classification</b> OPEN	<b>Decision Level</b> PLANNING COMMITTEE	<b>Date</b> 6.7.04
<b>From</b> Interim Development and Building Control Manager		<b>Title of Report</b> DEVELOPMENT CONTROL	
<b>Proposal</b> (03-AP-2314 )  Development of site, including existing nursery building, to provide two buildings (each part-4/part-6 storeys) fronting St James Road, for replacement nursery and 49 flats (with ancillary office accommodation) with basement plant and storage space, and new landscaped pedestrian link from St James's Road to churchyard.		<b>Address</b>  Vacant land, St James's Road SE16 (Bermondsey Spa Site J) including 30 St James's Road, SE16  <b>Ward</b> Riverside	

## **PURPOSE**

1. To consider the above application. The proposal requires Committee consideration because the Council has a pecuniary interest in the site as land-owner and because of the number of objections.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

2. Grant conditional permission subject to a legal agreement to secure the affordable housing, replacement tree planting in the churchyard and/or immediate locality and amendment of the traffic order to restrict a proportion of future residents from applying for parking permits, and subject to a resolution from the Executive as to the use of part of the funds from the sale of the sites for environmental improvements in the area.

## **BACKGROUND**

3. This proposal relates to a site located at the north end of St James's Road, near the junction with Jamaica Road. It forms part of the wider Bermondsey Spa Regeneration Area covered by a 'masterplan' prepared in August 2000 by Llewelyn Davies which aimed to optimize Council landholdings in the area (though this has no planning status). The applicants were subsequently selected by the Council in November 2002 as developers for the site.
4. Apart from a single storey post-war building used as a private nursery, the site is vacant and surrounded by a hoarding, having previously been used on a temporary basis as a small public garden. The surrounding area is a mix of Council blocks and small scale commercial uses. Although the area is of little

townscape value, it is dominated by the grade II\* listed St James's church, which the application site is immediately at the rear of. Bermondsey underground station is a few minutes walk from the site and there are good bus routes along Jamaica Road to London Bridge and Canada Water.

5. The proposal is for two separate buildings either side of a new pedestrian access linking St James's Road with the churchyard (owned and managed by the Council as public open space) and the rest of Bermondsey Spa beyond. The smaller building, at the south end of the site, comprises part-4, part-6 storeys and contains a replacement nursery, a small office ancillary to the management of the flats and 16 flats; the larger building at the north end of the site also comprises part-4 and part-6 storeys and will contain the remaining 33 flats. Given the physical constraints of the site, no parking is proposed.

## **FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION**

### **6. Main Issues**

The main issues in this case are the development of the site, the proposed residential accommodation, amenity and traffic.

### **7. Planning Policy**

#### Southwark Unitary Development Plan 1995 [UDP]:

Policy R.2.2 'Planning Agreements' - complies, as approval is subject to an agreement to secure a number of matters, including the affordable housing and financial contribution to amend the Traffic Order.

Policy E.1.1 'Safety and Security in the Environment' – complies, with the scheme as a whole designed to maximise the safety and security around and within the site.

Policy E.2.1 'Layout and Building Line' – complies, as the proposal maintains the main street pattern of St James's Road whilst providing a much improved pedestrian connection between St James's Road and the churchyard and area beyond.

Policy E.2.2 'Heights of Buildings' - generally complies, as the new buildings are higher than the low level houses on St James's Road opposite but satisfactorily relate to the height of the church and tall buildings at the junction of St James's Road and Jamaica Road.

Policy E.2.3 'Aesthetic Control' – complies, as the proposal is considered to be a high quality design.

Policy E.2.5 'External Space' – generally complies, subject to detailed drawings being secured by condition to confirming the treatment around the site.

Policy E.3.1 'Protection of Amenity' - generally complies: the proposal will have an impact on the light and outlook of the existing houses and flats on St James's Road, but daylight studies submitted by the applicants demonstrate that these properties will still receive natural daylight in excess of the recommended minimum.

Policy E.3.5 'Vacant Sites and Buildings' and Policy C.5.4 'Protection of Private and Public Urban Open Space' - generally complies: although until recently the site was used as an open space, managed by the Council, this was only a temporary measure.

Historically the site was occupied by houses which were demolished in the 1970s. Significant improvements by the Council are proposed for the churchyard, which is the main amenity space for the area.

