

Item No. 6.1	Classification: OPEN	Date: 9 May 2012	Meeting Name: Borough and Bankside Community Council Planning
Report title:	Development Management planning application: Application 11-AP-4321 for: Full Planning Permission Address: PROPOSED PENTHOUSE APARTMENT LEVEL 6 AND EXISTING FLOORS OF SOHO WHARF, CLINK STREET LONDON SE1 Proposal: Erection of additional floor to provide a three-bedroom self-contained flat and the provision of a new roof terrace, a retractable glazed roof, new frameless glass balustrade at roof level to replace previously approved (under ref. 10AP2963) safety metal railing, minor amendments to roof junctions, replacement of previously approved obscure glazing with film, replace previously approved large louvered plant room on the roof with smaller condensers, relocation of existing restaurant roof plant on roof level, alterations to fenestration on western and southern elevations and replacement windows in the north elevation.		
Ward(s) or groups affected:	Cathedrals		
From:	Head of Development Management		
Application Start Date 9 March 2012		Application Expiry Date 4 May 2012	

RECOMMENDATION

1. Grant permission subject to conditions

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Site location and description

2. Soho Wharf comprises a six-storey former warehouse building with basement, situated to the south of Clink Street and east of an elevated railway viaduct to Cannon Street Station. The site abuts the western perimeter of the former car park site at the junction of Stoney Street and Clink Street where a part four, part eight storey building known as Victor Wharf has been built. The site adjoins the 'Vinopolis' wine museum to the west and south. To the north are New British Wharf and Clink Wharf which are predominately residential. Clink Wharf having several residential roof terraces.
3. The building is currently occupied by The Clink Prison Museum at basement level, a recently opened restaurant, Gourmet Burger King (Use Class A3) at ground floor level and studio-style office accommodation on the five floors above. The 14th Century wall of the Clink Prison forms part of the flank wall to Soho Wharf. The site lies immediately adjacent to the Winchester Palace scheduled ancient monument area and is within an Area of Archaeological Importance and forms part of the Borough High Street Conservation Area. The Rose Window is a scheduled ancient monument and a grade

I listed building which lies to the east. Opposite the site is Winchester Wharf a Grade II listed building.

Details of proposal

4. There is an extant permission for the erection of an additional floor on the property to provide a three bedroom flat. This proposal is for the provision of a roof terrace with glass balustrade, relocation of the existing ventilation duct for the Gourmet Burger Kitchen, provision of film on the proposed windows of the flat, rather than obscured glazing, alterations to rectify errors in the previously approved drawings, new rooflights, together with reinstating a bricked up round window opening in the west elevation, with a window to match existing, and two new windows in the south elevation. The size of the flat will not change and provides room sizes of approximately:-
5. Living/dining area 84 square metres
Bedrooms 16.5, 27.5 and 16 square metres
6. Conditions attached to the original permission show one cycle storage space on the first floor next to the lift. A hatch onto the roof provides access for maintenance or means of escape. The proposed materials will be the same as those previously approved (11-AP-1838) in July 2011, namely

Brickwork - London yellow multi-stock brick
PPC double glazed metal windows
PPC metal detail, dark grey colour
Metal roof cladding - graphite grey colour
Metal railing - dark grey
7. The proposed roof terrace has an overall area of 47.77 square metres, with the wider element of the terrace being located away from the Clink Street elevation. Steps run from the living area beneath a sliding window giving access to the terrace. A smaller terrace of 11.9 square metres will be retained in this proposal.
8. A noise report accompanies the relocation of the plant for the Gourmet Burger Company which is to be located on the west side of the roof, together with the provision of 21 condensers on the east side of the roof. A sedum roof is provided on part of the roof area.

