

# Contents

Contents .....	1
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	3
BACKGROUND INFORMATION.....	5
Site location and description .....	5
Details of proposal.....	7
Public consultation .....	8
KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION.....	12
Summary of main issues .....	12
Legal context.....	12
Planning policy .....	13
ASSESSMENT .....	15
Principle of the proposed development in terms of land use.....	15
Environmental impact assessment (EIA).....	19
Design quality.....	19
Trees and landscaping .....	26
Affordable housing .....	28
Mix of dwellings .....	29
Wheelchair accessible housing .....	30
Quality of accommodation .....	30
Impact of proposed development on amenity of adjoining occupiers and surrounding area.....	34
Ecology .....	38
Transport.....	40
Air quality .....	42
Flood risk.....	43
Sustainable development implications .....	44
Fire safety .....	47
Digital connectivity.....	47
Planning obligations (S.106 agreement) .....	48
Community involvement and engagement .....	52
Consultation responses from external and statutory consultees .....	53
Community impact and equalities assessment .....	55
Human rights implications .....	55
Positive and proactive statement.....	56

Positive and proactive engagement: summary table ..... 56

CONCLUSION ..... 56

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS ..... 58

APPENDICES..... 58

AUDIT TRAIL..... 58

<b>Item No.</b> 7.2	<b>Classification:</b> OPEN	<b>Date:</b> 14 September 2022	<b>Meeting Name:</b> Planning Committee
<b>Report title:</b>	<b>Development Management:</b>  <b>Address:</b> 35-39 Parkhouse Street, London SE5 7TQ  <b>Proposal:</b> Demolition of existing buildings and construction of a mixed-use building up to nine storeys in height, comprising 85 residential units (Use Class C3) and 1,306 sqm (GIA) of commercial floorspace (Use Class E(g), B2 and B8) with associated car parking, landscaping and other associated work.		
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>	St Giles		
<b>From:</b>	Director of Planning and Growth		
<b>Application Start Date</b>	15.11.2019	<b>Expiry Date</b>	14.02.2020
<b>Earliest Decision Date</b>	07.02.2022	<b>PPA Date</b>	31.12.2022

## RECOMMENDATION

1. That planning permission be granted, subject to conditions and the applicant entering into an appropriate legal agreement by no later than 31 December 2022.
2. In the event that the requirements of (1.) are not met by 31 December 2022, that the director of planning and growth be authorised to refuse planning permission, if appropriate, for the reason set out at paragraph 218 of this report.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

3. This application is for the redevelopment of an industrial site to provide modernised and improved employment floorspace in addition to a significant number of new homes. Currently occupied by low rise brick built commercial buildings and two dwellings converted into four flats, the site is located on the north side of Parkhouse Street immediately to the south of Burgess Park and was previously considered to be a preferred industrial location. Burgess Park, which shares a boundary with the application site, is a site of importance for nature conservation (SINC).
4. When originally submitted, the proposed development sought consent for a ten storey building up to 35.5 metres in height with 100 'Build to Rent' homes and 1,323smq of commercial floorspace. Following concerns raised as part of the initial consultation process, feedback from officers and a requirement to work collaboratively with the adjacent landowners, the applicant sought to make significant revisions to the proposed development.

5. A completely redesigned scheme was then submitted as part of the current application. The revised scheme proposes 85 new homes (40% of which would be affordable) as well as full re-provision of the existing employment floorspace. The building was reduced in height to 27.23 metres and the layout, detailed design and architecture was fully reconsidered.
6. The proposed re-provided employment floorspace would be modern, flexible and more appealing to a range of potential tenants. The 85 new flatted dwellings that would be provided would be a net uplift of 81 homes and affordable housing would be provided at 40% with a policy compliant tenure split, unit mix and proportion of wheelchair homes. The proposed housing would be high quality with a high proportion of dual aspect units and all units benefitting from private amenity space.
7. Carbon emissions would be reduced by 49% above the building regulations which is well in excess of the 35% required by policy and a financial contribution would be secured to achieve carbon zero status. The development would make use of air source heat pumps and mechanical ventilation and heat recovery to deliver these on-site savings.
8. The development would have minimal impact on existing nearby residents with no significant adverse impacts identified in terms of daylight/sunlight, overlooking, loss of privacy or loss of outlook. Emerging schemes in the area have also been considered and the proposed development would have no detrimental impact on the new developments approved on the adjacent sites.
9. New landscaping and tree planting would provide greening and increase biodiversity on what is currently a hard-surfaced site devoid of any trees and a 95% biodiversity net gain would be achieved. Ecological impacts upon the adjoining SINC have been carefully considered through an independent ecological assessment, and following mitigation through conditions and planning obligations it is considered that there would be no significant adverse impacts.
10. The height, scale and massing of the building is considered to positively respond to the existing and emerging character and would have no adverse impact on adjacent heritage assets. The development is considered to be high quality in terms of design and architecture. The proposed materials are robust, contextual and would ensure a quality finish befitting of this important location adjacent to Burgess Park.
11. Transport impacts would be minimal and the development would contribute to transport improvements in the area including contributions towards bus improvements, cycle hire and highways improvements.

12.

Homes	Private Homes	Private HR.	Aff.SR Homes	Aff.SR HR	Aff.Int Homes	Aff.Int HR	Homes Total (% of total )	HR Total
Studio	4	8	0	0	0	0	4 (5%)	8

1 bed	16	34	8	16	6	12	30 (35%)	62
2 bed	18	66	9	36	3	12	30 (35%)	114
3 bed	13	65	4	20	4	20	21 (25%)	105
Total and (% of total)	51 (60%)	173 (60%)	31 (25%)	72 (25%)	13 (15%)	44 (15%)	85	289

13.	<b>Use Class</b>	<b>Existing sqm</b>	<b>Proposed sqm</b>	<b>Change +/-</b>
	Affordable workspace Use Class E	0	130 (10%)	+130
	Use Class E (g), B2 and B8	1,304	1,306	+2

14.		<b>Existing sqm</b>	<b>Proposed sqm</b>	<b>Change +/-</b>
	Public Open Space	0	Improvements to Parkhouse Street including increased pavement widths and new tree planting.	
	Play Space	0	255	+255

15.	<b>CO2 Savings beyond part L Bldg. Regs.</b>	<b>%</b>
	Trees lost	1 Class C
	Trees gained	5

16.		<b>Existing</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Change +/-</b>
	Urban Greening Factor	0	0.4	+0.4
	Greenfield Run Off Rate	90.1 l/s	2.5 l/s	-87.6 l/s
	Green/Brown Roofs	0	210 sqm	+210 sqm
	EVCPS (on site)	0	3	+3
	Cycle parking spaces	0	154	+154

17.	<b>CIL (estimated)</b>	<b>£262,080</b>
	<b>MCIL (estimated)</b>	<b>£449,280</b>
	<b>S106</b>	<b>£514,835</b>

## BACKGROUND INFORMATION

### Site location and description

18. Located on the north side of Parkhouse Street on the southern boundary of Burgess Park, the application site measures approximately 0.24 hectares and currently comprises a single storey brick built warehouse building and two 1950s dwellings that have been converted to four flats. The site is currently occupied by World Wide Ltd a wholesale brewery. Prior to that it was occupied by a packaging company (J Hunnex & Sons).

Site location



19. Existing vehicular and pedestrian access to the proposed development site is via Parkhouse Street (a one way road), which borders the site to the south, and forms a loop between Southampton Way and Wells Way. The site is in a predominantly industrial area, although there are residential uses at 1-13 and 37-39 Parkhouse Street. The site adjoins Burgess Park to the north which is Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) and a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC). There is a wooded area within the park which immediately adjoins the site which is known as the New Church Road Nature Area. To the east is an industrial building and associated yard at Parkhouse Street, Burgess Business Park is to the south on the opposite side of Parkhouse Street, and an industrial building at 25-33 Parkhouse Street adjoins to the west.

20. The site is subject to the following planning designations:

- Urban Density Zone
- Air Quality Management Area
- Area where 35% affordable and 35% private housing is required;
- Site allocation NSP 25 'Burgess Business Park'
- Public transport accessibility level (PTAL) 2 (low)

21. The site is within the setting of the Addington Square Conservation Area and grade II listed buildings the Lime Kiln in Burgess Park and the former St Georges Church and Groundwork Trust Offices on Wells Way.

## Images of application site



## Details of proposal

22. Planning consent is sought for the demolition of all buildings on site and redevelopment to provide a nine storey building with a maximum height of 27.23 metres above ground level. Arranged in an 'H' formation, the development would provide 1,306 sqm (GIA) of Class E commercial floorspace on the ground floor and mezzanine level whilst the upper floors would accommodate 85 new flatted dwellings as set out below:

Unit type	Market	Social rented	Intermediate	Total
Studio	4	0	0	4
1-bed	16	8	6	30
2-bed	18	9	3	30
3-bed	13	4	4	21
<b>Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>85</b>

Image – proposed development viewed from Parkhouse Street



23. Vehicular access would be gained from Parkhouse Street to a yard on the western flank of the site. This would enable servicing to be undertaken off-street and would also provide three accessible car parking spaces. Whilst the two residential cores could be accessed from this yard the principal residential entrance would be from Parkhouse Street which would also provide access to the main cycle parking area.

### **Public consultation**

24. Following the initial consultation on the originally submitted scheme, a total of 69 representations were received from neighbours and local groups (including Wells Way Triangle Residents Association) objecting to the proposed development. Two representations offering support for the development were received. These representations are summarised below:

25. Support

- Burgess Business Park is a small pocket of underutilised light industrial space that is no longer fit for purpose, with little demand for available space.
- The site could be repurposed to yield a significant number of housing units, which are desperately needed in the Borough, without evicting existing occupiers and returning the area to a suitable use.
- The proposals meet the minimum affordable housing criteria, which is excellent.
- There is a severe shortage of housing in London and especially in Camberwell.
- In Southwark the average first time buyer deposit is over £100,000, this is simply impossible to achieve for the vast majority of young people. Any action to increase the supply of housing will help relieve the housing crisis.
- It should be noted that this development is well placed, close to amenities such as Burgess Park, two bus routes, three current or proposed cycle routes and it will be a short walk from a proposed London Underground

Station on Old Kent Road.

- This is a car free development, there are too many motor vehicles on the streets around Burgess Park so this is also a positive.

26. Objection

Amenity impacts

- Loss of light and increased overshadowing to Burgess Park.
- Biodiversity in the nature area of the park will suffer because of overshadowing.
- The park would be impacted by the development as a result of having a tall building on its boundary.
- Noise coming from the outdoor space within the new development and restriction of light due to the height of the building will have a major impact into the Nature area.
- The tree on site should be protected.
- The development would result in disturbance including noise and dirt.
- There would be daylight impacts to local residents.
- There should be an ecological appraisal.

27. Design issues

- Site not suitable for tall buildings.
- The development is too high and out of context with its surroundings.
- Burgess Business Park should be designated as an Action Area or Opportunity Area and require master-planning to enable any taller elements to be delivered in a more coherent way.
- The scheme would be overdevelopment.
- The scheme would be over dense as a result of the excessive height.
- The development is ugly.
- The excessive height will have a negative impact on heritage assets.
- The site is inappropriate for a tall building
- The development is not set back sufficiently from the park.

28. Housing

- There is a lack of affordable housing.
- The development does not provide play space for the 12+ age group and Burgess Park is expected to take the strain.
- The housing would be poor quality.
- The development is not of an exemplary design in that almost all bathrooms are windowless and do not have natural light.

29. Land use

- The industrial estate should be retained and used to provide local jobs for local people.

30. Sustainability and infrastructure

- Transport, education and health services would be impacted by the increase in number of homes.
- There are no plans to incorporate renewable energy in the scheme to prevent additional carbon being emitted when it is in use.

31. Transport
- The development would put pressure on public transport.
  - The development will result in increased parking pressures.
  - Insufficient cycle parking is being provided.
32. Following this consultation exercise, the applicant engaged with officers and the landowners of the adjacent development sites in order to address wider and shared objectives in order to deliver a co-ordinated approach to development in the area and this is discussed further in the report. As a result of this engagement, the applicant fully revised the scheme, reducing the number of homes and building height as well as following a new architectural approach and an amended design. The amendments can be summarised as:
- A reduction in the number of homes proposed from 100 to 85 (an overall reduction of 15 homes), with 40% to be secured as affordable housing (based on habitable rooms).
  - An increase in dual aspect or single aspect south, east and west facing from 76% to 87%.
  - A reduction in the overall height and massing of the proposals compared to the previously submitted proposals, to a six-storey shoulder in accordance with the aspirations of the Local Development Study (LDS) with a pop up seventh floor.
  - Further setbacks from Burgess Park boundary with no balconies projecting into 5 metre ecological buffer zone.
  - 10% wheelchair adaptable homes retained.
  - Building set back further from Parkhouse Street to provide a more generous street.
  - Play space enlarged with a better outlook onto Burgess Park and
  - A retention of the re-provided commercial high quality floorspace.
33. As a result of the proposed amendments a further statutory consultation was undertaken by the council in addition to the consultation undertaken locally by the applicant. Following the council's re-consultation, a total of nine objections and one representation of support have been made. The response offering support states simply that they are generally supportive of the development but are of the view that the cycle parking is insufficient. The objections received do not raise any new issues further to those set out above.

