

## **Planning Sub-Committee B**

Monday 22 November 2021

7.00 pm

Ground Floor Meeting Room G02 - 160 Tooley Street,  
London SE1 2QH

## **Supplemental Agenda No.1**

### List of Contents

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Page No.</b>
<b>7.</b>	<b>Development management items</b>	
	<b>TABLED ITEMS – ADDENDUM REPORT</b>	<b>1 - 7</b>

<b>Item No:</b> 7.1, 7.2 & 7.3	<b>Classification:</b> Open	<b>Date:</b> 22 November 2021	<b>Meeting Name:</b> Planning Sub Committee B
<b>Report title:</b>		<b>Addendum report</b> Late observations and further information	
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>		Borough and Bankside and North Bermondsey	
<b>From:</b>		Director of Planning and Growth	

## PURPOSE

1. To advise members of clarifications, corrections, consultation responses and further information received in respect of the following planning applications on the main agenda. These were received after the preparation of the report and the matters raised may not therefore have been taken in to account in reaching the stated recommendation.

## RECOMMENDATION

2. That members note and consider the additional information and consultation responses in respect of each item in reaching their decision.

## FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION

3. Late observations, consultation responses, information and revisions have been received in respect of the following planning applications on the main agenda:

**Item 7.1: 21/AP/1207 – 17-21 Risborough Street, London, Southwark, SE1 0HG**

### Updated Information

4. Reason: *More in detailed analysis of Daylight and Sunlight assessment to 42 and 46 Copperfield Street.*

Paragraph 41: Updated Information (46 Copperfield Street)

Vertical Sky Component (VSC)					
Windows			Loss		
Total	Pass	BRE compliant %	20-30%	31-40%	41%+
6	0	0	0	6	0
Annual Probably Sunlight Hours (APSH)					
Rooms			Loss		
Total	Pass	BRE compliant %	20-30%	31-40%	41%+
3	1	33	2	0	0

#### Paragraph 43: Updated Information (46 Copperfield Street)

5. APSH: One of the three rooms passed the BRE guidance threshold with regards to annual probable sunlight scoring. The remaining two rooms saw a 20-30% loss and so the extent of impact is on balance considered acceptable. Whilst two rooms failed to meet the winter targets, one recorded score was already below as existing. The proposed development will still ensure a sufficient amount of sunlight over the course of the year and therefore on balance the impact is not considered significantly detrimental.

#### Paragraph 44: Updated Information (42 Copperfield Street)

Vertical Sky Component (VSC)					
Windows			Loss		
Total	Pass	BRE compliant %	20-30%	31-40%	41%+
7	4	57	0	2	1
Annual Probably Sunlight Hours (APSH)					
Rooms			Loss		
Total	Pass	BRE compliant %	20-30%	31-40%	41%+
2	2	50	1	0	0

#### Paragraph 46: Updated Information (42 Copperfield Street)

6. APSH: The survey scores for the annual level of probable sunlight were considered for the entire calendar year. One room passed the BRE guidance threshold, with the other room expecting a sunlight loss of between 20-30%. Whilst there is an impact, the extent of loss is not considered to be significantly detrimental. On balance the impact is therefore considered acceptable.

#### **Item 7.2: 21/AP/0179 - 26-34 Upper Ground, London, Southwark, SE1 9PD**

7. The Urban Forester has confirmed that replacement trees would be planted within 1km from the site. If members wish permission could be subject to an informative that replacement trees be planted in the Borough and Bankside ward.
8. Slide 42 in the member pack incorrectly refer to number 2 Broadwall as number 7 Broadwall. Number 2 Broadwall is an eight storey block with commercial on the ground floor and residential above.

### **Item 7.3: 21/AP/1615 - Development Site At Carpark Of Matson House, Slippers Place, London, Southwark**

#### **Additional representations**

9. Since the initial report was written, an additional nine objections have been received. The material considerations raised in these additional comments are about impact on amenity, including loss of light and loss of parking. These matters have been addressed in the officer report.
10. A letter has also been received from the Southwark Law Centre in support of comments and objections made on the application. They raised the following points:
  - Omission of a density figure from the officer report
  - Urban Greening Factor below the London Plan policy requirement
  - Privacy, overlooking, daylight and sunlight impacts
  - Mitigation during construction, including the impact on residents with disabilities

Officer advice on these matters is below.