Planning history

9. The site has been the subject of various planning applications for elevational alterations and changes of use. However, the most relevant are listed below
10. Planning permission granted 28.11.2005 (05-AP-0432) for erection of sixth floor and part extension to fifth floor to provide a four bedroom flat.
11. Details of cycle storage were approved on 3.12.2009 in respect to the above proposal. (09-AP-1961)
12. Details of facing materials were approved on 24.1.2009 for the above permission. (09-AP-1959)
13. Planning permission granted 14.5.2007 (06-AP-0679) for the erection of a sixth floor and part extension to provide two flats.

14. Planning permission granted 9.1.2008 for the use of part of the ground floor as a restaurant (07-AP-2048).
15. Renewal of planning permission 10-AP-0937 for the addition of a sixth floor to building to provide one new residential unit (Class A3) extension to fifth floor level and alterations to external facades was refused by the Council for the following reason
16. The proposal is for the provision of a family sized unit and no outdoor amenity area has been provided which results in poor quality of residential accommodation and which would be harmful to the amenities of future occupiers of the proposal. In this regard the scheme is contrary to Policies 3.2 Protection of Amenity, 3.11 Efficient use of land and 4.2 Quality of Residential Accommodation of the Southwark Plan 2007 and the Residential Design Standards SPD 2008.
17. Permission was granted on 24.12. 2010 (10-AP-2963) for the addition of a sixth floor to the building to provide a four bedroom self contained residential unit with a rear terrace area (Class C3), and an extension of the fifth floor level for office use (Class B1) and alterations to external facades.
18. There was a non-material amendment to planning permission reference 10-AP-2963 dated 24.12.2010 (for 'Addition of a sixth floor to building to provide a four bedroom self contained residential unit with a rear terrace area (Class C3), and an extension of the fifth floor level for office use (Class B1) and alterations to external facades') comprising:
Amendment to condition 2 (approved plans) to include the correct drawing numbers;
Amendment to condition 3 (obscure glazing) to include the correct drawing numbers.
rectify the inaccurate drawing numbers. [This was approved on 4.5.2011 (reference 11-AP-0715)].
19. There is an existing application (11-AP-4319) for this site for the provision for a new roof terrace, with a frameless glazed roof lantern with a frameless sliding glazed door, new frameless glass balustrade at roof level to replace previously approved (under ref. 10AP2963) safety metal railing, amendments to roof junctions, replacement of previously approved obscure glazing with glazing with film, replace previously approved large louvered plant room on the roof with smaller condensers, relocation of existing restaurant roof plant on roof level, alterations to fenestration on western and southern elevations. This proposal is recommended for refusal of planning permission and will be considered at a delegated panel. The reason for the recommendation for refusal is on the basis that the proposed glazed lantern (roof extension) on top of the proposed flat will further increase the existing building's height, resulting in a greater degree of prominence in the townscape which is considered to be unacceptable and would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Borough High Street Conservation Area or the building as a heritage asset. In this respect the proposal is contrary to Strategic Policy 12 – Design and conservation of the Core Strategy 2011 and Saved Policy 3.16 Conservation Areas of the Southwark Plan 2007 and paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2011.

Planning history of adjoining sites

20. In respect to the adjoining site known as Victor Wharf, permission was granted for the erection of a ground floor restaurant and upper floors comprising 11 x 2 bed, 2 x 1 bed and 1 x 3 bed maisonettes penthouse on appeal Ref. No. APP/A/5840/A/02/1092781 on 18 November 2002.

Clink Wharf, Clink Street SE1

21. Permission granted (23.12.2009 (09-AP-2221) for alterations associated with the existing residential unit, including removal of existing 7th floor zinc clad rear extension and its replacement with a full 7th floor level extension within the original roofline, with associated high level fenestration windows to west elevation at 6th and 7th floor levels, and extension to existing spiral staircase, new roof terrace at 8th floor level, and new enclosure to apartment entrance bridge.

Studio 1, Clink Wharf, 2 Clink Street, LONDON, SE1

22. Planning permission dated 6.5.2011 (11-AP-0200) for the change of use from B1 (photographic studio/live/work unit) to C3 (residential). Opening up of two windows in flank elevation, (retrospective).