#### Friends of Burgess Park

34. When consulted on the original scheme, Friends of Burgess Park (FoBP) objected on the following grounds:
- The development is too tall and represents overdevelopment of the site.
  - The height and proximity of the development to the park will reduce openness and impact on park users.
  - The development would be overbearing.
  - MOL should be protected from inappropriate development, particularly in inner London where there is limited green space of substantial size, an increasing population, higher density dwellings and fewer people having their own garden or open space.

- Loss of sunlight, noise and light pollution would adversely impact the nature area. There would be an adverse impact on heritage assets.
- Height, density and design of towers on local townscape. Should optimise the site not maximise it
- The density significantly exceeds policy. The development does not meet planning policy for densification in transports hubs or around high street area.
- Burgess Park should not make up for any playspace shortfall.
- Does not meet required urban greening factor in the draft London Plan.
- Green space is increasingly important for health, wellbeing and social interaction.
- Park will be affected by overlooking, encroachment and less use of the space as it becomes less appealing.

35. Following the scheme re-design, FoBP have made the following comments:

- FOBP recognises that the applicant has amended the earlier designs responding to comments and consultation.
- Although the building is going to be reduced in height, the buildings at 27.23m will still have an effect on Burgess Park.
- The proposed development responds to the planning policy site brief for taller buildings - under 30m in height. The height as shown on the illustrations does not appear to impinge on the views of St George's Church tower from across the park, which are an essential element of the local heritage and character.
- The building appears to sit below the tree line so that it will not dominate the park edge or intrude visually into the park. The height below the treeline will also reduce the impact of shadowing across the park from this north facing site, but still a consideration.
- The development maintains the boundary with Burgess Park, respects the 5m set back and has developed a sympathetic bio-diverse roof space along the wall responding to the location beside the park.
- The TPO tree on the corner of the site with Parkhouse St has been given an appropriate space and setting with additional planting.
- The industrial space is replaced with a small increase in the size.

36. FoBP have requested the following provision be made:

- The Urban Greening Factor of 4 achieved in this park side location.
- Provision for play (leisure/amenity provision) for over 12's developed within Burgess Park responding to developers around the park not meeting this need on site.
- Developers across the Parkhouse St properties being encouraged to develop a co-ordinated plan on the play offer, to reduce repetition and increase variety of the offer particularly in shared/communal areas.
- Developers collaborating on a cohesive public realm across Parkhouse Street as a whole.
- The design for balconies, lighting and noise impact on the park to be minimised.
- Swift boxes and bat boxes incorporated into the building.

- FOBP call for all developments near Burgess Park to maximise the green benefits of their development to be sympathetic to the park-side location.

## **KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

### **Summary of main issues**

37. The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:
- Principle of proposed development in terms of land use, including departure from policies to protect preferred industrial locations
  - Environmental impact assessment
  - Design, including building heights and impacts of tall buildings on local views
  - Impact on heritage assets
  - Trees and landscaping
  - Ecology
  - Density
  - Affordable housing
  - Mix of dwellings
  - Wheelchair accessible housing
  - Quality of accommodation
  - Impact of proposed development on amenity of adjoining occupiers and surrounding area
  - Transport
  - Air quality
  - Flood risk
  - Sustainable development implications
  - Fire safety
  - Digital Connectivity
  - Archaeology
  - Planning obligations (S.106 undertaking or agreement)
  - Mayoral and borough community infrastructure levy (CIL)
  - Community involvement and engagement
  - Community impact and equalities assessment
  - Consultation responses from external and statutory consultees
  - Human rights
  - Positive and proactive statement

These matters are discussed in detail in the 'Assessment' section of this report.

### **Legal context**

38. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) requires planning applications to be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this instance the development plan comprises the London Plan 2021 and the Southwark Plan 2022. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires decision-makers determining planning applications for development within Conservation Areas to pay special attention to the

desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. Section 66 of the Act also requires the Authority to pay special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings and their setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess.

39. There are also specific statutory duties in respect of the public sector equalities duty which are highlighted in the relevant sections below and in the overall assessment at the end of the report.

## **Planning policy**

40. The statutory development plan for the Borough comprises the London Plan 2021 and The Southwark Plan (2022). The National Planning Policy Framework (2021) constitutes material considerations but is not part of the statutory development plan. A list of policies which are relevant to this application is provided at Appendix 2. Any policies which are particularly relevant to the consideration of this application are highlighted in the report.

### Site allocation NSP25

41. The site falls within site allocation NSP25 in the Southwark Plan 2022 and this allocation covers the entire PIL. The site forms a small part of the overall site allocation as shown on the image below, which shows the full extent of NSP25 with the application site hatched in red. The various requirements for NSP25 are also set out below.
42. NSP 25 states that redevelopment of the site must:
- Ensure every individual development proposal increases or provides at least the amount of employment floorspace (E(g), B class) currently on the site; and
  - Provide new homes (C3); and
  - Enhance permeability including new north-south and east-west green links; and
  - Provide public realm improvements including a square.
43. The site allocation also considers that redevelopment of the site should:
- Provide industrial employment space (E(g)(iii)); (industrial processes)
  - Provide active frontages (retail, community or leisure uses) at appropriate ground floor locations.
44. The site allocation has a minimum residential capacity of 681 homes. The design and accessibility guidance states that development should establish green links into Burgess Park and from Chiswell Street to Newent Close, opening up access for new and existing residents with a new public realm offer throughout the site. Consideration should be given to focal points of activity and active frontages that encourage footfall. Redevelopment should enhance existing and proposed pedestrian and cycle routes including the Southwark Spine and good accessibility to bus stops.

## **Other relevant guidance**

45. The council recently commissioned a Local Development Study (LDS) which was completed in October 2020. The purpose of the Parkhouse Street LDS is to promote a design strategy for development for the Parkhouse Street area in order to co-ordinate developer activities and encourage a cohesive form of development across the various landownerships. The LDS covers the area outlined in red below which is described in the LDS as the composite site. Currently there are five landowners which have submitted proposals for sites in this area and timescales are broadly in parallel, which presents a unique opportunity to address wider and shared objectives in order to deliver a co-ordinated approach to development in the area.

46.



47. The LDS sets out a strategic response to the planning policy guidance that exists and is to be used as the basis for discussion between the various landowners. It should be noted that the LDS has no statutory Planning status; it is however an agreed reference point for a cohesive design approach. Relevant to this particular application is the principle of a mixed use redevelopment, maintaining an appropriate buffer to Burgess Park, a physical and potentially a visual link to the Lime Kiln in Burgess Park with active uses along the link, a consistent shoulder height along the Parkhouse Street frontage, the mix of uses, and public realm improvements to Parkhouse Street. Planning consent, has been granted for the following three sites:

48. **21-23 Parkhouse Street – 19/AP/0469** - Demolition of existing building at 21-23 Parkhouse Street and erection of two blocks (Block A and Block B) of 5 and part-7/part-10 storeys. Block A comprises 5-storey block for commercial/employment use (879sqm) and Block B comprises a part-7/part 10-storey block with ground floor commercial/employment use (111sqm) and 33 residential dwellings, accessible car parking, cycle parking, refuse storage, and associated landscaping  
Granted – 14.04.2022

49. **25-33 Parkhouse Street – 20/AP/0858** - The redevelopment of the site to provide a mixed-use development comprising buildings up to 11 storey's in height and accommodating new homes (Use Class C3) and commercial floorspace (Use Class B1c), car parking, cycle parking and associated landscaping.

Granted with legal agreement 27.05.2022

50. **Burgess Business Park – 21/AP/1342** - Demolition of the existing buildings and redevelopment of the site to provide residential units (Class C3), flexible commercial floorspace (Class E) and community floorspace (Class F) within 12 blocks of between 2-13 storeys, with car and cycle parking and associated hard and soft landscaping and public realm improvements.  
Granted subject to completion of legal agreement.

## **ASSESSMENT**

### **Principle of the proposed development in terms of land use**

51. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was updated in July 2021. At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The framework sets out a number of key principles, including a focus on driving and supporting sustainable economic development. Section 6 of the NPPF 'Building a strong, competitive economy' states that planning policies and decisions should help create the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt. Significant weight should be placed on the need to support economic growth and productivity, taking into account both local business needs and wider opportunities for development. The approach taken should allow each area to build on its strengths, counter any weaknesses, and address the challenges of the future.
52. Policy E4 of the London Plan 2021 seeks to ensure that there is a sufficient supply of land and premises in London to meet current and future demands for industrial and related functions, and the site falls within the locally significant industrial site category under this policy. Policy E6 of the London Plan relates specifically to locally significant industrial sites, and requires boroughs to designate such sites in their development plans and to make clear the range of industrial and related uses which would be acceptable in these locations. Policy E7 of the London Plan relates to industrial intensification, co-location and substitution. Development plans and proposals should be proactive and encourage the intensification of business uses in classes B1c, B2 and B8 occupying all categories of industrial land. In locally significant industrial sites the scope for co-locating industrial uses with residential and other uses may be considered, and must be plan-led. This is subject to certain criteria being met such as industrial uses not being compromised in terms of their continued efficient function, access and servicing, and subject to appropriate design mitigation within the residential units to enable industrial uses to function efficiently.
53. Whilst previously designated as a Preferred Industrial Location (PIL), the site designation has been replaced by the site allocation (NSP25) in order to become a mixed use neighbourhood and this aligns with London Plan policy E7. The site allocation sets out the land use requirements, which are for every individual development proposal within NSP25 to increase or provide at least the amount of employment floorspace currently on the site, and to provide new homes.
54. Policy P30 of the Southwark Plan requires replacement or increased

employment space where required by site allocations. In exceptional circumstances a loss of employment floorspace may be accepted where the retention or uplift in employment space is not feasible. This must be demonstrated by a marketing exercise for two years immediately prior to any planning application, and should be for its existing condition and as an opportunity for an improved employment use through redevelopment which shows that there is now demand.

#### Provision of employment floorspace

55. The site currently contains 1,304sqm (GIA) of Class E (formerly Class B) floorspace which is in storage and distribution use by World Wide Ltd, a wholesale brewery. The proposed development would include 1,306sqm (GIA) of light industrial floorspace (Class E (g)) with a vision to attract more affordable co-working serviced offices along with light industrial and workshop occupiers. This would represent a minor increase of 2sqm in employment space compared to that which currently exists on the site which would comply with the London Plan policies outlined above as well as NSP25. It is noted that policy P36 of the draft NSP requires an impact assessment for office proposals over 1,000sqm which are outside of town centres such as this site. However, as there is a specific requirement under the site allocation to replace or increase the existing amount of employment floorspace, no impact assessment is required in this instance.
56. The proposed employment space would be good quality and would be split between three units making them more attractive to small business owners. All of the units would benefit from level access at street level and as such do not require extensive loading and unloading facilities or goods lifts.
57. In accordance with policy E7 of the London Plan, a planning obligation is required to ensure that the commercial floorspace would be completed in advance of any of the residential units being occupied. A condition has been included in the draft recommendation to secure an appropriate level of fit-out for the units.

#### Existing business retention

58. Policy P31 of the Southwark Plan relates to affordable workspace and stipulates that development be required to retain small and independent businesses on a site and where they are at risk of displacement, to provide suitable affordable workspace for them within the completed development. Policy P33 - Business Relocation, requires applicants to provide a business relocation strategy in consultation with affected businesses which must set out viable relocation options.
59. The current occupier is Worldwide Beers Limited who occupy the commercial space on a short basis and the existing lease commenced on 2 May 2018, well after the point at which the applicant had commenced formal pre-application discussions with the council. A short term lease was offered to the current occupier as it was always intended to be a temporary occupation in lieu of site redevelopment. As such, a Business Relocation Strategy has not been submitted or requested in this instance.