Policy C.2.2 'Health, Social and Educational Facilities' - complies as the proposal includes a new replacement nursery.

Policy H.1.3 'New Housing' and Policy H.1.5 'Dwelling Mix of New Housing' - complies, with a good mix of unit sizes, a significant proportion of which are two bedroom dwelling units, that improves the local housing stock.

Policy H.1.4 'Affordable Housing' - complies, with just under the requisite amount of affordable housing being provided.

Policy H.1.7 'Density of New Residential Development' - complies with emerging policy.

Policy H.1.8 'Standards for New Housing' - generally complies, there being an absence of any communal amenity space, but this is off-set by a number of the flats having their own balcony or terrace and the site being immediately adjacent to the churchyard.

Policy H.1.10 'Provision of Housing to Mobility and Wheelchair Standards' – complies, the developer confirming that the site will meet Lifetime Homes Standards, with wheelchair access into and within the new buildings.

Policy T.1.2 'Location of Development in Relation to the Transport Network' - the site is well served by local bus routes and is close to Bermondsey Underground station.

Policy T.1.3 'Design of Development and Conformity with Council Standards and Controls' - generally complies.

Policy T.6.1 'On-Street Parking Control' and Policy T.6.3 'Parking Space in New Developments' - complies with emerging policy, but approval is subject to a restriction on some future residents of the new development from applying for parking permits.

### **The Southwark Plan [Revised Deposit Unitary Development Plan] March 2004**

The site is within the Urban Zone, a Public Transport Accessibility Zone and the Bermondsey Action Area; in addition the site is designated as a **Proposal Site**, for Class D non-residential institutional/ assembly and leisure uses which prioritizes community uses, and residential.

1.2 Local Policy Areas - complies: this is a mixed use redevelopment within the Bermondsey Spa Action Area that makes efficient use of vacant land providing a range of housing types and units and including a new, replacement nursery.

2.1 Enhancement of Community Facilities - complies, the proposal including a replacement nursery which considerably improves the existing accommodation.

3.2 Protection of Amenity - generally complies, as above

3.3 Sustainability Appraisal, 3.4 Energy Efficiency and 3.5 Renewable Energy - complies, the applicants have submitted a Sustainability Appraisal demonstrating their commitment to make this a sustainable development, with the aim of achieving an Eco Homes rating of "Very Good".

3.10 Efficient Use of Land - complies, this being a high density development that makes the best use of the land whilst ensuring acceptable levels of amenity for existing and future residents.

3.11 Quality in Design, 3.12 Design Statements and 3.13 Urban Design - complies: a Design Statement has been submitted demonstrating that this will be a quality design.

3.14 Designing Out Crime - complies in principle, although this will need to be further assessed with the submission of the detailed design.

4.1 Location and density of Residential Development - complies

4.2 Quality of Residential Accommodation - complies.

4.3 Mix of Dwellings - complies.

4.4 Affordable Housing - complies, the scheme including affordable housing.

5.1 Locating Development - complies, the site being well served by public transport

5.3 Walking and Cycling - complies, the scheme improving pedestrian access from St James's Road and incorporating cycle storage.

5.6 Car Parking – generally complies, given the good public transport accessibility and allowing for a proportion of future residents to apply for parking permits.

## 8. **Consultations**

Site Notice: 19.1.04 (expired 9.2.04) Press Notice: 2.1.04 (expired 23.1.04)

Consultees: 19.1.04 (expired 9.2.04)

English Heritage, Traffic Group, Housing Department, Arboricultural Officer,  
Crime Prevention Design Advisor

30, 32, 34, 36, 38 and 41-75 (odds) St James's Road, SE16

Royal Mail, 150 Spa Road, SE16

2, 2A and St James's Church, Thurland Road, SE16

20-34 (evens) Dockley Road, SE16; 1-20 Tranton Road, SE16

Manager, The Gregorian PH, 96 Jamaica Road, SE16

98 Jamaica Road, SE16

Flats 1-34 (inclus) Bromfield Court, Jamaica Road, SE16

1-17 (odds) Toussaint Walk, SE16; 1-9 (inclus) John McKenna Walk, SE16

Flats 1-83 (inclus) Casby House, Dickens Estate, SE16

Flats 1-43 (inclus) Bowley House, Dickens Estate, SE16

Headteacher, St James's C of E Primary School, Old Jamaica Road, SE16 4SU

In addition to the consultations undertaken by the Council, the applicant has also undertaken a series of consultation exercises. These include an exhibition held at St James's Church on Saturday 31st January and a leaflet drop to homes around the site.

