

Planning Committee (Major Applications) B

Tuesday 15 July 2025

6.30 pm

Ground Floor Meeting Room G02A - 160 Tooley Street, London SE1
2QH

Supplemental Agenda

List of Contents

Item No.	Title	Page No.
7.	Development Management	1 - 9

Contact

Gregory Weaver on 020 7525 3667 or email: greg.weaver@southwark.gov.uk
Webpage: www.southwark.gov.uk

Date: 15 July 2025

Meeting Name:	Planning Committee (Major Applications) B
Date:	15 July 2025
Report title:	Addendum report Late representations, clarifications, corrections, and further information
Ward(s) or groups affected:	Rye Lane and North Bermondsey
Classification:	OPEN
Reason for lateness (if applicable):	Clarifications to published reports and response to further public comments
From:	Director of Planning and Growth

PURPOSE

1. To advise members of clarifications, corrections, representations and further information received in respect of the following items on the main agenda. These were received after the preparation of the report(s) and the matters raised may not therefore have been taken into account in reaching the stated recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION

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

FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION

3. Information and/or revisions have been received in respect of the following items on the main agenda:

FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION

4. Correction and additions to the conditions on the draft decision notice in respect of the following item on the main agenda
5. On Monday 7th July 2025 the following Supplementary Planning Documents were adopted:
S106 and CI
Householder Development
Affordable Housing

Officers, had considered these SPDs in their assessment and the

committee are advised they can be given full weight. Their adoption does not change the advice given in the reports or officers' recommendations.

ITEM 7.1: 24/AP/2074 - The Aylesham Centre, Rye Lane, London, SE15 5EW

Amendments to proposed putative reason for refusal

6. Officers recommend that the putative reason for refusal for committee to consider be amended to:

The proposed development, owing to the low level of affordable housing and the **failure to deliver any** Community Land Trust homes would fail to deliver sufficient public benefits to outweigh the heritage harm to the character and appearance of the Rye Lane Peckham Conservation Area owing to the height, scale and massing of proposed blocks A, B and C; **the scheme would also result in harm to the townscape owing to the excessive height of proposed block L.** As such the proposed development would be contrary to paragraphs 212, 213 and 214 **215** of the NPPF (2024), policies D1 'Design, character and capacity for growth', **D4 'Delivering good design'** and HC1 'Heritage conservation and growth' of the London Plan 2021, policies P13 'Design of places', P20 'Conservation areas', P21 'Conservation of the historic environment and natural heritage' and site allocation NSP74 of the Southwark Plan 2022, and the Rye Lane Peckham Conservation Area Appraisal (2011).

The officer report identifies that townscape harm would arise from the height of proposed block L, but concludes that it would not cause any heritage harm. The putative reason for refusal has therefore been amended to reflect this.

Correction to paragraph 228 of the officer report

7. However, owing to the excessive height of blocks A, B and C on the Rye Lane it is considered that the proposal would fail to accord with paragraphs 212, 213 and 214 **215** of the NPPF (2024)....

Correction to paragraph 256 of the officer report

8. It is therefore concluded that the proposal would fail to conserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Rye Lane Peckham Conservation Area, contrary to a number of policies in the London Plan and Southwark Plan, together with paragraphs 212-214 **212, 213 and 215** of the NPPF and the Rye Lane Peckham Conservation Area Appraisal. Moreover, the proposal would cause townscape harm, owing to the height of proposed block L.

Breakdown of CIL figures

9. The estimated Southwark CIL amount for the proposed development is £7,981,867.96 and the estimated Mayoral CIL amount is £6,160,017.90.

Details of the proposed development by phase

10. Phase 1

Land use	Quantity (GIA)
Supermarket	4,436 sqm
Flexible retail space	113.9 sqm
New homes	375 (141 x 1-bed, 149 x 2-bed, 67 x 3-bed, 18 x 4-bed)

11. Phase 2

Land use	Quantity (GIA)
Flexible retail space	3,698.8 sqm
Workspace	2,725.3 sqm
New homes	492 (203 x 1-bed, 201 x 2-bed, 88 x 3-bed)

Additional information regarding housing need in Peckham

12. The application site is located within the SE15 postcode area. The Council's Programme, Policy and Change Manager (Housing Needs) has advised that between 2022-2025 35% of the total council housing applications due to homelessness were from people living in the SE15 area.
13. Monthly reports show that 680 households within SE15 are living in temporary accommodation which is 16% of the households in temporary accommodation in the borough. There are currently 1,383 households in the SE15 area living in overcrowded accommodation, which is 26% of the total overcrowded households on the council's housing register.