## Affordable workspace

60. Policy E2 (C) of the London Plan requires proposals for new B1 floorspace greater than 2,500 sqm (GEA) or a locally determined lower threshold to consider the scope to provide a proportion of flexible workspace suitable for micro, small and medium-sized enterprises. Policy E3 relates to affordable workspace and the use of planning obligations to secure affordable workspace at below market rates. Policy E8 of the London Plan is also relevant, which states that employment opportunities for Londoners across a diverse range of sectors should be promoted and supported, along with support for the development of business growth and sector-specific opportunities. It requires the delivery of suitable workspaces to support the evolution of London's diverse sectors including start-up space and affordable workspace.
61. Southwark Plan policy P31 – Affordable Workspace, requires development of 500sqm (GIA) or more employment floorspace to:
- Deliver at least 10% of the proposed gross employment floorspace as affordable workspace on site at discount market rents; and
  - Secure the affordable workspace for at least 30 years; and
  - Provide affordable workspace of a type and specification that meets current local demand; and
  - Prioritise affordable workspace for existing small and independent businesses occupying the site that are at risk of displacement. Where this is not feasible, affordable workspace must be targeted for small and independent businesses from the local area with an identified need; and
  - Collaborate with the council, local businesses, business associations and workspace providers to identify the businesses that will be nominated for occupying affordable workspace.
62. If it is not feasible to provide affordable workspace on site then the policy allows for an in lieu payment to be made for off-site affordable workspace. Additionally, the policy allows for the provision of affordable retail and cultural uses, albeit in exceptional circumstances only.
63. In seeking to meet the requirements of Policy P31, the applicant has agreed to the following AWS provisions:
- 10% affordable workspace (130 sqm) to be provided;
  - The affordable workspace to be secured for a 30 year term and the same occupier could remain for the entire period;
  - No more than 50% of the market rate floorspace to be occupied until the affordable workspace has been fitted-out ready for occupation;
  - Rent on the affordable workspace to be a 25% discount on market rent inclusive of service charge for the 30 year term (this currently equates to £15 per square foot);
  - Flexible leases;
  - Applicants for the affordable workspace must either have an existing small and independent business in Southwark or be a resident of Southwark and the proposed use must be from a specific sector which has a social, cultural or economic development purpose or to accommodate an existing

- occupier at the site;
- During the construction period, a database of interested parties must be compiled and maintained;
- On completion, the affordable workspace must be marketed using a website, newspapers, agencies, managing agent, database, and external signage. It must be actively marketed for nine months to Southwark businesses and residents. Only if the space remains unoccupied after this period of marketing can it be made available to the same types of businesses outside of Southwark which would be permitted to remain in the affordable space, paying affordable rent, for up to five years. After those five years, the process would start again. During this time the existing tenant(s) could remain until a suitable Southwark tenant is found;
- The day-to-day management of the space to be carried out by a suitably competent management company;
- Each unit would be equipped with mechanical and electrical fit-out, sprinklers, heating and cooling provision and kitchen and WC facilities.

#### Provision of new homes

64. The NPPF makes it clear that delivering a significant number of new homes is a key priority for the planning system. London Plan Policies GG4 and H1 reinforce the importance of delivering new homes, setting a 10 year target of 23,550 new dwellings for Southwark. Southwark policies reiterate the importance of delivering significant numbers of new dwellings. The Southwark Plan has identified capacity to meet the London Plan target of 23,550 by 2028.
65. The provision of new housing on the site would comply with site allocation NSP25. Of note is that the Planning Committee resolved to grant permission for three developments on Parkhouse Street which include residential accommodation, one at 21-23 Parkhouse Street (reference: 19/AP/0469); another at 25-33 Parkhouse Street (reference: 20/AP/0858); and most recently at Burgess Industrial Park (reference 21/AP/1342) . Following the completion of s106 agreements planning permission was granted in April 2022 for the proposed development at 21-23 Parkhouse Street and in May this year for the proposed development at 25-33 Parkhouse Street.

#### Agent of change principles

66. E7 of the London Plan supports the intensification of industrial uses and co-locating industrial and residential uses, provided the ability of the industrial uses to operate efficiently is not compromised. Light industrial uses can generally sit comfortably alongside residential uses. However, it is important to ensure that such uses are accommodated within buildings that are fit for purpose in terms of layout and construction techniques, and that proper regard has been given to technical matters such as soundproofing and ventilation. London Plan policy D13 requires all developments to consider 'agent of change' principles to ensure that where new developments are proposed close to existing noise-generating uses, they are designed in a sensitive way to protect the new occupiers, such as residents and businesses, from noise and other impacts. Policy E7 of the London Plan also seeks to ensure that industrial activities are not compromised in areas where residential uses are provided alongside industrial uses. This is an important consideration for this site given the proximity of proposed

residential uses in relation to existing and proposed employment uses.

67. The development has been designed to ensure that the commercial floorspace and the residential accommodation can co-exist without any significant residential amenity or commercial operation impacts. In order to further minimise any potential conflict of use, appropriately worded conditions to ensure that the residential units would be appropriately sound-proofed to reduce the likelihood of any noise complaints against neighbouring industrial uses are recommended. It is noted that some of the neighbouring sites are subject to planning applications for redevelopment including residential in any event.

#### Land use conclusion

68. Overall, the proposed development is considered to be acceptable in land use terms. It would provide an uplift in employment space, albeit minimal, which would be of good quality and flexibly designed. A policy compliant amount of affordable workspace would be provided, and the provision of new homes would meet the requirements of the site allocation (NSP25) of the Southwark Plan as well as complying with policy E7 of the London Plan. The contribution towards employment space and housing in the borough are noted as positive aspects of the proposal.

#### **Environmental impact assessment (EIA)**

69. The proposed development does not meet or exceed any of the thresholds set out in the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 and as such an EIA is not required in this instance.

#### **Design quality**

70. The NPPF stresses that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and is indivisible from good planning (paragraph 124). Chapter 3 of the London Plan seeks to ensure that new developments optimise site capacity whilst delivering the highest standard of design in the interest of good place making. New developments must enhance the existing context and character of the area, providing high quality public realm that is inclusive for all with high quality architecture and landscaping.
71. The importance of good design is reinforced in the Southwark Plan. Policies P13 and P14 require all new buildings to be of appropriate height, scale and massing, respond to and enhance local distinctiveness and architectural character; and to conserve and enhance the significance of the local historic environment. Any new development must take account of and improve existing patterns of development and movement, permeability and street widths; and ensure that buildings, public spaces and routes are positioned according to their function, importance and use. There is a strong emphasis upon improving opportunities for sustainable modes of travel by enhancing connections, routes and green infrastructure. Furthermore, all new development must be attractive, safe and fully accessible and inclusive for all.

72. Site allocation NSP25 assumes redevelopment at a higher density than the existing buildings, and employment space to be re-provided, along with new homes. The overall area should have enhanced east-west and north south routes, including into Burgess Park.
73. Objections have been received that the proposed building is too tall, poorly designed and that the site is not suitable for a development of this size.

Image – Emerging context



Urban design (height, scale, massing and arrangement)

74. The proposal has been arranged on three urban design principles: to reinforce the Parkhouse Street frontage and offer natural surveillance and active frontages onto the street; to respect the Burgess Park edge setting back from the mature planted 'Nature Area' at the southern edge of the park; and the courtyard design of the recently consented neighbouring scheme (25-33 Parkhouse Street).
75. The design is arranged in H-shape with one flank fronting onto Parkhouse Street, the other flanking Burgess park and the link block defining two courtyards. One courtyard to the west is set at ground level and marries up with a similar-sized courtyard on the neighbouring plot. The eastern courtyard is at podium level and is designed as a communal garden accessible by all future residents. This arrangement is natural and reflects all the key principles of urban design as set

out in the LDS.

76. The development has a generously sized (over 5m high) commercial base providing high quality space for businesses accessed from Parkhouse Street and the shared courtyard. Above that the blocks rise to a shoulder height of six-storeys with a set-back 1.5-storey high attic. The blocks are clad in brick up to the shoulder with generous overhanging balconies and the attic storey is clad in a dark grey metal cladding formed in gabled roof forms that emulate the industrial heritage of the site.

Image – view from Burgess Park with existing boundary wall retained



77. Whilst the block is urban in character on Parkhouse Street with a confident geometrical appearance, the wing facing onto Burgess Park is staggered to break down its massing and introduce a measure of dual aspect capitalising on views across the park. In this location the building is set at least five metres back from the park edge and will appear behind the retained gabled warehouse wall located at the park edge.
78. The proposed height is appropriate and relates well to the recently consented developments nearby respecting the consented 'shoulder' heights. This plot does not include a tall building and takes its cue from the setting of the spire of the former St George's church. It does this by defining a cone of vision from the approaching path that ensures the church spire is not interrupted by building mass in its backdrop when viewed from the park.
79. In conclusion, the block has been carefully crafted in a direct response to its context and its urban setting. It is highly articulated and is set at a scale and

massing that does not appear overly dominant. It reinforces the street edge appropriately on Parkhouse Street, offering natural surveillance from the upper floors and creating confident active frontages along the full length of the street edge. The arrangement allows the site to be serviced on the plot. On the park edge it will become part of a continuous frontage that is slightly taller than the mature tree-lined edge of the park, forming an articulated park edge when considered cumulatively with the recently consented developments. This is a consistent approach to the Park and will give it a strong edge without appearing overly dominant or discordant.

Image – Internal views



80. In conclusion, the urban design approach to his plot is sound, reflects all the key principles set out in the LDS and will deliver a building that will complement its urban, parkland and historic setting.

Architectural design (fabric, function and composition)

81. The design is well conceived and mannered, making the most of its highly articulate form and responding to its context. The main body of the building (up to its six-storey 'shoulder') is clad in brick to reflect the prevailing material in the area.
82. The simple elegant street façade is punctuated by the projecting forms of the residential balconies arranged in three columns. In contrast, the more articulated profile of the Burgess Park frontage the balconies are set within the stepped profile of the building so as not to appear to be reaching over or dominating the mature landscape. On the prominent eastern flank, the largely blank façade of the party walls are embellished with two large butterfly motifs, reflecting the local landmark on the listed Wells Way Baths building, a recognised local landmark in the area.

83. The set-back attic storey homes are clad in a dark grey metal and the roof takes on the serrated profile of an industrial roof. This not only reflects the industrial heritage of the Parkhouse Street Industrial Estate, an echo of this local memory, but also gives the block an interesting and elegant silhouette.
84. The development provides high quality homes of exemplary quality, a high proportion of dual aspect homes and generous proportions. At the same time the development blends the two uses, hard-working commercial spaces on the ground floor with residential uppers, in a deft and confident manner. The service entrance on the western edge of the site leads to a commercial yard – which is designed to complement the yard on the neighbouring plot and create a commercial cluster. The residential entrance is on the eastern edge of the site and leads to the two separate cores, linked by a top-lit corridor and communal cycle store. On the podium, in the space between the two wings, is an east-facing elevated garden for residents which will include play-space for children.

Image – Ground floor layout



85. In conclusion, the proposed design is well conceived, it proposes high quality contextual finishes in a highly articulated form and includes design features that ensure the needs of future occupiers are addressed. The quality of the design will rely to a large degree on the quality of detailing and the choice of materials. Accordingly conditions requiring 1:5 and 1:10 scale construction details as well as sample panels of all the finishes is recommended if Members are minded to approve this development. The retained flank wall of the current warehouse which faces onto Burgess Park will also require conditions for a detailed

measured and condition survey as well as a Method Statement for its retention and integration into the final development.

### Heritage assets

86. The site does not include any listed building and does not fall within a designated conservation area. At the centre of the site is a 1960s warehouse building and a large brick-built industrial chimney. Both are recognised in the LDS as being of local interest. The proposal seeks to remove the warehouse but retains the chimney and makes it a focal point of the new arrangement as suggested by the LDS.
87. Objections have been received that the development would have an adverse impact on views and heritage assets.

### Image – view from Limekiln



88. The nearest designated heritage assets include the Grade II Listed 73, 75 and 77 Southampton Way, Collingwood House on Cottage Green and No 113 Wells Way which are immediately adjacent the site. The proposal on this site, due to its scale and massing is unlikely to affect the settings of these listed buildings.
89. Further afield are a number of heritage assets located within or adjacent to Burgess Park. These include the Addington Square Conservation Area, and the Grade II Listed Limekiln, the Wells Way Baths and the Former Church of St George on Wells Way.
90. The Former Church of St George is a notable feature of the recent upgrade of Burgess Park being the focus of a number of routes across the park. The proposed development is in the backdrop of views of the church in the main approach form the Old Kent Road.
91. The application includes a Townscape Visual Impact Assessment (TVIA) and

includes Accurate Visual Renderings (AVRs) overlaid onto current photographs to demonstrate, from defined viewpoints, how the proposed development will appear in the context. These views help to understand the development in the round and have been used to assess the impact of the proposed development on the affected heritage assets.