### **Replies from:**

English Heritage: confirm that this is a case that can be determined in accordance with Government guidance in PPG15 '*Planning and the Historic Environment*' and development plan policies, and do not wish to make any representations on this occasion.

Traffic Group: £2,500.00 must be secured towards changing the existing Traffic Order to exempt a proportion of the future residents in the development from obtaining residents parking permits: recommend that permits are issued at a ratio of 0.5, ie 25 permits for the 49 flats; requests conditions on refuse and cycle storage and a Travel Plan being submitted for the nursery.

Housing Department: no objections to the proposal; the Horizon Housing Group, who will be purchasing the affordable units on a long lease, have also confirmed the proposed affordable units are acceptable, although the studio unit in the main affordable block is to be excluded and provided with a separate entrance, as there is no Council nomination requirements for this type of accommodation.

Arboricultural Officer: generally happy with the proposals and prepared to accept the loss of one of the existing mature Plane trees on St. James's Road and other trees at the rear of the site, subject to suitable replacements in this location and in the vicinity.

Environmental Health: require (by condition) a site investigation to determine the extent of any soil contamination - this can be limited if a proper desktop study is undertaken.

Crime Prevention Design Advisor: confirm applicants consulted him prior to making the application and some minor concerns have been addressed; the slightly excessive number of dwellings on each main entrance can be dealt with by the provision of CCTV cameras. Subject to the correct materials being used this development could achieve Secured by Design Approval.

Vicar of St James's Church: only comment relates to concern about the potential restriction of the proposed development on the Church's future proposals for developing the Crypt, the entrance to which is at the east end of the church (to the rear of the current housing proposal).

Occupier, 25 Bromfield Court, St James's Road: **objects** - lives opposite the site and is worried that it will block out a lot of light, that there is plenty of waste ground further along Old Jamaica Road that could be built on without taking away the view from St James's Churchyard;

Occupier, 33 Bromfield Court, St James's Road: **objects** - too many spaces are being turned flats and houses in this part of Bermondsey;

Occupier, 32 St James's Road: **objects** - concerned about infestation of rats in the area, which is already a problem, noise and disruption of building works, especially during the summer as their windows will need to be kept closed; would not want view of the church obscured in anyway;

Occupiers, 45 St James's Road: objects -

- the height of the proposed buildings is twice/three times as high as the majority of the properties opposite it, there will be loss of privacy to the front bedrooms to the houses opposite, the distance between the existing and proposed buildings will be less than 15 metres; to keep in line with the existing area the development should be no higher than the properties opposite; the height of the development will have an overbearing affect on the existing area, buildings and features;
- there will be severe traffic problems during the construction, especially given the limited access to the site, worsening an already bad situation; traffic levels will be higher than they are now (which have already increased since the traffic lights were installed) after construction has finished, worsening existing noise levels; dust, noise and environmental problems during construction will be "devastating" for people living in the area, particularly those living opposite, for a considerable time, and the "hemming in" of the area will be considerable;
- object to loss of the open space; the aesthetic relationship with the church and its grounds will be destroyed; consider the developer's claim that they will preserve the trees is not feasible/false because the trees will be right up against the new windows;
- comments that the site was cleared and fenced off more than six months before the application was submitted, implying that this is a "*fait accompli*"; proposal will cut out light in summer evenings and block the view of the church and gardens;
- comments that there are plenty of other sites in the vicinity that have been derelict for some time and these should be developed first, and concludes that apart from the new nursery and the walk through to the church grounds, this development is not the right one for the site and will be too high and overbearing on the existing area;

Occupiers, 75 St James's Road: comment that given the increased noise levels from traffic on St James's Road since the traffic lights were installed two years ago, their only concern is the noise, and asks whether they can have double glazing.

Occupier, 2 Thurland Road: concerned about the new buildings being higher than the existing buildings in an already densely populated area and it will make St. James's Road seem very built up and crowded; consider 2-3 storeys would be more compatible with the current buildings and would maintain a sense of spaciousness.

Occupier, 49 Casby House, Jamaica Road: thinks it is a good idea to have a nursery building, with hard and soft landscaping including the playground, but concerned about building 49 flats - there are not enough parking spaces for the existing tenants living in the area and the problem of parking would increase.