Flat 6, Clink Wharf, Clink Street, LONDON, SE1 9DG

23. Planning permission dated 7.10.2011 (11-AP-2213) for alterations to the profile of the existing mansard roof at to the northern end of the building at 7th floor level, including the installation of four conservation roof lights, and installation of a new glass enclosure around the entrance bridge at 6th floor level.

Flat 6, Clink Wharf, Clink Street, LONDON, SE1 9DG

24. Permission dated 2.11.2011 (11-AP-2214) for alterations associated with the existing residential unit, involving removal of the existing zinc clad extension to the southern end of the building at 7th floor level and its replacement with a flat roof mansard.

Winchester Wharf - the most recent decisions being

25. Winchester Wharf, 4 & 5 CLINK STREET LONDON SE1
Permission dated 23.4.2010 (0-AP-0177) for:
Introduction of 10 no. balconies in place of existing timber flaps, associated steelwork and glazed balustrades to the river front facade.
26. Commercial Unit 1, 4 & 5 WINCHESTER WHARF, CLINK STREET, LONDON, SE1 9DL
Permission dated 16.6.2011 (11-AP-0400) for: Listed Building Consent
Proposed internal works to ground floor of the building
27. Unit 1 Winchester Wharf (GROUND FLOOR), 5 CLINK STREET, LONDON SE1 9DL
Permission dated 28.6.2011 (11-AP-2016) for Cert. of Lawfulness - existing
The use of ground floor as a single residential dwelling (C3 Class)

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Summary of main issues

- 28 The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:
 - a) impact on the amenities of nearby residential occupiers and the commercial occupiers of the existing building
 - b) parking and highway issues

c) impact on the Borough High Street Conservation Area, the existing building and nearby listed buildings/scheduled historic monument.

Planning policy

Local Development Framework designations 2011

29. Central Activities Zone, Archaeological Priority Zone, Thames Special Policy Area, Air Quality Management Area, Action Area and District Town Centre, Strategic Cultural Area.
Borough High Street Conservation Area

Core Strategy 2011

30. Strategic Policy 12 – Design and conservation
Strategic Policy 13 – High environmental standards

Southwark Plan 2007 (July) - saved policies

31. 1.7 Development within town and local centres
3.2 Protection of Amenity
3.12 Quality in Design
3.14 Designing out Crime
3.16 Conservation Areas
3.17 Listed Buildings
3.18 Setting of Listed Buildings, conservation areas and World Heritage Sites.
3.19 Archaeology
5.2 Transport Impacts
5.3 Walking and Cycling
7.4 Bankside and Borough Action Area.

London Plan 2011

32. Policy 5.12 Flood risk management
Policy 7.5 Public realm
Policy 7.6 Architecture
Policy 7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

33. On 27 March, the DCLG published the National Planning Policy Framework with immediate effect. The NPPF replaces previous government guidance including most PPGs and PPSs. Full weight should be given to the NPPF as a material consideration in taking planning decisions.
- the policies in the NPPF apply from the day of publication and are a material planning consideration;
 - for the purpose of decision-taking, the policies in the Core Strategy, DPDs and SPDs should not be considered out of date simply because they were adopted prior to the publication of the NPPF;
 - for 12 months from the date of publication, decision-takers can continue to give weight to relevant local planning policies such as LDDs adopted in

accordance with the PCPA 2004 and those in the London Plan.