92. In the TVIA the wider visual impact of the proposal is assessed and particular attention is paid to the visual impact on the immediately surrounding heritage assets as well as those that are visible from Burgess Park.
93. In this respect a series of dynamic views is presented along the axial route from the Old Kent Road where the development forms the immediate backdrop of the Grade II Listed former St Georges Church as well as the views from Addington Square CA, the Grade II Listed Limekiln.

Image – View from Burgess Park



94. The spire of the former church is the focus of the main pathway axis from the Old Kent Road where it forms a visual beacon helping to orientate visitors to the area and marking the main route across the park. Whilst this may not have been its historic purpose, its presence is recognised in the modern parkland setting and its location at the end of the park axis contributes positively to its significance.
95. The series of views submitted with the application (views A, B and G) demonstrate that the development is located to the left of the spire and, whilst it remains in the view for some of the 500m plus walk, it does not cause harm to the setting of the former church and generally remains subservient in the views disappearing from view as the viewer approaches the church.
96. The views also include the cumulative impact of the recently resolved to be consented and other applications in the Parkhouse Street area and these also demonstrate that the cumulative impact is not harmful with proposed buildings generally remaining subservient and stepping away from the spire, preserving its

prominent silhouette when viewed from the park.

97. In the remaining views from the park the TVIA demonstrates that it conforms to the principles set out in the LDS, forming a generally consistent 'shoulder' height at the edge of the park with taller elements (the subject of separate planning applications) set back and located towards the centre of the former industrial site.
98. In conclusion, where the impact of this proposal on the historic environment is concerned Officers are satisfied that there is no harm arising due to the visibility of the proposal from Burgess Park (including the lake and the Lime Kiln), Wells Way or Parkhouse Street itself. There is no direct impact on any listed buildings or conservation areas. Any harm arising due to visibility in the wider setting of heritage asserts is extremely limited and of the lowest order of Less than Substantial as defined by the NPPF and can be considered in the balance against the public benefits arising.
99. In these instances, decision-makers are advised by paragraph 202 of the NPPF to weigh "*any harm against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.*" In this case the contribution of the new public realm, the quality of design, and the inclusion of affordable housing and affordable workspace have been considered in the balance and found to be acceptable justification for the limited harm.

## **Trees and landscaping**

100. Policy G7 of the London Plan 'Trees and woodlands' states that development proposals should ensure that, wherever possible, existing trees of value are retained. If planning permission is granted that necessitates the removal of trees there should be adequate replacement based on the existing value of the benefits of the trees removed. Policy P61 of the Southwark Plan states that development must retain and protect significant existing trees. It states that development must retain and enhance the borough's trees and canopy cover.
101. Objections have been received that the site would not achieve the appropriate Urban Greening Factor (UGF) of 0.4 and that the tree on Parkhouse Street would be affected by the proposed development.
102. The site currently comprises hard landscaping consistent with its use as an industrial site and contains only two trees, one of which is protected by a Tree Preservation order (TPO) and another which is considered to be of poor quality. The opportunity therefore exists for significant improvements to be made in terms of soft landscaping and contribution towards urban greening.
103. The proposed development does not require the removal of any high value (Category A) trees. This has been achieved by offsetting the main building away from the TPO tree and the trees located off-site to the north. The removal of one low value tree (T2) is proposed due to its poor condition and to accommodate the new landscaping arrangement in this location. This is not considered to represent an arboricultural impact given the low value nature of tree. The proposed planting plan submitted separately as part of the application, proposes the planting of five new trees. The new trees would be located within internal terrace / courtyard spaces and to the south of the site on Parkhouse Street. This

demonstrates the potential to provide additional tree cover on the site as part of the proposed development compared to the existing scenario.

104. The arboricultural assessment suggests that the removal of three poor quality trees within Burgess Park, adjacent to the northern boundary of the site, would benefit other trees within that group by allowing them space to grow. These trees are not within the applicants control and officers do not support their removal. Works to these trees does not form part of this application and any potential future works to these trees will be the responsibility of Southwark Council.

Image - Landscaping



105. The planting of any trees in the pavement would need to be agreed with the council's highways development management team, and it is recommended that a clause be included in the S106 agreement requiring a bond of £6,000 per street tree which the council could use towards tree planting in the wider area in the event that not all of the street trees can be planted, or that any of them fail / die within a specified time period.

### Landscaping

106. Policy G1 of the London Plan 'Green infrastructure' states that development proposals should incorporate appropriate elements of green infrastructure that are integrated into London's wider green infrastructure network. Green infrastructure is defined in the plan as comprising the network of parks, rivers, water spaces and green spaces, plus the green elements of the built environment such as street trees, green roofs and sustainable drainage systems. Policy G4 of the London Plan 'open space' states that development proposals should, where possible, create areas of publicly accessible open space, particularly in areas of deficiency.
107. The landscaping for the development would be focussed on the first floor communal roof terrace. This would comprise a soft landscaped space with seating and opportunities for child play. The orientation of the terrace is such that

it would benefit from morning and afternoon sun as well as benefitting from views out towards Burgess Park.

108. Private terraces are buffered with screens and raised planters to ensure residents of these units have security and privacy. Social seating spaces around planters are arranged to provide both secluded pocket spaces for residents wanting to relax and benches are located where parents and guardians can observe their children as they play. Sensory planting provides colour, texture and form within the raised planters, with vertical play elements along the front.

#### Urban Greening Factor

109. Policy G5 of the London Plan 'Urban greening' requires boroughs to develop their own urban greening factor (UGF) policies, and sets an interim target score of 0.4 for developments which are predominantly residential. Following the revisions to the scheme the proposed development would achieve a UGF of 0.4 through measures such as tree planting, green roofs and permeable surfaces. This would meet the London Plan target which is welcomed.
110. Overall, the existing site offers little greening and the proposed development would provide new green infrastructure, landscaping and tree planting which would be a positive addition to the streetscene and positive in terms of biodiversity and habitat creation.

#### **Affordable housing**

111. Objections have been received that there would be a lack of affordable housing. The proposed development would provide 40% affordable housing which would equate to 34 units and 115 habitable rooms. There would be a policy compliant tenure split of social rented and intermediate (London Living Rent) homes.
112. Section 5 of the NPPF sets out the government's approach to the delivery of significant new housing including a requirement for housing of different sizes, types and tenures to meet the needs of different groups. The supporting text to policy H4 of the London Plan 'Delivering affordable housing' sets out that there is a need for the provision of 43,500 affordable homes per year across London.
113. At borough level, strategic policy SP1 'Homes for all' of the Southwark Plan requires 2,355 new homes to be delivered per annum. Policy P1 'Social rented and intermediate housing' of the Southwark Plan requires developments of 10 or more residential units to provide a minimum of 35% affordable housing, comprising a minimum of 25% as social rented and the remainder as intermediate. This policy sets out that for affordable housing purposes a habitable room of up to 28sqm is counted as one habitable room, a room between 28.1-42sqm is counted as two habitable rooms and so on.

#### Affordable housing by habitable room

Unit type	Private market habitable rooms	Social rented habitable rooms	Intermediate habitable rooms	Total habitable rooms
Studios	8	0	0	8
1-bed	34	16	12	62
2-bed	66	36	12	114
3-bed	65	20	20	105
<b>Total</b>	<b>173 (60%)</b>	<b>72 (25%)</b>	<b>44 (15%)</b>	<b>289</b>

#### Affordable housing unit mix

Unit type	Social rented	Intermediate	Total
1-bed	8	6	14
2-bed	9	3	12
3-bed	4	4	8
<b>Total</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>34</b>

114. The quality of accommodation is considered in detail later in the report and the units have been designed to be tenure blind. In line with policy SP1 of The Southwark Plan the applicant can follow the Fast Track route and is not required to provide a viability assessment as the level of affordable housing provision is 40%. The level of affordable housing is in excess of the minimum 35% requirement and is considered to be a significant benefit of the scheme.
115. It is recommended that the S106 agreement includes clauses to monitor the provision of affordable housing, together with a monitoring fee of £132.35 per unit. This would ensure that the provision of the affordable homes can be monitored and they remain affordable in perpetuity. The clauses would require the developer to provide plans showing the location of the social rented and intermediate homes, to ensure the exact location of these homes are identified and can be monitored by the council.
116. The developer would be required to notify the council at several stages throughout the development, including at practical completion, to ensure that the council can check that the provision of the affordable homes is as approved. The developer would be required to provide the council with as-built plans of the development identifying the address (as approved by the street naming and numbering service) and tenure of each unit. The developer would also be required to allow the council access to the development with reasonable notice in order to verify the submitted plans.

### Mix of dwellings

117. Policy P2 of the Southwark Plan 'New family homes' requires a minimum of 60% of the residential units to contain two or more bedrooms with a mix of 2-bed 3 person and 2-bed 4 person homes, and a minimum of 25% of the units to contain three or more bedrooms in the Urban Zone. A maximum of 5% studio units is permitted and these can only be private units.

Unit type	Number of units	Percentage of units %
Studio	4	5%
1-bed	30	35%
2-bed	30	35%
3-bed	21	25%
Total	85	100%

118. The proposed unit mix would be fully compliant with the standards set out in the Southwark Plan.

### **Wheelchair accessible housing**

119. Policy D7 of the London Plan 'Accessible housing' requires residential development to provide at least 10% of dwellings to meet Building Regulation requirement M4(3) 'wheelchair user dwellings' and for the remaining dwellings to meet Building Regulation requirement M4(2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings'. Policy P7 of the Southwark Plan requires the 10% to be based on habitable rooms rather than unit numbers. It also states that where those homes are affordable wheelchair user homes, 10% of the social rented homes must meet Building Regulations M4(3)(2)(b) standard (wheelchair accessible dwellings). It sets out larger minimum floor areas which wheelchair accessible dwellings must meet, and requires a mix of dwelling sizes and tenures that meet the above standards, including family homes. Two bedroom three person affordable wheelchair homes will not be acceptable.
120. The proposed development would provide 10% wheelchair adaptable units by habitable room, based on the overall habitable room calculations. This equates to 30 habitable rooms based on the total 289 habitable rooms across the scheme, provided by these units. This would include five two bedroom four person affordable units of which three are social rented and two are intermediate tenure, and the five private units (1B2P) which would all meet Building Regulations standard M4(3)(2)(b). Additionally, the wheelchair units would all meet or exceed the accessible wheelchair user housing minimum space standards set out in Policy P7 and the Residential Design Standards SPD.

### **Quality of accommodation**

121. Policy D6 of the London Plan 'Housing quality and standards' requires housing developments to be of high quality design and to provide adequately-sized rooms with comfortable and functional layouts which are fit for purpose and meet the needs of Londoners without differentiating between tenures.
122. Policy P15 of the Southwark Plan requires developments to achieve an exemplary standard of residential design, and sets out a number of criteria which must be met. The council's Residential Design Standards SPD establishes minimum room and overall flat sizes dependant on occupancy levels, and units should be dual aspect to allow for good levels of light, outlook and cross-ventilation.

123. Objections have been received that the proposed housing would be poor quality, under sized, poorly lit and with too many single aspect homes. These issues are considered below.

Unit sizes

124. The Residential Design Standards sets out the minimum unit sizes for new homes and these are set out in the table below alongside the range of provision for the new units.

125.

<b>Flats</b>	<b>SPD minimum sqm</b>	<b>Proposed unit sizes sqm</b>	<b>SPD amenity space minimum sqm</b>	<b>Amenity space proposed sqm</b>
Studio	37 or 39	37	10	8
1-bed	50	50-72	10	6-44
2-bed	61-79	71-91	10	7-25
3-bed	74-102	87-98	10	10.5-34

126. All of the residential units would meet or exceed the minimum overall floorspace requirements set out in the Nationally Described Space Standards, and they would all comply with the minimum room sizes set out in the SPD including storage requirements. They would also comply with new requirements set out in policy D6 of the London Plan ‘Housing quality and standards’.

Internal daylight and sunlight

127. A daylight and sunlight assessment for the proposed dwellings has been submitted, based on the Building Research Establishment (BRE) Guidance. Average Daylight Factor (ADF) determines the natural internal light or day lit appearance of a room and the BRE guidance recommends an ADF of 1% for bedrooms, 1.5% for living rooms and 2% for kitchens. No value is given for studios and given the shared living and sleeping spaces officers consider that 2% would be appropriate.
128. Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH) should be considered for all windows facing within 90 degrees of due south (windows outside of this orientation do not receive direct sunlight in the UK). The guidance advises that windows should receive at least 25% APSH, with 5% of this total being enjoyed during the winter months.
129. ADF analysis shows that 212 of 242 rooms assessed (88%) will meet or exceed the recommended minimum values for their respective room type (1.5% for LKDs and 1% for bedrooms). The overall level of compliance would drop slightly to 82% in the cumulative condition which takes into account the developments that have been consented but not yet constructed. This represents a good level of compliance for an urban area. Of the 43 rooms that fall below the guidance in the cumulative condition, 41 either have a private balcony directly overhead which limits the availability of light or they have direct access onto a balcony, which provides additional outdoor amenity.