Occupier, 80 Casby House, Jamaica Road: asks if it will be noisy and what mitigation measures there will be.

Occupier, 15 Bowley House: returned comment sheet without any comments

## **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

### **LAND USE**

#### Principle of Developing the Land

9. Apart from the existing nursery, the remainder of the site is vacant and surrounded by a hoarding. Prior to this it was used as an open area with some landscaping. However, this was only ever intended to be a temporary measure: historically the land was used for housing (albeit cleared some time ago) and the intention has always been to redevelop it. The site was identified for development in the Bermondsey Spa "masterplan", which was approved by the Council in October 2000. Following the production of a development brief and a competition to secure a suitable developer, the Council Executive agreed in November 2002 that the current applicant be selected as the preferred developer for the site. The objections to loss of open space are therefore not considered to be sustainable, especially with the close proximity of St James's Churchyard, owned and managed by the Council, which provides adequate open space for the area.

#### Residential Accommodation

10. The proposal is for a mixed use development, predominantly for housing but with a replacement nursery (which caters for 25 children under the age of 5 years), which is welcomed. Of the 49 flats proposed, nine would be affordable; this represents 24.6% of the accommodation as measured by habitable rooms. Although just under the 25% required by Council policy at the time the application was submitted, this is considered to be acceptable. This accommodation, which will be secured as part of the legal agreement, is provisionally to be managed by the Horizon Housing Group and has the support of the Housing Department.
11. The 40 private flats comprise 1 x studio, 18 x 1-bedroom and 21 x 2-bedroom units; the affordable comprises 2 x 1-bedroom, 3 x 2-bedroom and 4 x 3-bedroom flats. With the majority being 2-bedroom or more, this is considered to be acceptable. All units comply with the Council's criteria in terms of room size and are of an acceptable standard. Adequate refuse storage is proposed at ground level for each group of flats (with separate storage for the nursery) and the scheme has been revised so that the doors to the refuse stores do not open out over the public highway.

### Density

12. The residential density of the proposal is 772 habitable rooms per hectare (hrh). Under the adopted plan the density criteria for the area is 175-210 (hrh); in the Revised Deposit UDP the site falls within the Urban Zone, where the policy seeks to achieve densities of 300 to 700 hrh. However, it is also within a Public Transport Accessibility Zone: this is an area that has better access to public transport, significant potential for new development and investment and a mixed use character. Within these areas the policy allows densities to be exceeded above those for the Urban Zone on those sites where the increased scale of development is appropriate in terms of design and amenity. This is subject to the development providing an exemplary standard of design, with an excellent standard of living accommodation, and a significant contribution to environmental improvements in the area, including public realm improvements. Although the proposed scheme does exceed the density criteria for the Urban Zone, the difference is relatively small; furthermore it is considered to comply with the conditions under which this may occur, and accordingly this aspect of the scheme is considered to be acceptable.

### Amenity Space

13. Based on the number of units proposed, Council policy would normally require the scheme to incorporate 540 sq.m of communal amenity space. Whilst there is no designated communal amenity space, 31 of the 49 flats have either a balcony or terrace, varying in size from 5.8 sq.m to 39.5 sq.m and totaling 585 sq.m. The applicants have suggested that the 234 sq.m space between the two blocks that forms the pedestrian "gateway" between St James's Road and the churchyard be included as communal space, but in practice this is likely to be used as little more than a through route. Irrespective of this, the amenity space provision is considered to be acceptable given the constraints of the site. Furthermore, residents will have access to the churchyard which is open to the general public and which is due to be refurbished in due course (along with the nursery play area, also open to the public).

## **TOWNSCAPE AND DESIGN**

### Urban Design Strategy/Site planning

14. The overall urban design strategy has been to provide a terrace-like structure to the development whilst still maintaining open space and links between Spa Road and St James's Road. On St James's Road the blocks are arranged with adequate pavement widths and defensible space in front of ground floor windows. Entrances are also placed at regular intervals, as they are on the new open space, providing an active edge to the building. The provision of the nursery also provides essential surveillance of and activity in the surrounding open spaces.