34. It should be noted that the weight accorded to saved policies of the Southwark Plan (UDP) should be given according to their degree of consistency with policies in the NPPF. In this case the Sections for consideration are

NPPF - Section 2 'Ensuring the vitality of town centres'

NPPF - Section 6 Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes

NPPF - Section 7. Requiring good design

Principle of development

35. Clink Street is a predominantly mixed use area with an increasing residential population. The provision of a new residential unit has already been agreed previously with the extant permission. This is further justified by Section 2 'Ensuring the vitality of town centres' of the NPPF identifies residential uses as bringing vitality to town centres and being a suitable use within a town centre.
36. The proposal provides a roof terrace for an extant proposal for the erection of an additional floor to provide a three bedroom flat, and also other external alterations. The principle of additional residential accommodation with an outdoor amenity space is acceptable in principle, subject to ensuring there is no loss of amenity for adjoining occupiers and the proposal preserving the character and appearance of the Borough High Street Conservation Area and the setting of adjoining listed buildings, and the Rose Window, a scheduled ancient monument.
37. The proposal also involves the relocation of an existing ventilation duct for the ground floor restaurant. Again this is acceptable in principle, subject to impact on the amenities of adjoining occupiers, and this is discussed below.

Environmental impact assessment

38. A Screening Opinion was not requested prior to the submission of the application as the scheme is not Schedule 1 development. It does fall within Schedule 2, being an urban development project. Having reference to the Column 2 criteria, the site area does not exceed the initial threshold of 0.5ha. In addition it has been determined that the development is unlikely to have a significant effect upon the environment by virtue of its nature, size or location based upon a review of the Schedule 3 selection criteria for screening Schedule 2 Development. The site is a brownfield site in an inner London location, and is located outside of a sensitive area as per Regulation 2(1) and the development is unlikely to generate any significant environmental effects. Therefore an Environmental Impact Assessment is not required.

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

Privacy Issues

39. The proposal will provide a new roof terrace, together with the reinstatement of a window in the west elevation and two new windows in the south elevation. In respect to privacy, the roof terrace has been set back from the Clink Street elevation by 3.4 metres, Clink Street itself measures 4 to 7 metres wide. The main, wider element of the roof, is set to the centre of the roof, away from adjoining residential occupiers. The proposed glass balustrade will have Lumisty control film applied to safeguard the loss of privacy to adjoining occupiers. It is proposed to replace the proposed previously

obscured glazing with Lumisty control film, and this is not objected to, subject to a sample of the film being submitted to ensure that it provides adequate privacy. However, an objector has identified that this could be easily removed and could not be monitored. However, it is considered that the appearance of the windows would change if the film were removed, which would be visible from adjoining occupiers properties. If this happens and there is a loss of privacy then Enforcement Action could be taken.

40. In respect to the proposed windows, there is already a window in the west elevation and re-opening an existing window is not considered to give rise to any additional loss of privacy. There are also currently windows in the south elevation on the lower floors, albeit serving the office/studio units. The windows will not directly overlook residential properties and therefore there is no need for them to be obscured or fitted with film.

Noise Issues

41. Following the submission of concerns from local residents in respect to noise, the applicant was prepared to accept a condition that the terrace should not be used other than between the hours of 7am and 10pm. However, given that the property is located within the Central Activity Zone within a mixed use area and would be only for one unit, it is considered that such a condition would be unreasonable and unlikely to be defended on appeal. If the terrace is used for noisy activities then the Environmental Protection Team could take action to stop unreasonable use of the terrace.
42. In respect to the relocation of the ventilation duct and the provision of condensers on the roof, insufficient information has been provided, but it has been agreed with the Environmental Protection Team that further information could be conditioned. However, as the existing duct has not given rise to any noise issues and the applicant is proposing to provide additional noise attenuation, it is considered that this element of the proposal would be unlikely to result in loss of amenity for adjoining occupiers or the future occupiers of the flat.
43. Previous applications for the erection of an additional floor considered the impact of the proposal on sunlight and daylight for adjoining occupiers. Due to the design of the extension it was concluded by officers and an Inspector that the additional floor would be unlikely to harm the amenities of adjoining occupiers.