130. In terms of sunlight the applicant's report demonstrates that all units within the development will receive some sunlight and where sunlight is most restricted to the north of the scheme, the units will benefit from excellent views over Burgess Park. The submitted study shows that 66 of 95 rooms assessed (69%) in the proposed condition and 45 of 95 rooms assessed (47%) in the cumulative condition would meet the BRE Report guidance for sunlight, receiving at least 25% of available sunlight. Each unit benefits from a private balcony, a key benefit in an inner urban location such as this. A number of factors affect the amount of daylight and sunlight reaching the units, including the provision of balconies which can obstruct light to the windows below, proximity to other structures, and window sizes. In this instance the overall level of compliance and quality is considered to be acceptable and the new homes would be well lit.

#### Overshadowing

131. The applicant's assessment shows that over half of the first-floor communal courtyard would receive at least two hours of sunlight on 21 March, both in the proposed and cumulative conditions, exceeding the BRE's minimum recommendation for this assessment.

#### Privacy and overlooking

132. The council's Residential Design Standards SPD recommends a minimum of 21m between the rear elevation of properties, and a 12m separation distance between properties which face one another across a highway. The block is arranged as two connected blocks broadly in an 'H' shape. Home within opposing facades of the blocks benefit from at least 20 metres separation distance and as such would comply with the guidance.

#### Aspect and outlook

133. Policy P15 of the Southwark Plan 'Residential design' requires residential units to be predominantly dual aspect and allow for natural cross ventilation. In circumstances where due to site constraints it is impossible or impractical to provide dual aspect dwellings, it must be demonstrated how overheating and ventilation will be mitigated (this is considered later in the report). Single aspect dwellings will not be acceptable if they have three or more bedrooms, or are north-facing, or where the façade is exposed to high noise levels.
134. A high proportion of the units (86%) would be dual aspect. The remaining 21 units would be single aspect however they would have either east, south or west views and as such would benefit from good light levels. All single aspect units would be either studio accommodation or 1 bedroom units.

#### Amenity space and child playspace

135. Section 3 of the Residential Design Standards SPD sets out the council's amenity space requirements for residential developments. Flats should have a minimum of 10sqm of private amenity space, and any shortfall must be added to the communal provision. Policy D6 of the London Plan requires private outdoor amenity space to have a minimum depth and width of 1.5m, and this requirement

would be met. Policy P2 of the Southwark Plan requires family homes in apartment blocks to have direct access to outdoor amenity space and allow for oversight of children outside.

136. The GLA’s playspace calculator sets out that the development would need to provide a total of 314sqm of child playspace broken down as follows:

Age group	Playspace requirement (sqm)
Under 5	145
5-11	106
12+	63

137. The applicant is proposing to provide the child playspace for the under 5 and 5-11 age group on site within the proposed first floor terrace in order that play can be supervised by parents and that children would be able to play in a safe, contained and secure environment. The first floor terrace is large enough to accommodate the required 251sqm of playspace for this age group.
138. Given that the site is immediately adjacent to Burgess Park, the applicant is proposing that the 12+ age group use the facilities designed for their age group within the park. Given the proximity of the site to the park and the site specific circumstances that prevent the 12+ age group from being accommodated on site, this proposal is considered acceptable subject to the provision of £10,350 towards play facilities within Burgess Park.
139. In terms of private amenity space, all units will benefit from balconies ranging from 6sqm to 44sqm. All three bedroom units would benefit from a balcony of at least 10sqm and as such complies with the SPD. Where one and two bedroom units do not benefit from a 10sqm balcony, the shortfall must be added to the communal amenity space requirement. The SPD requires 50sqm of communal amenity space and the balcony shortfall for this development equates to 172sqm. As such, private amenity space of 222sqm should be provided.
140. Given the site specific circumstances, including the requirement to re-provide the commercial floorspace and limit the height of the proposed building, it has not been possible to provide the communal amenity space shortfall in addition to the playspace. Officers have taken the view that the first floor terrace is suitable as a playspace and can also be used as an amenity space for residents as it will be a pleasant, green landscaped space. The proximity of the site to Burgess Park is such that residents can make use of this park as an amenity space and in line with the S106 and CIL SPD it is considered appropriate to secure a financial contribution to upgrading and improving Burgess Park. The SPD requires a payment of £205 per sqm shortfall and in this instance this would equate to £43,460 and this would be secured as part of the S106 agreement.
141. Overall it is considered that the quality of accommodation can be described as exemplary on balance. Whilst not every unit would comply with all of the exemplary criteria the majority would meet most if not all of those criteria. The Mayor’s Housing SPG advises that a failure to meet one standard would not

necessarily lead to a failure to comply with the London Plan, but that a combination of failures would cause concern. All of the units would meet the minimum floorspace requirements and many would significantly exceed them. All of the wheelchair accessible units would meet the larger unit sizes and a significant majority of the units would be dual aspect and would comply with the BRE guidance for average daylight factor. All of the units would have private amenity space and the playspace for the 0-11 age group would be fully provided in site. The remaining play and amenity space requirements can be met within the adjacent Burgess Park subject to the SPD compliant financial contributions previously mentioned.

### **Impact of proposed development on amenity of adjoining occupiers and surrounding area**

142. Policy P56 of the Southwark Plan states that development should not be permitted when it causes an unacceptable loss of amenity to present or future occupiers or users. Amenity considerations which will be taken into account include privacy and outlook, overlooking, smell, noise, vibration, daylight, sunlight and wind microclimate impacts. The adopted Residential Design Standards SPD expands on policy and sets out guidance for protecting amenity in relation to privacy, daylight and sunlight.
143. Following consultation, neighbours expressed concern that they would be subjected to a loss of light, loss of privacy and increased noise. These issues are considered in more detail below.

#### Impact of proposed use

144. The proposed development would contain Class E floorspace and residential uses. Given the broad range of uses which Class E contains, a condition is recommended requiring the uses described in the application to be provided.
145. Policy P18 of the Southwark Plan 'Efficient use of land' states that development will be permitted which optimises land use, does not unreasonably compromise the development potential or legitimate activities on neighbouring sites, and provides adequate servicing facilities, circulation space and access to, from and through the site.
146. The proposed development would introduce residential properties in close proximity to existing industrial however, conditions have been included in the draft recommendation to ensure that the proposed dwellings would be adequately sound-proofed which would reduce the likelihood of noise complaints against existing businesses. It is noted that the site is allocated for redevelopment including residential uses in the Southwark Plan, and the proposed development would be consistent with this.

#### Privacy and overlooking

147. In order to prevent harmful overlooking, the Residential Design Standards SPD 2011 requires developments to achieve a distance of 12m at the front of the building and any elevation that fronts a highway and a minimum of 21m at the rear. The proposed development would maintain or exceed the minimum distances as set out in the supplementary planning document and as such it is considered that there would be no significant adverse impact in terms of overlooking or loss of outlook.

#### Daylight and sunlight

148. Daylight and sunlight testing has been undertaken based on the BRE guidance. The BRE Guidance provides a technical reference for the assessment of amenity relating to daylight, sunlight and overshadowing. The guidance within it is not mandatory and the advice within the guide should not be seen as an instrument of planning policy. The guidance notes that within dense urban environments a higher degree of obstruction may be unavoidable to match the height and proportion of existing/consented buildings. This site benefits from an allocation in the Southwark Plan that indicates that the use of the site could be intensified.
149. The BRE sets out the detailed daylight tests. The first is the Vertical Sky Component test (VSC), which is the most readily adopted. This test considers the potential for daylight by calculating the angle of vertical sky at the centre of each of the windows serving the residential buildings which look towards the site. The target figure for VSC recommended by the BRE is 27% which is considered to be a good level of daylight and the level recommended for habitable rooms with windows on principal elevations. The BRE have determined that the daylight can be reduced by about 20% of their original value before the loss is noticeable.
150. The second method is the No Sky Line (NSL) or Daylight Distribution (DD) method which assesses the proportion of the room where the sky is visible, and plots the change in the No Sky Line between the existing and proposed situation. It advises that if there is a reduction of 20% in the area of sky visibility, daylight may be affected.

#### Impact on existing properties and spaces

151. The daylight and sunlight assessment considered the potential impact on the following existing buildings:
- 1-13A Parkhouse Street
  - 59 Wells Way
  - 61-67 Wells Way
  - 69-75 Wells Way
  - Former Church of St George Housing Co-op
152. These properties would satisfy the preliminary 25-degree line test recommended by the BRE Report. As such, there is unlikely to be an adverse effect on the diffuse skylight and sunlight enjoyed by these properties and detailed analysis is not required. As such there would be no significant daylight or sunlight impacts

on any existing residents as a result of the proposed development. Therefore, analysis is limited to assessing overshadowing on Burgess Park and the lands surrounding the former Church of St George.

153. Using the Sunlight Hours On Ground test, analysis shows that the grounds of the former Church of St George would see no change in the area receiving a minimum of 2 hours sunlight on 21 March and would remain BRE compliant. Overshadowing from the development would only affect the southern edge of Burgess Park. The area of Burgess Park bound by New Church Road and Wells Way would see no change in the 98% of its area receiving a minimum of two hours sunlight on 21 March, between the existing and the proposed conditions. When looking at the impact of the proposed development alongside the consented schemes, there would be a marginal reduction of 3% to the area of the park directly north of 25-33 Parkhouse Street and the application site, it would however remain compliant with the BRE.
154. In terms of transient overshadowing, this would be limited to the area immediately to the north of the site, between New Church Road and Wells Way. The scheme has been reduced in height since originally submitted and the shadow path is less pronounced than that of the consented schemes 25-33 and 21-23 Parkhouse Street. In the summer months, when the park is used more intensely, assessment on 21 June shows that the development shadow would match the existing shadow of the two-storey warehouse and subside by mid-afternoon.

#### Impact on proposed properties and spaces

155. The daylight and sunlight assessment has considered the impact of the proposal on the consented developments on the following sites:
- Block B, C, D, F, G, H and K – Camberwell Union
  - 21-23 Parkhouse Street
  - 25-33 Parkhouse Street
156. Blocks B-D, G, H and K of the Camberwell Union scheme and the development at 21-23 Parkhouse Street all pass the preliminary BRE 25 degree test and as such are not considered to be significantly impacted by the proposed development.

#### Block F Camberwell Union

157. This approved seven storey block would be located directly south of the site across Parkhouse Street. Given the building's orientation, there would be no effect on sunlight to this scheme from the proposed development.
158. In terms of VSC, 118 windows have been tested and 81 would continue to meet the BRE standards with the proposed development in place, equating to 69% compliance. Of the remaining 37 windows, 23 are bedroom or secondary windows located underneath balconies or within recessed parts of the façade which the BRE acknowledges can make VSC reductions unavoidable. It should

be noted that all but one rooms with one or more windows that would see impacts contrary to the BRE would exceed the standards for ADF. A total of 47 of 55 rooms assessed for ADF would continue to meet the BRE standard and this equates to 85% compliance. It is considered that the development would not have a significant impact on Block F of the Camberwell Union development.

#### 25-33 Parkhouse Street

159. This consented development lies immediately to the east of the application site and includes buildings up to 12 storey's in height with commercial use on the ground floor which is the equivalent of two storeys in height. Residential use would be located on all upper levels.
160. Using the VSC test, 264 of the 303 windows tested (87%) would meet or exceed the BRE standards. Of the remaining 39 windows, 16 are one of a double set of windows or secondary windows that serve a living space. In each case the main window or remaining window in the set would continue to meet the VSC criteria. The remaining 23 windows serve bedrooms which are less sensitive to daylight reductions, a fact acknowledged by the BRE guide. As for ADF, 187 of the 190 rooms tested would continue to meet the BRE standards and this would equate to 98% compliance.
161. In terms of sunlight, the analysis has been limited to those windows that face within 90 degrees of due south. Of the 134 rooms tested, 128 would remain compliant (96%). Analysis of the proposed communal gardens within 25-33 using the SHOG test, shows there would be no effect on those areas receiving a minimum 2-hours sun-on-ground on a typical 21 March.

#### External lighting

162. External lighting has been designed in order to ensure safety, security and appropriate site coverage whilst minimising light spillage to adjacent properties and Burgess Park. The lighting scheme is considered to be appropriate and would not have any nuisance impacts on the adjacent scheme or the parkland.