### Setting of the Listed Building

15. One of the main design issues for consideration is the setting of the grade II\* listed St James church. For the majority of St James's history the east end was obscured by housing and although it has benefited from being open to views in the recent past (following the demolition of the Victorian terrace) it is acknowledged that the proposal is recreating an equally historic development pattern by building on this open space.
16. The proposal does include an open space but this at the southern end of the site, effectively removing axial views of the east end of the church. However, the most important axial view of the church is the western (front) portico end and the more subtle sequential views promoted by the application scheme have significant merit, not least because the open space sits more comfortably within the wider regenerative and urban design ambitions of Bermondsey Spa to promote links between Spa Road and Jamaica Road.

### Building Heights

17. The proposal is for two separate buildings creating a 'broken' terrace of ground plus three storeys with the addition of two storey pods or attics over two distinct parts of the buildings. The four storey 'plinth' establishes an appropriate scale and relationship corresponding to the height of the main body of the church. The two taller elements are slightly taller than the upper clerestory but do not dominate or challenge the main townscape focus of the area, the spire.
18. Although the proposed building is larger than the majority of buildings on the opposite side of St James's Road, these low-rise, low-density single houses are not considered to be typical of the area as a whole. There are four and seven storey buildings at the north end of St James's Road, and the proposed building, which complies with both Government and Council policy for higher density schemes that make more efficient use of land, relates satisfactorily with these, and the new buildings proposed to the west of the church.

### Detailed design issues

19. The architectural quality of the proposal is high, from the overall placement of buildings on the site and their massing to the detailed design and use of materials. The architects have provided a great deal of detail in their drawings, which indicates that this will be a scheme of architectural merit.
20. Although not listed the existing boundary railings to the church are of some historic interest as are the stones stacked up against them (formerly marking graves). Careful consideration has been given to the issue of how to deal with

these at the point where the new open space adjoins the existing churchyard. A drawing has been provided of a new gate incorporating a re-used section of railing. It is also clear that a number of grave-stones will need to be moved in order to complete the link between the new and existing open spaces. However at this time it is not clear who will be responsible for this part of the project – the Council (as owner and manager of the churchyard) or the developer. This needs to be conditioned as the linking of these two spaces, both physically and aesthetically, is essential to this development. Conditions also require submission of design details such as the residential entrances.

21. There is also an issue as to how the new playground for the nursery is to be used and what kind of boundary treatment is proposed. However, this forms part of the churchyard, which the Council intends to refurbish in due course.

#### Trees and Landscaping

22. A detailed tree study has undertaken. This demonstrates that the proposal requires the removal of five of the trees at the rear of the site and one of the London Planes on St James's Road (at the point of the open space between the two new buildings), mainly to gain adequate site access but also because the tree has some trunk decay which makes it unsuitable for long term retention anyway. The removal of these trees is considered to be acceptable, subject to adequate tree replacements being planted within the churchyard and/or the immediate locality. If the replacements are to be outside of the site boundary, and given the Council's own longer term intention to refurbish the churchyard, it is appropriate to incorporate this requirement in the legal agreement. A condition will require full details of the planting within the site, including the treatment of the open space that forms the new pedestrian link between St James's Road and the churchyard.
23. The tree study indicates that the remaining trees will need to be pruned, and in the case of the large Planes on St James's Road this pruning will need to be significant. However, this is a species of tree that can tolerate a significant amount of pruning and this is considered to be acceptable. Furthermore, this may improve the amount of natural daylight that the existing houses and flats on the opposite side of St James's Road receive, or at least off-set some of the loss of light arising from the new building (see below). A condition is proposed concerning the protection and extent of works allowed for the retained trees.

#### **Daylight and Amenity Issues**

24. The main impact that the proposal will have will be reducing daylight and sunlight and increasing the sense of enclosure to the existing houses and flats opposite the site on St James's Road, where some of the existing residents have objected to the proposal on these grounds. 41-59 (odds) St James's Road and 1 Tranton Road are all believed to comprise single houses 2-3

storeys high with kitchens at front ground floor (and living rooms at the rear) with bedrooms above. These are set back from the road, with small front gardens. The entrance to Tranton Road is immediately opposite the south end of the site; the north end of the site is partially opposite the four storey Bromfield Court: this comprises 2-storey maisonettes on top of each other, each of which is believed to have the living room on the lower floor and bedroom above.

