

Item No: 7.1	Classification: Open	Date: 20 July 2021	Meeting Name: Planning Committee
Report title:		Addendum report Late observations and further information	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		London Bridge and West Bermondsey	
From:		Director of Planning and Growth	

PURPOSE

1. To advise members of observations, 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 recommendation stated.

RECOMMENDATION

2. That members note and consider the late observations, consultation responses and information received 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 No. 7.1

Application 20/AP/0944 - BECKET HOUSE, 60-68 ST THOMAS STREET, LONDON, SE1 3QU.

Late Observations

4. Members are advised of a further late representation from the Old Bermondsey Neighbourhood Forum (OBNF) who have raised the following concerns regarding the Committee Report:
 - Paragraph 68 fails to identify NSP 50 & 51 or the London Bridge Area Vision as 'most relevant policies despite these being of substantive importance and under significant contention and associated modification. The same applies to strategic policy SP2 (Regeneration that works for all) and P30 Local List amongst others which are very relevant.

- Paras 72-74 and paras 85-88 (site allocations) fail to mention any of the key design about which there are clear consultation issues and associated modifications. The same applies to the indicative site capacities.
- Paras 407-408, refer to the inspectors letter only and then incorrectly states that no main modifications were requested on NSP 50 & 51. OBNF also understand from Planning Policy that the council have been preparing main modifications, have had a response to them and are working on them presently.

Officer Response

5. Paragraph 68 of the main report identifies the most relevant “policies” rather than site allocations. Of course SP2 is also relevant, not mentioning it doesn’t make it irrelevant, the same applies to local listing. Para 69 to 71 of the main report identifies limited weight attributed to draft policies to which objections have been received.
6. Para 72 to 74 of the main report references NSP 50 which is relevant to this application. The adopted and emerging policy position is set out in paragraphs 75 to 107. And In respect of the draft plan para 85 is clear, ‘until formal adoption takes place, the policies will continue to have limited weight’, paras 393 to 404 of the main report go into further detail in respect of adopted policy. On the specific point about para 85 to 88 referencing design guidance in the allocation, this is covered both the first addendum and in para 407 and 408 of the main report.
7. In the main the report at paragraphs 405 and 408 officers identify that in the Inspectors letter received post the EIP Main Modifications were not proposed to the NSP 50 and 51 designation. Officers noted that the Inspectors had confirmed that their initial list of main modifications was not exhaustive.
8. Paragraph 408 the report notes that officers were proposing minor modifications to the allocation “which will identify that building heights reduce towards Bermondsey Street and establish a minimum open space requirement...”
9. The plan inspectors have subsequently indicated that the proposal to amend the text to identify the reduction in building heights towards Bermondsey Street and to identify a minimum open space requirement should be classed as a main modification. The content of the text change will remain the same but as a main modification it will be subject to a further statutory period of consultation of six weeks with all of the other main modifications, prior to the plans adoption.

10. Officers remain of the view that, as set out in para 404 of the main report, current adopted plan policies continue to provide a sound basis on which to make decisions in respect of this site, and no indication has been given by the Inspector either during or after the EIP that he will require a fundamentally different approach to this site allocation.

Conclusion of the Director of Planning and Growth

11. Having taken into account the additional consultation response and other additional information and following consideration of the issues raised, the recommendation remains that planning permission should be granted.

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