#### Noise and disturbance

163. Demolition and construction works can lead to an increase in noise and disturbance which to some extent is inevitable in order to bring forward development. However, subject to appropriate conditions and the approval of detailed management plans, these potential impacts can be suitably mitigated in order to minimise any potential adverse impacts. The relevant conditions would be attached to any consent issued.

#### Conclusions on amenity

164. As set out above, it is considered that the proposed development would not result in any significant loss of amenity to neighbouring properties or compromise the continued use of the neighbouring industrial units. It is also concluded that there

would be no significant adverse impacts upon the quality of residential accommodation which is proposed/consented on some of the neighbouring sites.

## **Ecology**

165. Burgess Park which adjoins the rear of the site is a borough level site of importance for nature conservation (SINC). The area of the park which immediately adjoins the site is identified as the New Church Road Nature Area which forms part of the wider SINC designation and is one of the most important habitats in the park. The council has recently completed a £3 million improvement project to remove the redundant New Church Road and undertake habitat improvements in this area. This includes incorporating a finger of land in the nature area which was formerly part of application site as shown on the image below. The council purchased this piece of land and in 2018 the hardstanding was removed and new planting undertaken. The nature area now contains semi-natural broadleaved woodland interspersed with areas of grassland, and includes features such as bird and bat boxes and bug hotels.
166. Policy G6 of the London Plan 'Biodiversity and access to nature' states that SINC's should be protected. Where harm to a SINC is unavoidable and where the benefits of the development proposal clearly outweigh the impacts on biodiversity, the policy sets out a mitigation hierarchy which must be followed. The policy states that development proposals should manage impacts on biodiversity and aim to secure net biodiversity gain. This should be informed by the best available ecological information and addressed from the start of the development process.
167. At borough level policy P60 of the Southwark Plan 'Biodiversity' states that development must contribute to net gains in biodiversity including through enhancing the nature conservation value of SINC's, protecting and avoiding damage to SINC's, protected species and habitats, and including features such as green and brown roofs, green walls and soft landscaping.
168. The applicant has submitted an updated Preliminary Ecological, Bat Roost and Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment. A number of objections have been received raising concerns about ecology and impact on the park. The site is currently almost fully occupied by buildings and hardstanding with a high brick boundary wall onto the park edge. The brick boundary wall to the park would be retained and a five metre buffer would be maintained between the new building and the park edge as requested by the council's parks department. No new entrances are proposed from the site directly into Burgess Park and this is also supported as it will ensure minimal impact on the SINC from potential increased use/footfall.
169. The applicant's biodiversity report sets out that there would be a 95.19% biodiversity net gain as a result of the proposed development and this is fully supported by the council's ecology officer. The following enhancements are set out below:

- The proposed development will include a native green roof, new tree planting, sedum garden planting, native shrub and ornamental shrub planting.
- Instalment of bat and bird boxes either integrated into or hung on the new building to provide additional roosting and nesting opportunities on-site. This is in line with the Southwark and Greater London Biodiversity Action Plans;
- Implementation of bug hotels within the green roof and use of bee bricks within any walls constructed, to provide new opportunities for invertebrate species, in line with the Southwark and Greater London Biodiversity Action Plans;
- Use of native species where possible and reducing the use of non-native species in the landscape designs to provide new opportunities for fauna; and
- Instalment of swift boxes on higher floors in order to provide new habitat for bird species using high rise buildings to roost and nest.

170. Several objections set out the cumulative concerns regarding impacts from the four Parkhouse Street schemes on the nature area. As part of the consultation response on the approved scheme at 25-33 Parkhouse Street, The Friends of Burgess Park (FOBP) commissioned the London Wildlife Trust (LWT) to prepare a report considering the cumulative impacts. This report was submitted to the council and reviewed by officers including the council's ecology officer.
171. The LWT report considers two areas of woodland within the park, and the closest to the application site is described as the Southampton Way woodlands which adjoins the rear of the site. The report concludes that Burgess Park is of borough level importance rather than local importance, that cumulatively lighting from the different developments would affect bats, breeding birds and moths, that cumulative overshadowing could result in a prevalence of more shade tolerant species to the detriment of grassland areas, and that insufficient information has been provided to enable the council to determine this application.
172. The council commissioned an independent ecology report prepared by an external ecologist to assess the cumulative ecological impacts of the four proposed developments which would adjoin the park. The report considers cumulative construction impacts, overshadowing, increased recreational pressure and light spillage.
173. With regard to overshadowing, the report concludes that the area of woodland which would experience increased shadowing is broadly the area which supports the lowest understorey diversity. Whilst some disturbance upon the woodland is therefore possible, it is not considered likely that this would significantly impact the conservation status of the New Church Road Nature Area or Burgess Park as a whole, nor would it likely impact bird, bats or invertebrates. The greatest overshadowing impact is predicted for the winter months when trees and most flora are dormant. The woodland understory is not of sufficient diversity or structure for the additional shadowing to be considered significant in ecological terms i.e. any change to the woodland community would not affect its conservation status or ecological functionality given the site's urban location, existing level of disturbance, and the presence of common species. It is therefore concluded that any impact would not be significant.

174. As for potential impacts upon birds and bats, the report concludes that without mitigation there could be temporary impacts arising from construction, and permanent local impacts including from lighting and increased use of the park. Mitigation is recommended through a construction environmental management plan to include measures to minimise disturbance during demolition and construction, lighting controls, landscaping within the sites supported by landscape and habitat management plans, and enhanced opportunities for ecology and biodiversity on the sites through the provision of living roofs and appropriate planting. All of these matters would be secured by way of conditions and s106 obligations. As the bat surveys have been updated within the past year, it is not considered necessary to repeat them.
175. To mitigate increased use of the park, the report suggests that the developments coming forward provide an opportunity for the creation of a small strategic habitat bank in the park, which the developments adjoining the park could fund. This could be in the form of new meadow planting, bird and bat boxes, insect hotels and stag beetle loggeries. To this end and in consultation with the council's Ecology Officer a contribution of £40,770 should be secured through the s106 agreement towards habitat creation in Burgess Park, and this is based on the amount of floorspace proposed and includes provision for monitoring and maintenance.

## **Transport**

176. Chapter 9 of the NPPF seeks to ensure that transport issues are properly addressed as part of development proposals. Proposals must assess the impact upon existing transport networks, promote and maximise opportunities for sustainable transport modes whilst mitigating any adverse transport related environmental effects and must make a significant contribution to improving accessible movement and permeability as a key priority for place making. Paragraph 111 states "development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe".
177. This approach is reflected in Chapter 10 of the London Plan and Southwark Plan Policies P49 – P55, which require development proposals to maximise sustainable modes of transport by minimising car journeys, to deliver enhanced walking and cycling opportunities and safe, accessible routes to public transport. Developments should be car free save for disabled parking provision and mitigation will be secured where necessary to address impacts upon the road and public transport networks to serve new developments.
178. Objections have been received that the development would lead to increased local parking pressures, increased use of public transport and that insufficient cycle parking would be provided. These issues are considered in more detail below.
179. The site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 2 (low), although the applicant considers that a PTAL score of 4 (medium) would be more representative. Parkhouse Street is a single carriageway road which operates as a one-way street from Wells Way to the east linking with Southampton Way to

the west. It is located in a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) which operates Monday to Friday 8.30am to 6.30pm. The nearest bus stop is approximately 150m from the site on Wells Way which is served by the 136 and 343 bus routes. There are some on-street pay and display spaces on Parkhouse Street (maximum stay 2 hours).

#### Access and servicing

180. Pedestrian access into the employment space would be from Parkhouse Street as well as from within the eastern yard. The two residential lobbies could be accessed from the Parkhouse Street entrance or from the lobby entrances within the eastern yard. The development would be serviced off-street from within the eastern yard where there would be adequate room and visibility to safely turn a vehicle. It is recommended that a condition be imposed to secure adequate visibility splays onto Parkhouse Street,

#### Trip generation

181. Concerning the vehicle movements emanating from this development proposal, the Transport Officer has reviewed the applicant's Transport Assessment and has undertaken a review of the TRICS database which demonstrates that the residential aspect of this development would generate 21 two way vehicle movements in the morning or evening peak hours while the commercial element would produce 11 in each of these periods. Overall, it is projected that this development would produce some 32 two-way vehicle movements in the morning or evening peak hours, which when offset against the estimated two two-way vehicle movements in the morning or evening peak hours for the present industrial buildings on this site, means that it would create 30 additional two way vehicle movements in the morning or evening peak hours. It is also estimated that this proposed development would produce 26 two way service vehicle movements per day. Taking into account the likely vehicle movements from the adjacent consented developments, the forecasted supplementary vehicle movements would not have any noticeable adverse traffic impact on the surrounding roads.
182. The applicant's consultants have projected that this development would create an estimated 33 two way public transport trips in the morning or evening peak hours which is deemed reasonable. It is considered that the applicant should make a contribution of £77,273 to bus improvements in the area and this should be secured in the S106 agreement.

#### Car parking

183. With the exception of three wheelchair accessible parking spaces (two residential and one commercial), the development would be car-free. As the site is located in a controlled parking zone (CPZ), a planning obligation preventing future occupiers of the development from being able to obtain parking permits is recommended. An amendment to the Traffic Management Order would be required to enable the relocation of parking bays on Parkhouse Street and this should be secured through the s106 agreement.

### Car club

184. Policy P53 of the draft NSP 'Car parking' requires developments to provide a minimum of three years free membership, per eligible adult who is the primary occupier of the development, to a car club if a car club bay is located within 850m of the development; and / or contribute towards the provision of new car club bays proportionate to the size and scale of the development if it creates 80 units or more.
185. There is a car club bay on Sam King Walk which is approximately 180m to the west of the site therefore a planning obligation is required to secure car club membership in accordance with the above policy.

### Cycle parking

186. A total of 136 long stay and nine visitor cycle parking spaces would be provided for the residential aspect of the proposal. The commercial units would benefit from five long stay spaces and five visitor spaces. The level of cycle parking being proposed would be compliant with both London and Southwark Plan policies.
187. The TfL cycle hire scheme does not currently extend into the area, although TfL are seeking to expand it and a contribution of £33,000 towards this should be secured through the s106 agreement. This would be in accordance with policy P52 of the Southwark Plan. If the scheme is extended into the area prior to the occupation of the development the s106 agreement would also secure two years' free cycle hire business accounts for commercial occupiers and two years' free cycle hire membership per household for the residential units.
188. Regarding transport impacts, the site layout and servicing arrangements are considered to be acceptable and no adverse impacts are anticipated. The cycle parking arrangements would be acceptable and would comply with both the London Plan and Southwark Plan policies. Planning obligations would secure contributions towards various transport measures including improvements to bus facilities, the cycle hire scheme, and the provision of car club membership. Overall the transport impacts of the proposed development are considered to be acceptable.

### **Air quality**

189. The site sits within an air quality management area. Policy SI 1 of the London Plan 'Improving Air Quality' seeks to minimise the impact of development on air quality, and sets a number of requirements including minimising exposure to existing poor air quality, reducing emissions from the demolition and construction of buildings, being at least 'air quality neutral', and not leading to a deterioration in air quality.
190. An air quality assessment has been submitted with the application which assesses the impact of the proposed development on air quality during the construction and operation of the development. It advises that the main construction impact relates to dust and that measures would need to be put in place to minimise this. The assessment concludes that future users of the site

are unlikely to be exposed to poor air quality.

191. The proposed development is expected to generate road traffic volumes below the relevant EPUK/IAQM screening criteria. As such, road traffic impacts associated with the operation of the proposed development can be considered as having an insignificant effect on local air quality. The development would be considered air quality neutral.

## **Flood risk**

192. Policy SI 12 of the London Plan 'Flood risk management' states that development proposals should ensure that flood risk is minimised and mitigated, and that residual risk is addressed. Policy P68 of the Southwark Plan 'Reducing flood risk' states that development must not increase flood risk on or off site and sets out the requirements for achieving this. This includes that finished floor levels are set no lower than 300mm above the predicted maximum water level where they are located within an area at risk of flooding.
193. The site is located in Flood Zone 3 as identified by the Environment Agency flood map, which indicates a high probability of flooding. Paragraph 159 of the NPPF advises that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere. In line with the NPPF, the council has a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment which acknowledges that development within flood zone 3 is required, and is allowed with the application of the exception test set out the NPPF.
194. Paragraph 163 of the NPPF states that the need for the exception test will depend on the potential vulnerability of the site and of the proposed development, in line with the flood risk vulnerability classification set out in national planning guidance. The development would contain residential units from first floor level upwards which are classified as more vulnerable uses under the NPPF.
195. For the Exception Test to be passed it must be demonstrated that the development provides wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk, and that a site-specific flood risk assessment must demonstrate that no adverse impacts would occur. Where planning applications come forward on sites allocated in the development plan through the sequential test, applicants need not apply the sequential test again. However, the exception test may need to be reapplied if relevant aspects of the proposal had not been considered when the test was applied at the plan-making stage, or if more recent information about existing or potential flood risk should be taken into account.
196. The site is located on previously developed land and there are strong sustainability reasons why it should be redeveloped. The development of brownfield sites such as this will be necessary if accommodation is to be provided to meet the current shortfall in housing in the area. The site is allocated for mixed-use development including housing in the Southwark Plan, and the proposed design is capable of providing good quality housing, with less vulnerable

commercial space at ground level and no residential units below first floor level.