#### **Density**

11. The omission of the density of the development is an error in the report. The site is in the Urban Density Zone which has a density range of between 200-700 habitable rooms per hectare. The site is 0.0585 hectares and the development would provide 61 habitable rooms at a density of 1060 habitable rooms per hectare.
12. While this is above the density range of in the 2011 Core Strategy, it should be noted that the London Plan 2021 and the New Southwark Plan, which is likely to be adopted soon, do not include a density range. The London Plan GG3 (creating a healthy city) refers to adopting a design led approach to determine the optimum development capacity of a site while the New Southwark Plan P 14 (residential design) says that development must achieve exemplary standard of residential design which this proposal does, as referenced in paragraphs 36-41 of the main report.

### Urban greening

13. It is a true that the development would not meet the required 0.4 urban greening factor and this is acknowledged in the main report. The initial proposal was for a factor of 0.21 which was increased to 0.35.

### Privacy, overlooking and daylight/sunlight

14. These matters are addressed in paragraphs 53 to 68 of the main report. The 21m separation distance to the rear of a building is recommended to prevent loss of privacy and overlooking which on the upper floors would only occur from windows. Hickling House is to the rear and the separation distance from windows would be around 15m, though importantly, the relationship is not one that is opposite or directly facing as shown on the plan below. Any overlooking would be at an angle and would replicate the relationship between Matson House and Hickling House in terms of overlooking and privacy. There are no windows in the proposed development that would allow direct overlooking of Matson House.



### Mitigation during construction and parking

15. Condition 4 requires a construction environmental management plan to be submitted before development starts. This will need to detail methods to minimise impacts, including dust on all neighbours including the resident whose daughter has disabilities. This resident also mentioned their parking requirements as they have a wheelchair accessible car with a ramp. This resident lives in Hickling House and two of the parking spaces outside this block would be changed to provide a parking space for a resident with disabilities. There are no bays marked for the use of people with disabilities in the car parks south of Matson House and Hickling House and the resident could apply for one. There would still be space nearby for any displacement parking to be accommodated as the survey showed that on average 15 spaces were free within 200m of the site.
16. One of the objections received was from a neighbour who had already objected. They asked about:
- Noise and fire safety from the plant room
  - The geo-environmental site assessment
  - Daylight and sunlight
  - Amendments to plans in reference to the pre-application advice
  - Residential Design Standards
  - Bin Store
  - Existing foundations

Officer advice on these issues is as follows:

#### Noise and fire safety from the plant room

17. The noise assessment included details of background sound levels for the site which will inform the criterion for noise emitted from the plant room. Condition 13 requires noise from the plant room to be 10dB below background sound levels- effectively meaning that the sound environment would not increase. This condition does not reference possible sound transfer through the wall so officers recommend an amendment to this condition as follows (additional text in *italics*):

*Prior to the commencement of above grade works, details of sound insulation for the plant room shall be submitted for approval to the local planning authority. These details shall include measures to mitigate sound transfer through the building fabric and measures to ensure that the Rated sound level from any plant, together with any associated ducting shall not exceed the Background sound level (LA90 15min) at the nearest noise sensitive premises. Furthermore, the plant Specific sound level shall be 10dB(A) or more below the background sound level in this location. For the purposes of this condition the Background, Rating and Specific sound levels shall be calculated in full accordance with the methodology of BS4142:2014 +A1:2019*

18. In relation to fire, the plant room would need to comply with the building regulations for fire safety and separation.

### Geo-environmental assessment


19. The comment references a sewer and foundations. These matters will be considered in the detailed design of the scheme if planning permission is given.

### Daylight and sunlight

20. The objector references the impact on the Stanley Arms and Hickling House. This is detailed in paragraphs 56 to 67 of the main report. All existing windows in this building would comply with the BRE guidelines for daylight with this development in place. The impacts would be on the scheme for two additional storeys that was consented in 2019 where the daylight distribution for the rooms served by the affected windows would meet the BRE test. Secondary windows on flats at Hickling House would be affected but the rooms they served would continue to receive good levels of light.

### Amendments to plans in reference to the pre-application advice

21. The objector refers to a report which is the advice given to the applicant pre-application stage where different massing and design of building was proposed. The image below shows the building that was proposed at that stage, it was amended in line with the advice provided.



### Residential Design Standards

22. This matter is addressed in the main report and above in response to the comments from the Southwark Law Centre.

### Bin Store

23. Comments were made about odour and pests. This would be managed by Housing as other bin stores are; the particular design and location of the bin store is not expected to cause any significant impacts.

### Existing foundations

24. The objector asked about inspection pits and foundations. These would need to be considered in the structural design stage and would be controlled through the building regulations.

## **BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

<b>Background Papers</b>	<b>Held At</b>	<b>Contact</b>
Individual files	Chief Executive's Department 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH	Planning enquiries Telephone: 020 7525 5403