Applicant response to London Fire Brigade comments

14. Paragraph 702 of the officer report explains that London Fire Brigade raised some concerns regarding the location of kitchens within the flats, the proposed stay-put and evacuation strategies, and the siting of post boxes

within a final escape route. The applicant's Fire Engineer has responded to this by referring to comments by the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) whereby the HSE has reviewed the amendments to the application and has no comments to make. As part of the appeal process officers will need to provide a list of planning conditions, and this could include a condition requiring a revised Fire Strategy to be submitted for approval, so as to address any possible concerns.

Morrisons car parking requirement

15. In response to paragraph 629 of the officer report, the applicant has provided details of a Development Agreement between Morrisons and Berkley Homes. Much of the agreement is redacted, but it includes provision for 140 parking spaces and provision of two hours free parking.

Works to Peckham bus station

16. As set out in paragraphs 585-587 of the officer report, discussions with TfL regarding works to Peckham bus station are ongoing and this would continue as part of the appeal process.

Demolition and construction management plan monitoring fee

17. The council's Environmental Protection Team has requested a construction management plan monitoring fee of £104,778.45. This would need to be considered in the round with the other planning obligations required, and negotiated during the appeal process.

Late representations received

Additional support received

18.
 - Adequate distance from other properties;
 - Contributes positively to surroundings;
 - Does not increase traffic;
 - High quality design;
 - Improves surrounding public realm;
 - Improves the quality of the area;
 - Provides new homes;
 - Provision of commercial uses;
 - The housing crisis will not be solved by preventing 800+ new homes being built on the site of a large, underused carpark and tired old shopping centre;
 - Ideally there would be more affordable homes, but pragmatism is needed.

Letter of support from Morrisons

19. Full support for the planning application
- The existing store is nearing the end of its useful life. The building no longer meets the operational standards expected by our customers or required by a modern food retailer.
 - Investment is needed to secure its future in Peckham;
 - The new supermarket would allow Morrisons to significantly improve the offer to customers, deliver a more sustainable and efficient store, and ensure we can continue serving the local community for decades to come.
 - The proposed development offers a major benefit to Peckham, not only in terms of housing and public realm improvements but also through securing the long-term future of Morrisons on this site.
 - This application safeguards a vital local service and supports local employment, both now and for the next generation.

Additional objections:

20. Two additional objections have been received raising the following concerns:
- Development out of keeping with the character of Peckham;
 - Lack of genuinely affordable housing;
 - The proposal is deeply unpopular and approval would send the message that community voices are secondary to commercial interests;
 - Cumulative impacts of the increase in population density, traffic, pressure on local services, and environmental impacts not adequately considered;
 - Impacts upon the views from Peckham Levels and the Bussey building which are huge draws to the area.

Conclusion of the Director of Planning and Growth

21. Having taken into account the additional information, following consideration of the issues raised, the recommendation remains that there should be one putative reason for refusal as set out in the officer report and updated through this addendum, which would form the basis for defending the appeal

Purpose

22. To advise members of clarifications, corrections, and to respond to further public comments received in respect of items 7.2 and 7.3 on the main agenda.

Recommendation

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

Factors for consideration

24. Late observations, consultation responses, information and/or revisions have been received in respect of the following items on the main agenda:

ITEM 7.2: 24/AP/3800 – s96a – Chambers Wharf, Chambers Street, London, SE16 4XQ

Correction

25. For the avoidance of doubt, this application has been submitted as a non-material amendment under s96a of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Officers recommend that the application for non-material changes is AGREED, subject to the amended description and additional condition of consent below to clarify the extent of the permission approved by ref 13/AP/4266 and its associated amendments.

Recommended Amended Description of Development

(to be considered as attached to 13/AP/4266)

‘Erection of six residential buildings providing residential units and flexible Class A/B1 floorspace at ground floor level along Chambers Street and Class D1 floorspace along Llewellyn Street; basement parking; service and access roads, works of hard and soft landscaping together with other works incidental to the application.’

Recommended additional Condition

Condition 35

The development approved by this permission provides for 589 residential units and 275 square metres of flexible Class A/B1 floorspace at ground floor level along Chambers Street and 203 square metres of Class D1 floorspace along Llewellyn Street.