197. The applicant has submitted a Flood Risk Assessment which has been reviewed by the Environment Agency who have raised no objection to the proposal subject to conditions.

### **Sustainable development implications**

198. Chapter 9 of the London Plan deals with all aspects of sustainable infrastructure and identifies the reduction of carbon emissions as a key priority. Policy SI2 requires all developments to be net zero carbon with a minimum onsite reduction of 35% for both commercial and residential. Non-residential development should achieve 15 per cent reduction through energy efficiency measures. Where developments are unable to meet net zero carbon targets any shortfall between the minimum 35% and zero carbon must be mitigated by way of a payment towards the carbon offset fund. The energy strategy for new developments must follow the London Plan Hierarchy (be lean/ be clean/ be green/be seen) and this must be demonstrated through the submission of an energy strategy with applications and post construction monitoring for a period of five years.

199. Southwark Plan Policies P69 and P70 reflect the approach of the London Plan by seeking to ensure that non-residential developments achieve a BREEAM rating of 'Excellent' and include measures to reduce the effects of overheating using the cooling hierarchy. The policies reflect the London Plan approach of 'lean, green and clean' principles and requires non-residential buildings to be zero carbon with an onsite reduction of at least 40%. Any shortfall can be addressed by way a contribution towards the carbon offset green fund. The energy hierarchy is as follows:

- Be lean – use less energy
- Be clean – supply energy efficiently;
- Be green – use renewable energy;
- Be seen – monitor, verify and report on energy performance

#### Be Lean

200. In accordance with London Plan policy SI-2, the energy strategy prioritises the 'Be lean' category of the energy hierarchy, with heat demand reduced to such an extent that there would be no demand for heat from a centralised system within the site or from off-site networks. Energy efficiency measures include:

- Efficient fabric to reduce heating and cooling demand
- Appropriate glazing ratios and deep window reveals to reduce risk of overheating in summer and reduce heat loss in winter.
- Enhanced airtightness that reduces infiltration heat losses.
- Providing energy efficient heating cooling and mechanical ventilation plant.
- Providing energy efficient lighting.
- Providing adequate control of building services systems and lighting systems.
- Providing training to building users to enable them to utilise the building efficiently.

201. Measures under this category would result in a 14% reduction in carbon emissions, with 12% for the residential units and 24% for the commercial space which would exceed the 10% and 15% requirements set out in the London Plan.

#### Be Clean

202. The proposed development would not achieve any carbon savings under this category because it proposes individual heating systems to the flats and commercial units rather than a site-wide communal system.

#### Be Green

203. Heating and hot water for residential apartments will be met via an exhaust air source heat pump, ventilation will be provided through an efficient MVHR with openable windows for additional ventilation in summer. Heating and cooling for office areas will be provided by refrigerant-based simultaneous heating and cooling 'variable refrigerant flow' systems, comprising of external air source heat pump units and internal fan coil units. The MVHR system will provide ventilation to the office areas. A photovoltaic cell system that generates at least 13 MWh of electricity per year will be installed. This can be achieved with 75 m<sup>2</sup> PV lying at 35 degrees on the south facing pitched roof. The PV array will contribute to site wide carbon emission reductions and will be used by the non-domestic development.
204. Measures under this category would result in a 35% reduction in carbon emissions, with 35% for the residential units and 34% for the commercial space

#### Be Seen

205. London Plan policy SI2 sets out an additional stage of the energy hierarchy, 'Be Seen'. This stage requires the calculation of the operational energy in detail design stage, monitoring, verification and reporting of energy performance throughout the construction and usage of the building for the first 5 years. The development commits to disclosing in-use energy consumption data to the GLA for a minimum of 5 years post construction. To allow monitoring, verification and reporting of energy performance, the following sub-metering strategy has been developed:

**Electricity:** Utility meters are to be provided for:

1. Each dwelling
2. Each commercial tenant
3. Landlord supply. This is to be sub-metered in accordance with CIBSE TM39, with submetering for:
  - a. Lighting
  - b. Small power
  - c. Major plant items

**Water:** Utility meters are to be provided for:

1. Each dwelling
2. Each commercial tenant
3. Landlord CAT-5 supply for wash down

## Circular economy

206. Policy SI 7 Reducing Waste and Supporting the Circular Economy of the London Plan requires referable applications to promote circular economy outcomes and aim to be net zero-waste.
1. How all materials arising from demolition and remediation works will be re-used and/or recycled.
  2. How the proposal's design and construction will reduce material demands and enable building materials, components and products to be disassembled and re-used at the end of their useful life.
  3. Opportunities for managing as much waste as possible on site.
  4. Adequate and easily accessible storage space and collection systems to support recycling and re-use.
  5. How much waste the proposal is expected to generate, and how and where the waste will be managed in accordance with the waste hierarchy.
  6. How performance will be monitored and reported.
207. This development supports London's transition to a low carbon circular economy, the following circular economy principles will be investigated:
- Retaining and reusing materials;
  - Building in layers;
  - Designing for disassembly- through the use of mechanical rather than adhesive connections;
  - Allow space for easy maintenance and replacement of building elements – optimising building longevity and allow for simple material reclamation at the end-of-life; and
  - Implementing material passports for elements of the building to improve the ability of disassembled elements to be reused.
208. Further details of circular economy will be secured as part of the S106 agreement.

## BREEAM

209. Southwark Plan Policies P69 requires the development to achieve BREEAM 'excellent'. A BREEAM pre-assessment has been undertaken estimating that seven credits could be achieved which would equate to BREEAM Outstanding. As such an appropriate condition should be imposed on any consent issued in order to secure this standard.

## Conclusion on energy strategy

210. The proposed energy strategy would achieve an on-site reduction in carbon emissions of 49% beyond the building regulations, significantly exceeding the 35% London Plan requirement. It would achieve a 14% reduction under the 'be lean' stage for residential uses and 24% for the non-residential uses, also exceeding the 10% and 15% requirements set out in the London Plan. Whilst it would not meet the Southwark Plan policy of 100% on-site savings, there is no

scope to provide further PV on the building. A financial contribution of £151,032 should be secured in the S106 Agreement in order to achieve carbon zero status for the development.

## **Fire safety**

211. Policy D12 of the London Plan (Fire Safety) requires all development proposals to achieve the highest standards of fire safety. All development proposals must be accompanied by a fire statement, i.e. an independent fire strategy produced by a third party, suitably qualified assessor.
212. A fire safety statement has been submitted which has been prepared by fire engineers on behalf of Jensen Hughes by appropriately qualified engineers. The Fire Safety Statement details the safety systems that would be employed on site such as fire detection alarms and sprinklers. In terms of evacuation in event of a fire, the residential part of the building will follow a stay put strategy, where only the apartment on fire evacuates. Provisions to provide dignified means of escape for all occupants will be provided in line with the London Plan D12 policy. The residential core corridors would be smoke vented. Fire engines would be able to enter and exit the site in a forward gear and vehicle tracking has been submitted demonstrating this.
213. The building has a top floor height greater than 18m. Therefore, a firefighting shaft will be provided comprising the following:
  - Firefighting stair at least 1.1m clear width. Firefighting lift opening within 7.5m of the entrance to the firefighting stair.
  - 2 hours fire resisting enclosure to the stair and firefighting lift
  - Dry fire main outlet within the stair enclosure with an outlet at every level.
  - Automatically opening vent at the head of the stair achieving at least 1m<sup>2</sup> in cross-sectional area.
214. Although the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) is not a statutory consultee for this application because it was submitted before 1 August 2021, they were consulted but declined to make comments.

## **Digital connectivity**

215. London Plan Policy SI6 introduces the need for new developments to address London's requirements for enhanced digital connectivity. The policy requires development proposals to ensure that sufficient ducting space for full fibre connectivity infrastructure is provided to all end users, to meet expected demand for mobile connectivity generated by the development, to take appropriate measures to avoid reducing mobile connectivity in surrounding areas, and to support the effective use of rooftops and the public realm (such as street furniture and bins) to accommodate well-designed and suitably located mobile digital infrastructure. This is repeated through policy P44 of the Southwark Plan 'Broadband and digital infrastructure'.
216. In order to address this requirement a condition is recommended to ensure that the appropriate ducting for future connection to the full fibre infrastructure would be installed within the proposed development.

## Planning obligations (S.106 agreement)

217. Policy DF1 of the London Plan advises that Local Planning Authorities should seek to enter into planning obligations to avoid or mitigate the adverse impacts of developments which cannot otherwise be adequately addressed through conditions, to secure or contribute towards the infrastructure, environment or site management necessary to support the development, or to secure an appropriate mix of uses within the development. Policy IP3 of the Southwark Plan sets out similar requirements, and further information is contained within the council's adopted Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure Levy SPD.

Planning obligation	Mitigation	Applicant's position
Affordable housing	40% by habitable room, to be completed and made available before more than 50% of the private units can be occupied	
Affordable housing monitoring fee	£4,500	
Affordable housing monitoring clauses	As set out earlier in this report	
Affordable housing review mechanism	Early and late stage review mechanisms up to 50% affordable housing	
Employment during construction	20 sustained jobs for unemployed borough residents, 20 short courses and 5 construction industry apprenticeships, or a payment of £96,500 for shortfall, and the associated employment, skills and business support plan	
Employment within the completed development	Not required for a development of this size.	
Local procurement	During construction	
Delivery of the employment space	Employment space in each phase to be delivered before any of the residential units in	

	that phase can be occupied.	
Delivery of 10% affordable workspace	In accordance with the terms provided earlier in the report.	
Provision of a workspace marketing and management plan / strategy	To ensure that the workspace would be properly marketed and managed	
Post-completion monitoring of the affordable workspace	Terms to require monitoring of the space to be submitted to the council.	
Ecology contribution	£40,770 towards the creation of new habitat in Burgess Park.	
Burgess Park play space and amenity space contributions	£10,350 and £43,460 respectively.	
Carbon offset fund	£151,032	
Street tree bond	£5,000 per tree in the event that the proposed street trees cannot be planted or die and new trees need to be planted.	
Highway works	Adoption of a strip of land between the public highway and the proposed building which currently does not form part of the public highway; Amendment to the existing Traffic Management Order to reposition on-street parking spaces;  S278 agreement to complete the following: Pre-commencement highways condition survey Repave the footway including new kerbing fronting the development on	

	<p>Parkhouse Street (precast concrete slabs and 150mm wide granite kerbs)</p> <p>Construct vehicle crossover on Parkhouse Street to current standards</p> <p>Reinstate redundant vehicle crossover on Parkhouse Street as footway</p> <p>Install 4 street trees on the footway</p> <p>Repair any damages to footways, kerbs, inspection covers and street furniture within the vicinity of the development due to construction activities</p>	
Raised table and resurfacing on Parkhouse Street	£35,000	
Reconstruction of footway adjacent to site	£5,040	
Delivery service plan bond	£9,806	
TfL bus contribution	£77,273	
TfL cycle hire contribution	£33,000 towards a cycle hire docking station in the vicinity of the site in the event that the cycle hire zone is agreed to be extended into Camberwell within 2 years of the occupation of the development	
TfL cycle hire membership	Two years free cycle hire business accounts for commercial occupiers and 2 years free cycle hire membership per household for the residential units.	
Car club membership	Three years' membership for each eligible resident within the development including the commercial occupiers.	

Parking permit exemption	Future residents and businesses would be prevented from obtaining parking permits for the surrounding streets	
Future-proofing for district heating network	To enable the development to connect to future district heating networks if deemed feasible	
Post-installation review of energy measures installed	Review to verify the carbon savings delivered with an adjustment to the carbon offset green fund contribution if required.	
Total financial contributions	£ 505,021 (equivalent - excludes servicing monitoring fee)	
Administration and monitoring fee (excluding affordable housing monitoring fee and servicing bond)	£9,814	
Grand total	£514,835	

218. In the event that an agreement has not been completed by 31 December 2022, the committee is asked to authorise the director of planning and growth to refuse permission, if appropriate, for the following reason:

In the absence of a signed S106 legal agreement there is no mechanism in place to mitigate against the adverse impacts of the development including through contributions, and it would therefore be contrary to policy DF1 'Delivery of the Plan and Planning Obligations' of the London Plan 2021, Policy IP3 'Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and Section 106 planning obligations' of the Southwark Plan 2022, and the Southwark Section 106 Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure Levy SPD (2015).