Quality of Accommodation for future occupiers

44. The proposed room sizes all exceed the minimum room sizes set out in the Residential Design Standards SPD 2011 and the overall unit size in the London Plan 2011. Due to means of escape legislation it is not possible to provide two units, hence the exceptionally large room sizes as set out in paragraph 5 of this report. The proposal will provide adequate amenity space. Cycle storage is to be provided, but refuse will need to be stored in the flat until collection day. The proposal is considered to provide good quality accommodation in compliance with Section 6 'Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes' of the NPPF 2012.

Impact of adjoining and nearby uses on occupiers and users of proposed development

45. The property is located above a restaurant on the ground floor and offices on the other floors, however, it is considered that with the imposition of relevant conditions that the occupiers of this development would not be affected by these uses.

Traffic issues

46. The extant planning permission (10-AP-0937) for the provision of the three-bedroom unit was subject to a unilateral agreement which was signed on the 24th December 2012 and the fees paid. This was passed to the Parking Shop and a change to the Traffic Management Order was made to prevent future occupiers from obtaining parking permits. Therefore a further undertaking is not required.
47. The cycle storage provision (11-AP-1754) was approved on 29 July 2011 and comprises of one space on the first floor. A condition ensuring it is provided prior to the occupation of this unit is recommended.

Design issues

48. The design of the approved additional floor was considered acceptable under the extant permission which was granted permission at a Planning Meeting of the Borough and Bankside Community Council meeting on 22 December 2010 and subject to a non material amendment in May 2011. However, this application now seeks to provide a roof terrace on the roof of the proposed additional floor of accommodation, additional windows and changes to the form of the obscured glazing for the proposal.

Proposed roof terrace

49. The proposal results in the addition of a roof terrace, concern was expressed about the increase in the height of the development, however, in the extant permission, the drawings showed a safety rail, and the proposed balustrade is unlikely to exceed this height. Concern is expressed in respect to the use of the terrace for the storage of outside furniture. However, as this serves only one unit it would be unreasonable to try to control this by condition. In design terms, the provision of a terrace is considered acceptable and there is a recent precedent for a roof terrace on the opposite building at Clink Wharf.

Obscured Glazing

50. On design grounds the use of Lumisty control film instead of obscured glazing is considered acceptable subject to samples of the film being submitted.

Proposed additional windows and replacement windows

51. There are no design issues in respect to the provision of the two additional windows and the re-opening of an existing window. More detailed drawings will be required for the treatment of these windows including the need to obscure them or provide Lumisty control film where they overlook neighbouring residential windows in the north elevation. The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Saved Policy 3.16 of the Southwark Plan 2007 and Strategic Policy 12 – Design and conservation of the Core Strategy 2011
52. The proposal also provides replacement windows to the front elevation of the existing property, which were included in the previously approved scheme, which will bring uniformity to the north elevation and greatly enhancing the appearance of the building.

Impact on character and setting of a listed building and/or conservation area

53. It is considered that the roof terrace and the other alterations would preserve the

character and appearance of the existing building, a heritage asset, the Borough High Street Conservation Area and the setting of nearby listed buildings and the Rose Window, a scheduled ancient monument. The proposal is therefore considered to be comply with paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the 'significance of a designated asset, great weight should be given to the assets's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. In this case the building is not listed but is none the less a heritage asset' by virtue of it being a positive contributor within the conservation area. Careful consideration has been given to the impact of the proposal on the existing building, the conservation area and the setting of nearby listed buildings and scheduled historic monument. It is considered that the proposal will not harm this heritage asset or its setting, and therefore is compliant with the NPPF.

Impact on trees

54. There is no impact on any trees

Planning obligations (S.106 undertaking or agreement)

55. The proposal is for the provision of an additional unit which does have an extant permission, plus a roof terrace. Therefore, the proposal is under the threshold for Section 106 Agreements. The extant permission for the three bedroom unit, did include a unilateral agreement preventing future occupiers from obtaining parking permission. This was executed on the 23 December 2011 and the Traffic Management Order has been amended to prevent future occupiers from obtaining parking permit. An informative reminding the applicant and any future owner of this provision has been included in the recommendation.