25. Apart from the large Plane trees, which do block out a considerable amount of light, and the church itself, the existing residential accommodation does benefit from the open nature of the site, especially at the houses and flats face west and thus receive late afternoon and evening sun. However, as indicated above, the site was only meant to be left undeveloped for a temporary period, and it is therefore inevitable that the existing houses and flats will lose some amenity if the site is to be developed.
26. The minimum distance between the new buildings and the existing residential accommodation is 17m, increasing to 21m between the north end of the site and the flats in Bromfield Court, which helps ensure a minimum level of amenity. The extent of lost daylight and sunlight will vary, however, because of the changes in the design: those houses opposite the open space between the new buildings will be least affected; the majority will be opposite the four storey elements of the new blocks, whilst a few will be opposite the six storey elements (namely two of the maisonettes in Bromfield Court, 41 and 59 St James's Road and the side elevation of the double-aspect 1 Tranton Road). Daylight studies have been undertaken which demonstrate that even after the development is built, the existing accommodation will still receive natural daylight well in excess of the Government's minimum recommendations as measured by the average daylight factor. On this basis there should also be adequate sunlight. Given these circumstances the objections on these ground are not considered to be sustainable.
27. The distance of 17-19m between the proposed flats and existing accommodation opposite exceeds the minimum distance of 12m for the front of buildings specified in the Council's standards to prevent unnecessary problems of overlooking, loss of privacy and disturbance. However, in order to minimize potential overlooking from the roof terraces in the new blocks, the proposal has been amended to remove one small balcony at the front of the new building and require the installation of set-back guard railings (to be secured by condition) on the main roof terraces.
28. It is not considered that the proposal will have an adverse effect on the church. Although the Vicar has queried whether the proposal will restrict the main entrance to the Crypt (which is at the east end of the church, i.e. immediately behind the proposed development) which they hope to improve in the future, there is adequate space between the two sites and this is not considered to be

an issue.

29. The proposal will inevitably cause some disruption during the construction period. However, the applicants are committed to joining the Council's Considerate Contractor's Scheme and intend to help minimize disruption by incorporating building techniques, such as the use of pre-fabricated elements, to shorten the construction period.

### **Traffic and Highways**

30. The proposed scheme does not incorporate any off-street car parking and there have been objections to the proposal increasing car parking pressures and traffic generation in the area. As St James's Road is the only road adjacent to the site, and which is extremely busy, it is not considered practical to incorporate parking into the scheme without creating access problems and potential highway safety issues. The site is within a Public Transport Accessibility Zone (as defined in the Revised Deposit UDP), being close to Bermondsey Station and good bus routes on Jamaica Road. On this basis the absence of any parking on the site is considered to be acceptable in principle.
31. The site is within a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) which does have capacity for additional parking permit holders. However, this scheme needs to be assessed alongside the concurrent proposals for Bermondsey Spa Sites E-U (on the other side of St James's Church), where there is also an issue of increased demand for on-street parking spaces. It is therefore proposed to allow only a proportion of future residents to apply for parking permits, and it is recommended that permits are issued at a ratio of 0.5, ie 25 permits for the 49 flats. This is to be part of the legal agreement (with the applicant also required to pay £2,500 to amend the traffic order to enable this). Although the applicant is requesting that a higher proportion of permits are issued for his site, given the need to allow parking for existing residents as well as future residents in the development of Sites E-U, the 25 permits for this site is considered to be a fair allowance, especially given the good public transport facilities.
32. The proposal has incorporated space for cycle storage. Although adequate in principle the actual method of storage has yet to be finalised and this has been conditioned accordingly.
33. The site is over the Jubilee Line tunnel. The applicants have been in discussion with London Underground and this is not considered to be an issue.

### **EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IMPLICATIONS**

34. The proposal incorporates level access into the new nursery; the residential accommodation has been designed to comply with Lifetime Homes Standards, including wheelchair access, etc. The nursery widens educational choice within

the area.

## **LOCAL AGENDA 21 [Sustainable Development] IMPLICATIONS**

35. The applicants have indicated their intention to incorporate a number of features such as a “green roof” on the four storey blocks, careful use of materials, and explore the use of photovoltaic cells, with the intention of achieving an EcoHomes rating of ‘very good’.

LEAD OFFICER	James F Sherry	Interim Development and Building Control Manager [tel. 020 7525 5420]
REPORT AUTHOR	Paul Quayle	
CASE FILE	TP/321-28	
Papers held at:	Council Offices, Chiltern, Portland Street SE17 2ES [tel. 020 7525 5402]	