Reason:

For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

ITEM 7.3: 24/AP/3801 – s73 – Chambers Wharf, Chambers Street, London, SE16 4XQ

26. As reported in the officer’s report 30 comments (including 10 from previous submitters and 2 comments with no name or address) were received in relation to application 24/AP/3801 and 38 comments (including 3 repeat submitters and 2 comments with no name or address) were received in relation to 24/AP/1547 (the preceding application which was withdrawn).
27. A further objection was received in relation to 24/AP/3801 bringing the total number of objections to 31 comments. The objection is uploaded to the Council’s planning register, including a PDF version which includes tables of sunlight and daylight results. The main focus of the objection is related to concern that daylight impacts to properties in Axis Court have not been appropriately assessed and that not all results are presented in the officers

report. In addition to this, the same objector has submitted correspondence directly to members of the committee questioning why officers are not recommending a planning condition restricting the height of Building A. These concerns are assessed in full below.

Consideration of condition to restrict height of Building A

28. An objector has questioned what grounds officers consider it would be unreasonable to impose a condition requiring that height of Building A be reduced to the consented level. Particularly, the objector has taken issue with the below assessment which is contained at paragraph 158 of the officer's report:

An objector has suggested that the amendments to buildings B, C and D may be approved with a condition imposed saying that notwithstanding the submission, no changes to building A are approved. The changes to building A are part of the overall scheme and include changes to comply with fire safety requirements and for a change from gas to renewable energy on site. Officers do not believe that it would be reasonable to impose such a condition.

29. The objector considers that the 13 consented ground-floor flats in Building A were replaced by a swimming and gym complex which they consider necessitated the re-provisioning of the 13 ground floor flats through the proposed extra height and facade extension to Block A. The consented scheme featured 111 units in Block A and this will be reduced to 93 units in the proposed scheme. It is the case that the massing of this building would increase as a result of the changes and there would be an impact on residents of Axis Court and Luna House, mainly from daylight and sunlight. Officers have set out the impact in the main report. The application before committee is as presented and officers do not believe it would be reasonable to impose such a condition.
30. The objector has questioned the rationale behind the assessment of daylight impacts to Axis Court in the officer's report, particularly in regard to why an assessment of daylight impacts to all Kitchen, Living, and Dining rooms and Studio units in Axis Court was not included in the officer report.
31. At paragraph 156 of the officer's report, the below results for Axis Court are presented. The comparison table below shows the VSC (daylight) results for Axis Court which would experience reduction in daylight as a result of the proposed amendments (which are shown in Bold) when compared against the consented scheme (figures in brackets are the equivalent figures from the 2010 scheme approved under 07/AP/1262), as calculated against the 2007 baseline.

VSC						
Address	# of windows tested	Windows that pass	20.1-29.9% loss	30-39.9% loss	40%+ loss	proposal VSC reduction range (2007 VSC range)

Axis Court	128 (128)	64 (75)	8 (13)	14 (22)	42 (18)	20.2% - 95.5% (20.7% to 100%)

32. The objector has questioned why all impacts to properties were not discussed by officers, including impacts to all Kitchen, Living, and Dining rooms and Studio units in Axis Court where impacts are less than a 3% VSC reduction. Officers consider VSC shifts of less than 3% absolute VSC from the consented position not to be significant. For completeness, the daylight impacts raised by the objector (to the Kitchen, Living, and Dining rooms and Studio units in Axis Court at Axis Court) are discussed below.
33. The objector has raised concern that flats 12, 23, and 42 in Axis Court will fall below 15% as a result of the proposed amendments. The impacts to the Kitchen, Living, and Dining Rooms for these flats will be limited to a range of 2.4-2.87 and these windows will have retained daylight levels over 10% absolute VSC.
34. Further, the objector has raised concern with the impacts to flats 6, 10, 11, 16, 17, 22, 28, and 37 in Axis Court which as approved feature windows which are below 15% VSC and will see some reductions as result of the amendments. The impacts to these flats will be small with the majority of reductions 2% VSC or below, with the exception being Flat 37 which despite the changes has retained VSC values of over 10 VSC.
35. Officers consider that retained daylight levels would be largely consistent with the approved scheme and are therefore acceptable as detailed in the report.
36. The objector also raised that some properties had incorrectly been labelled under the heading 'reductions resulting to less than 15% VSC'. This was due to an error with the ordering of the results. However, the assessment provided next to each property remains accurate.

Correction

37. Paragraph 289 of the report indicates that the recommendation for approval would be subject to GLA referral. However, GLA Stage 2 Referral is not required as the GLA confirmed the application does not give rise to any new strategic issues and they do not need to be consulted further on this application.

Conclusion of the Director of Planning and Growth

38. Having taken into account the additional information, following consideration of the issues raised, the recommendation remains that there should be one putative reason for refusal as set out in the officer report and updated through this addendum, which would form the basis for defending the appeal.

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Individual files	Environment Neighbourhoods and Growth Department 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH	Planning enquiries Telephone: 020 7525 5403