Mayoral CIL Issues

56. This proposal if approved, will be subject to a payment dependent on the gross internal area that is being added. The applicant has provided details of the gross internal area. Payment will be on implementation of the proposal.

Sustainable development implications

57. The proposal does provide a sedum roof on part of the roof, but due to the scale of the development this is not a policy requirement. However, there is a requirement to comply with Sustainable Homes Code 4 and a condition in the recommendation reflects this.

Flood Risk Issues

58. A flood risk assessment was submitted with the proposal, the Environment Agency have confirmed they have no objection to the proposal.

Other matters

59. A resident in Winchester Wharf has identified that the west elevation is a party wall. While officers do not consider this to be a party wall, it overlooks the railway line and it is not considered there is any potential for redevelopment next to this wall. Furthermore, there is an existing window in this elevation.

Conclusion on planning issues

60. The proposal is considered to be acceptable, the provision of an additional flat does

not give rise to any land use issues.

61. The proposal is not likely to affect the amenities of local residents, subject to conditions in respect to samples of the proposed Lumisty film being agreed and applied to sensitive windows and balustrade on the north side of the building. The roof terrace will not increase the height of the extant development for the provision of an additional floor and new three bedroom unit. It is considered that this and the other alterations will preserve the appearance and character of the conservation area and the setting of nearby listed buildings and scheduled ancient monument. The proposal is considered to comply with the relevant saved policies of the Southwark Plan, Core Strategy and London Plan. It also complies with paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
62. As a change in the Traffic Management Order is already in place, the future occupiers of this proposal will be unable to apply for parking permits, and therefore there are no adverse traffic issues with this proposal.
63. Therefore planning permission is recommended subject to the conditions set out in the recommendation.

Community impact statement

64. In line with the Council's Community Impact Statement the impact of this application has been assessed as part of the application process with regard to local people in respect of their age, disability, faith/religion, gender, race and ethnicity and sexual orientation. Consultation with the community has been undertaken as part of the application process.
 - a) The impact on local people is set out above.
 - b) There is the potential of the proposal to overlook adjoining properties.
 - c) The impact of the loss of amenity for future occupiers is considered to have been overcome with conditions set out in the recommendation.

Consultations

65. Details of consultation and any re-consultation undertaken in respect of this application are set out in Appendix 1.

Consultation replies

66. Details of consultation responses received are set out in Appendix 2.

Summary of consultation responses

67. Four letters of objection on grounds of noise, appearance of outdoor furniture, proposed film being able to be removed easily, provision of window in a party wall, loss of light and loss of privacy.

Human rights implications

68. 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.

69. This application has the legitimate aim of providing additional amenity area. 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.

SUPPLEMENTARY ADVICE FROM OTHER OFFICERS

Strategic Director of Communities, Law & Governance

N/A

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Site history file: TP/1153-K Application file: 11-AP-4321 Southwark Local Development Framework and Development Plan Documents	Deputy Chief Executive's Department 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2TZ	Planning enquiries telephone: 020 7525 5403 Planning enquiries email: planning.enquiries@southwark.gov.uk Case officer telephone: 020 7525 5453 Council website: www.southwark.gov.uk

APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	Consultation undertaken
Appendix 2	Consultation responses received

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Gary Rice, Head of Development Management	
Report Author	Michèle Sterry, Senior Planning Officer	
Version	Final	
Dated	23 April 2012	
Key Decision	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Strategic Director of Communities, Law & Governance	No	No
Strategic Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods	No	No
Strategic Director of Environment and Leisure	Yes	Yes
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team		27 April 2012

Consultation undertaken

Site notice date: 25.1.2012

Press notice date: 19.1.2012

Case officer site visit date: 25.1.2012

Neighbour consultation letters sent: 16.1. 2012

Internal services consulted:

Environmental Protection Team

Statutory and non-statutory organisations consulted:

Environment Agency

Neighbours and local groups consulted:

FLATS 1- 7 CLINK WHARF CLINK STREET LONDON SE1 9DG
CLINK PRISON MUSEUM SOHO WHARF CLINK STREET LONDON SE1 9DG
1 BANK END LONDON SE1 9BU
1 HORSESHOE WHARF APARTMENTS 6 CLINK STREET LONDON SE1 9FE
STUDIO 30 SOHO WHARF CLINK STREET LONDON SE1 9DG
FIRST FLOOR AND SECOND FLOOR 30 PARK STREET LONDON SE1 9EQ
1 PICKFORDS WHARF CLINK STREET LONDON SE1 9DG
2 PICKFORDS WHARF CLINK STREET LONDON SE1 9DG
LIVING ACCOMMODATION ANCHOR 1 BANKSIDE LONDON SE1 9DN
FLAT 7 28 PARK STREET LONDON SE1 9EQ
FLAT 8 28 PARK STREET LONDON SE1 9EQ
225-227 CLINK STREET LONDON SE1 9DG
3-8 PICKFORDS WHARF CLINK STREET LONDON SE1 9DG
FIRST TO FIFTH FLOORS PICKFORDS WHARF CLINK STREET LONDON SE1 9DG
FIRST FLOOR SOHO WHARF CLINK STREET LONDON SE1 9DG
SECOND FLOOR SOHO WHARF CLINK STREET LONDON SE1 9DG
WATERSIDE APARTMENT CLINK WHARF CLINK STREET LONDON SE1 9DG
ANCHOR 1 BANKSIDE LONDON SE1 9DN
FLAT A CLINK WHARF CLINK STREET LONDON SE1 9DG
FLAT B CLINK WHARF CLINK STREET LONDON SE1 9DG
OLD THAMESIDE INN PICKFORDS WHARF CLINK STREET LONDON SE1 9DG
LOWER GROUND FLOOR SOHO WHARF CLINK STREET LONDON SE1 9DG
THIRD FLOOR SOHO WHARF CLINK STREET LONDON SE1 9DG
FOURTH FLOOR SOHO WHARF CLINK STREET LONDON SE1 9DG
FIFTH FLOOR SOHO WHARF CLINK STREET LONDON SE1 9DG
1-13 HORSESHOE WHARF APARTMENTS 6 CLINK STREET LONDON SE1 9FE
FLATS 1-5 28 PARK STREET LONDON SE1 9EQ
FLATS 1-14 7 VICTOR WHARF CLINK STREET LONDON SE1 9DW
THE FACTORY WINCHESTER WHARF 4 CLINK STREET LONDON SE1 9DL
FLAT 1 LITTLE WINCHESTER WHARF 5 CLINK STREET LONDON SE1 9DG
5 WINCHESTER WHARF 4 CLINK STREET LONDON SE1 9DL
FLAT 2 LITTLE WINCHESTER WHARF 5 CLINK STREET LONDON SE1 9DG
STUDIO 2 CLINK WHARF CLINK STREET LONDON SE1 9DG
FLAT 3 LITTLE WINCHESTER WHARF 5 CLINK STREET LONDON SE1 9DG
FLAT 1 VICTOR WHARF CLINK STREET LONDON SE1 9DW
FLAT 2 VICTOR WHARF CLINK STREET LONDON SE1 9DW
4 WINCHESTER WHARF 4 CLINK STREET LONDON SE1 9DL
1 WINCHESTER WHARF 4 CLINK STREET LONDON SE1 9DL
2 WINCHESTER WHARF 4 CLINK STREET LONDON SE1 9DL
3 WINCHESTER WHARF 4 CLINK STREET LONDON SE1 9DL
GROUND FLOOR RIGHT 30 PARK STREET LONDON SE1 9EQ
THIRD FLOOR 30 PARK STREET LONDON SE1 9EQ