Mayoral and borough community infrastructure levy (CIL)

219. Section 143 of the Localism Act states that any financial contribution received as community infrastructure levy (CIL) is a material 'local financial consideration' in planning decisions. The requirement for payment of the Mayoral or Southwark CIL is therefore a material consideration. However, the weight attached is determined by the decision maker. The Mayoral CIL is required to contribute towards strategic transport invests in London as a whole, primarily Crossrail. Southwark's CIL will provide for infrastructure that supports growth in Southwark

220. The site is located within Southwark CIL Zone 3 and MCIL zone 2 £60/sqm. Based on the floor areas provided in the applicant's CIL Form and Accommodation Schedule, the gross amount of CIL is approximately £711,360, including £449,280 of Borough CIL and £ 262,080 of Mayoral CIL. It should be noted that this is an estimate, and the floor areas on approved drawings and relief eligibility would be checked when the related CIL Assumption of Liability Form and CIL relief forms are submitted, after planning permission has been obtained.

## **Community involvement and engagement**

221. A Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and engagement summary template have been submitted with the application, detailing the pre-application consultation undertaken with key stakeholders and the local community prior to the submission of the planning application.
222. The SCI advises that the approach to the pre-application consultation was to provide detailed information about the proposed redevelopment scheme to key stakeholders and the local community, in order to answer questions about the proposals and provide reassurance that key issues that may affect the local community have been addressed as part of the development of the proposals. A range of communication methods were utilised to provide information and to give people the opportunity to get in touch to provide feedback. These methods included:
- Holding 16 one-to-one meetings with key stakeholders to explain the proposals and to receive feedback;
  - Holding a two-day public exhibition to give people the opportunity to view the initial plans and discuss the proposals with the Applicant and the project team that was attended by 36 people.
  - Holding a further two-day public exhibition to give people the opportunity to view the revised plans and discuss the proposals with the Applicant and project team that was attended by 23 people.
223. Following the initial statutory consultation exercise undertaken by the council, the applicant was advised to revise the scheme. In effect, the proposed development was completely re-designed as follows:
- A reduction in the number of homes proposed from 100 to 85 (an overall reduction of 15 homes), with 40% to be secured as affordable housing (based on habitable rooms).
  - An increase in dual aspect or single aspect south, east and west facing from 76% to 87%.
  - A reduction in the overall height and massing of the proposals compared to the previously submitted proposals, to a six-storey shoulder in accordance with the aspirations of the Local Development Study (LDS) with a pop up seventh floor.
  - Further setbacks from Burgess Park boundary with no balconies projecting into 5 metre ecological buffer zone.
  - 10% wheelchair adaptable homes retained.

- Building set back further from Parkhouse Street to provide a more generous street.
- Play space enlarged with a better outlook onto Burgess Park and
- A retention of the re-provided commercial high quality floorspace.

224. In order to explain these changes to key stakeholders and the local community, a series of meetings were arranged with stakeholders to explain the changes and receive feedback. In addition to these meetings the Applicant has also been in correspondence with Peachtree Services Limited, the owner of the Burgess Business Park and Joseph Homes, the owner of 25-33 Parkhouse Street to ensure the developments are brought forward corroboratively in line with the LDS aspirations of the council.
225. As part of its statutory requirements the Local Planning Authority sent letters to surrounding residents, displayed site notices in the vicinity, and issued a press notice publicising the planning application. Adequate efforts have, therefore, been made to ensure the community has been given the opportunity to participate in the planning process. Details of consultation and any re-consultation undertaken by the Local Planning Authority in respect of this application are set out in the appendices.

## **Consultation responses from external and statutory consultees**

### Environment Agency

226. No objections subject to appropriate conditions.  
**Response** – Noted and agreed, the relevant conditions would be attached to any consent issued and continue to be relevant to the revised scheme.

### Greater London Authority

227. When originally submitted, the application proposed a building that was in excess of 30 metres in height and as such was considered to be a referable application in line with the Mayor of London Order 2008. As such, the GLA were consulted on the application and offered a Stage I response. Subsequent to that, the applicant completely redesigned the scheme in order to address concerns raised as part of the overall consultation process and to respond to the LDS. The revised scheme included a reduction in height, reduction in the number of homes, increased proportion of affordable housing and a new design/layout. The revised scheme was reduced in height to approximately 27.23 metres and as such was no longer a referable application. The GLA advised the council of this as part of the re-consultation on the revised scheme and the application was withdrawn from the referral process. The GLA are no longer a consultee on the application and should consent be granted, the application will not need to be referred to the GLA prior to issuing a decision.

### Health and Safety Executive

228. The Executive became a statutory consultee on 1 August 2021. As such, they consider that they cannot comment on planning applications from local planning authorities submitted, prior to that date. Therefore, on this occasion they will not be able to provide a response to this application.

**Response** – Noted.

London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority

229. An undertaking should be given that access for fire appliances as required by Part B5 of the Building Regulations will be provided.

**Response** – Noted and agreed, this would be secured by condition on any consent issued.

Metropolitan Police

230. With regards to the revised scheme, concerns have been raised that the cycle store would be open and visible once past the initial secure entry and additional concerns have been raised about the covered area to the front of the development. Otherwise, the scheme could achieve Secure by Design and a condition is recommended to achieve this.

**Response** – The cycle store could be further subdivided internally and the final layout and design of the cycle store would be reserved by condition. The covered area to the front of the development is very limited and once this development and surrounding developments are completed, Officers consider that there would be sufficient natural surveillance to ensure there would be no anti-social behaviour.

Natural England

231. No objections.

**Response** – Noted.

Thames Water

232. No objection subject to conditions regarding piling. These comments continue to be applicable to the revised scheme

**Response** – Noted, the relevant condition would be attached to any consent issued.

Transport for London

233. Electric car parking should be provided for all three spaces and residents should be made exempt from obtaining parking permits. The scheme as originally submitted did not meet the London Plan cycle parking standards however the revised scheme now complies with this requirement. Contributions secured for bus service improvements and cycle hire should be pooled and used flexibly for the most pressing and useful transport enhancements. The Travel Plan, Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) and a Delivery and Servicing Plan (DSP) must be submitted for approval by the council prior to commencement, to be secured by condition or s106 planning obligation.

**Response** – Noted and agreed, the details above would be secured either as conditional requirements on the consent or as obligations within the s106 agreement.

## **Community impact and equalities assessment**

234. The council must not act in a way which is incompatible with rights contained within the European Convention of Human Rights
235. The council has given due regard to the above needs and rights where relevant or engaged throughout the course of determining this application.
236. The public sector equality duty (PSED) contained in Section 149 (1) of the Equality Act 2010 imposes a duty on public authorities to have, in the exercise of their functions, due regard to three "needs" which are central to the aims of the Act:
1. The need to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct prohibited by the Act
  2. The need to advance equality of opportunity between persons sharing a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. This involves having due regard to the need to:
    - Remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are connected to that characteristic
    - Take steps to meet the needs of persons who share a relevant protected characteristic that are different from the needs of persons who do not share it
    - Encourage persons who share a relevant protected characteristic to participate in public life or in any other activity in which participation by such persons is disproportionately low
  3. The need to foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and those who do not share it. This involves having due regard, in particular, to the need to tackle prejudice and promote understanding.
237. The protected characteristics are: race, age, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, disability, sexual orientation, religion or belief, sex, marriage and civil partnership. The loss of the existing temporary business on the site would not impact on individuals with protected characteristics. The provision of 40% affordable housing would benefit those from BAME communities who are disproportionately impacted by the supply of affordable housing. The provision of accessible housing would also benefit those with disabilities.

## **Human rights implications**

238. This planning application engages certain human rights under the Human Rights Act 2008 (the HRA). The HRA prohibits unlawful interference by public bodies with conventions rights. The term 'engage' simply means that human rights may be affected or relevant.
239. This application has the legitimate aim of providing new homes and improved employment space. The rights potentially engaged by this application, including

the right to a fair trial and the right to respect for private and family life are not considered to be unlawfully interfered with by this proposal.

### **Positive and proactive statement**

240. The council has published its development plan and Core Strategy on its website together with advice about how applications are considered and the information that needs to be submitted to ensure timely consideration of an application. Applicants are advised that planning law requires applications to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
241. The council provides a pre-application advice service that is available to all applicants in order to assist applicants in formulating proposals that are in accordance with the development plan and core strategy and submissions that are in accordance with the application requirements.

242. **Positive and proactive engagement: summary table**

Was the pre-application service used for this application?	YES
If the pre-application service was used for this application, was the advice given followed?	YES
Was the application validated promptly?	YES
If necessary/appropriate, did the case officer seek amendments to the scheme to improve its prospects of achieving approval?	YES
To help secure a timely decision, did the case officer submit their recommendation in advance of the agreed Planning Performance Agreement date?	YES

### **CONCLUSION**

243. In land use terms the proposed development would fully accord with the requirements of site allocation NSP25 of the Southwark Plan by providing a mixed use development comprising new homes and re-provision of the existing employment floorspace. The co-location of employment and residential units would comply with the relevant policies in the London Plan and the new employment floorspace would be much higher quality and more flexible/usable than the existing provision.
244. Whilst there would be the loss of the existing four flats on the site, the 85 new homes would provide a significant uplift of 81 new residential units that would be high quality, sustainable, well designed and adaptable. Affordable housing would be provided at 40% including 25% social rented homes and this is a positive aspect of the development.
245. In terms of neighbouring amenity, the proposed development would have no significant adverse impacts on any neighbouring existing residential neighbours

in terms of a loss of outlook, loss of privacy or a detrimental reduction in the availability of daylight or sunlight. The immediately adjacent buildings are industrial buildings and their continued use for industrial purposes would not be compromised by the proposal. Furthermore, planning consent has been granted (or resolved to be granted) on three of the four adjacent sites for employment and residential uses in any event. Officers do not consider that the proposed development would compromise the ability to provide high quality residential accommodation on these neighbouring sites and there would be no conflict of use detrimental to amenity or commercial operations.

246. Design quality is of the utmost importance and the proposed scheme would demonstrate high quality design with robust and appropriately contextual materials and finishes. The scale, massing and appearance of the building is such that it would not have any detrimental impact on the character or setting of any listed buildings and these have been fully considered as part of the submitted THVIA.
247. The development would provide an improved public realm onto Parkhouse Street and fully on site and supervised play space would be provided for the 0-11 age group. In sustainability terms, the development would achieve a 49% carbon reduction, well in excess of the policy requirement and alongside BREEAM Outstanding, would result in a sustainable brownfield development.
248. Ecological impacts upon the adjoining SINC have been carefully considered through an independent ecological assessment, and following mitigation through conditions and planning obligations it is concluded that the proposal, like those approved on neighbouring sites, could deliver some biodiversity enhancements to Burgess Park.
249. Subject to conditions and a number of planning obligations the transport impacts of the proposal are considered to be acceptable. Impacts relating to air quality, flood risk, contaminated land and fire safety have all been considered and are found to be acceptable, subject to a number of conditions.
250. The issues raised in the large number of objections to the application have been noted, and addressed within the report and it is considered that the substantial scheme revisions that took place during the course of the application have suitably addressed the majority of concerns and this was reflected in the response to the re-consultation. On balance it is concluded that the benefits of the scheme are material considerations which can outweigh the failure to fully comply with development plan and emerging policy.
251. Overall it is concluded that the proposed development would be acceptable, and that planning permission should be granted, subject to conditions, completion of an appropriate s106 agreement.

## BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Southwark Local Development Framework and Development Plan Documents	Chief Executive's Department 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH	Planning enquiries telephone: 020 7525 5403 Planning enquiries email: planning.enquiries@southwark.gov.uk Case officer telephone: 020 7525 0254 Council website: www.southwark.gov.uk

## APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	Recommendation (draft decision notice)
Appendix 2	Consultation undertaken
Appendix 3	Consultation responses received
Appendix 4	Planning history

## AUDIT TRAIL

<b>Lead Officer</b>	Stephen Platts, Director of Planning and Growth	
<b>Report Author</b>	Terence McLellan, Team Leader Planning	
<b>Version</b>	Final	
<b>Dated</b>	30 August 2022	
<b>Key Decision</b>	No	
<b>CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER</b>		
<b>Officer Title</b>	<b>Comments Sought</b>	<b>Comments included</b>
Strategic Director of Finance and Governance	No	No
Strategic Director of Environment and Leisure	No	No
Strategic Director of Housing and Modernisation	No	No
<b>Date final report sent to Constitutional Team</b>		31 August 2022