40 STONEY STREET LONDON SE1 9LB
FOURTH FLOOR AND FIFTH FLOOR 30 PARK STREET LONDON SE1 9EQ
1A BANK END LONDON SE1 9BU
GROUND FLOOR WEST WINCHESTER WHARF 4 CLINK STREET LONDON SE1 9DL

Re-consultation:

As above on 14.3.2012

Consultation responses received

Internal services

Environmental Protection Team -

Considerable development has occurred and / or been approved in close proximity to the application site including the development of the lower floors of this premises to accommodate a Gourmet Burger Restaurant. I would suggest that the 'roof-scape' has changed and may impact on the new residential unit in terms of noise / vibration and/or heating / odour emissions. In addition the relocation of existing restaurant roof plant and additional condensers may impact on adjoining uses.

The submitted Noise Impact Assessment dated 14th August 2007 rev July 2008 is no longer current or appropriate. and should be re-assessed with the proposed changes and additional mitigation measures

The plans and sections do not provide sufficient details of how / where the restaurant kitchen flue emission are to discharge following the relocation and their relationship to opening windows in the new residential addition./ and or fresh air intakes for mechanical ventilation.

Re-consultation with Environmental Protection Team

It was subsequently agreed with Environmental Protection Team that the issues raised above could be overcome by conditions.

Statutory and non-statutory organisations

Environment Agency - No objections

Neighbours and local groups

One objection has been received from the occupiers of 2 Horseshoe Wharf 6 Clink Street on the grounds of noise nuisance from the terrace, and suggest a condition restricting the hours of use of the terrace and no noise being audible in the street below during the daytime and supporting the comments below.

One objection has been received from the occupier of 5 Winchester Wharf 4 Clink Street on the following grounds

1. The Roof Terrace

Although the detail of the glazed balustrade will be insignificant as an addition in itself, it is the use of the terrace that is of concern. The conundrum the applicant faces is that the more invisible the permanent structure, the more visible will be the temporary clutter of tables, chairs and even parasols. It is the occupancy that is the issue rather than the details of the balustrade.

It will not just be seen from every angle, any activity will also be heard, should, therefore, permission be granted, we ask that the use of the terrace be restricted to the hours of 7am till 11.00pm and that no amplified music should be allowed at all. This is now a normal condition on similar developments in the area.

2. Windows in the northern elevation

Restrictions were rightly placed on the design and specification on the previously approved application. All windows facing the opposite properties should have obscured, translucent glazing to protect the privacy of the existing dwellings. The distance between windows falls far short of the Borough's residential standards and the glass specification offers the only opportunity to mitigate such harm. Although the proposal to replace the obscure glass with film may be a clever alternative, such film is easily removable and difficult to monitor and test. The specification for obscure glazing was previously agreed and should remain.

3. New windows to the west face

On the face of it, this is an attractive change. The difficulty, however, is that these windows are located in the party wall. It ought to be a principle that neighbours should not be disadvantaged by having apertures in such walls that may prevent future development. The issues of fire spread and cleaning should also be considered. Should approval be given to this part of the application, however, we suggest that the applicant enter into a legal agreement similar to that which was suggested on the recent Stoney Street application that overlooks Blows yard.

Re consultation

5 Winchester Wharf 4 Clink Street - As the re consultation advised of the change of the description the comments submitted previously still stand.

7 Victor Wharf Clink Street - Object to the increase of the height of Soho Wharf on the following grounds

- Being to the west of Victor Wharf the increased height of Soho Wharf will materially affect the amount of late afternoon sunlight to the flats in Victor Wharf and the street below
- The increased height and roof terrace will overlook the terraces on Victor Wharf, decreasing the amenity of those features

The area in and around Clink Street has buildings of various elevations. I believe it would be inappropriate to allow existing buildings to continue developing skyward and increasing height.