

Item No. 6.1	Classification: OPEN	Date: 8 October 2013	Meeting Name: Planning Committee
Report title:	Development Management planning application: Application 12/AP/3940 for: Full Planning Permission Address: SAMPSON HOUSE 64 HOPTON STREET SE1 9JH & LUDGATE HOUSE 245 BLACKFRIARS ROAD SE1 & ADJACENT RAILWAY ARCHES. Proposal: Demolition of existing buildings and the construction of a mixed use development totalling 144,571 sq.metres GEA comprising 489 flats (Class C3), 45,372 sqm (including basement) of offices (Class B1), 2,581sqm of retail (Classes A1-A5), 1,969sqm of community uses (Class D1) and 1,014sqm of gym (Class D2). New open space including formation of two new east-west routes, new public square, reconfigured vehicular and pedestrian access and works to the public highway with associated works including landscaping and basement car park for 200 cars (including 54 disabled car parking spaces) plus servicing and plant areas. Change of use of the railway arches from a nightclub to retail, gym and community uses. Configuration of the toilet block for retail uses and toilets. The development contains of 9 new buildings: Ludgate A: 13 storeys (62.08m AOD), Ludgate B: 49 storeys (169.60m AOD), Ludgate C: 15 storeys (73m AOD), Sampson A: 17 storeys (62.85m AOD), Sampson B: 31 storeys, (112.10m AOD), Sampson C: 27 storeys (98.30m AOD), Sampson D: 14 storeys (60.80m AOD), Sampson E: 5 storeys (24.6m AOD), Sampson F: 6 storeys (28.9m AOD).		
Ward(s) or groups affected:	Cathedrals		
From:	Head of Development Management		
Application Start Date 24/12/2012		Application Expiry Date 15/04/2013 PPA Date 31/03/2014	

RECOMMENDATION

- 1 a) That planning permission is GRANTED subject to conditions and the applicant entering into an appropriate legal agreement by no later than 31 March 2014, and subject to referral to the Mayor of London;
- b) If it is resolved to grant planning permission, that it is confirmed that the environmental information has been taken into account as required by Regulation 3(4) of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessments) Regulations 2011;
- c) That it is confirmed that, following issue of the decision, the Head of Development Management should place a statement on the Statutory Register

pursuant to Regulation 24 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessments) Regulations 2011 which contains the information required by Regulation 21 and that for the purposes of Regulation 24(1)(c) the main reasons and considerations on which the planning committee's decision was based shall be set out as in this report;

- d) In the event that the requirements of (a) are not met by 31 March 2014, the Head of Development Management be authorised to refuse planning permission, if appropriate, for the reasons set out under paragraph 350.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Site location and description

The site

- 2 The site is approximately 2.1 hectares and comprises the land occupied by Sampson House, 64 Hopton Street and Ludgate House, 245 Blackfriars Road, and the arches under the railway viaduct between the two buildings. It is bound by the Thames Path and Blackfriars Station (southern entrance) to the north, Hopton Street to the east, Southwark Street to the south and Blackfriars Road to the west.
- 3 Sampson House was built in 1979 as a cheque clearing centre for Lloyds Bank and is currently used as a data centre and disaster recovery centre/facility by IBM with a low number of people employed at the site.
- 4 Ludgate House comprises a 10 storey office building, built in 1989, being occupied by United Business Media as their head office.
- 5 The viaduct arches comprise 14 individual arches. Arches 1-5 are occupied by the Pulse Nightclub and Arches 12-14 provide access to Ludgate House from Hopton Street. The remainder provide car parking for Ludgate House.
- 6 The site also contains 14 trees all along Blackfriars Road, including a group of 9 Plane trees that are subject to a Tree Preservation Order. The site also includes part of the Blackfriars and St Paul's railway bridge, which is grade II listed.
- 7 The site is not within a conservation area and the existing buildings on the site are not listed. An application was made to English Heritage to designate Sampson House as a listed building but the application was unsuccessful and the building remains unlisted.

The surrounding area

- 8 The riverside walk to the north of the site provides pedestrian links to numerous cultural attractions on the South Bank. To the east of the site lies Hopton Street, which is both residential and commercial in character and includes flatted developments such as Falcon Point (including Falcon Point piazza) and Bankside Lofts. There is also the Hopton Street Almshouses which are grade II* listed, 61 Hopton Street which is grade II listed and the Blackfriars and St Paul's railway bridge, also grade II.
- 9 To the south along Blackfriars Road, is the site of 231-241 Blackfriars Road which is undergoing redevelopment to provide a 20 storey office building. Adjoining Sampson House to its south at 144 Southwark Street is an office building known as Titan House.

- 10 To the west lies River Court, a residential housing block fronting the river and also the site of 1 Blackfriars Road, which has planning permission for a 50 storey residential tower and is in the early stages of construction.
- 11 The nearest conservation area is the Old Barge House Alley Conservation Area, which is to the west of the site, split between the boroughs of Southwark and Lambeth and contains the unlisted Oxo Tower building. Other nearby conservation areas are Bear Gardens to the east of the site (east of the Globe Theatre) and Kings Bench to the south east of the site (south of Union Street). The Whitefriars Conservation Area is located across the river, within City of London.

Details of proposal

- 12 The proposed development is for the demolition of Ludgate House, Sampson House and the transformer station/toilet block to allow for the redevelopment of the site. It would include the erection of 9 new buildings ranging from 5 to 49 storeys, and the change of use of the railway arches under the railway viaduct. It would also involve the reconfiguration of the toilet block adjacent to the station. A more detailed description of the uses and the layout of the site is provided below.

Table of areas

	GEA (sqm)
Residential Class C3	93,560
Office Class B1	45,378
Retail Classes A1-A5	2,627
Gym Class D2	1,014
Cultural Use Class D1	1,969
Public toilets	74
Total (including basements)	144,622

The proposed buildings

- 14 Ludgate A (LHA) – This building would be located on the northern part of the Ludgate House site (and fronts the Thames Path). The 13 storey building (62.1m AOD) comprises cultural space at lower ground, ground and first floor levels with residential above (17 flats).
- 15 Ludgate B (LHB) – This building would be located in the centre of the Ludgate House site fronting Blackfriars Road and is the tallest building proposed, at 49 storeys (169.6m AOD). It would comprise retail (Classes A1-A5) space at ground floor level with residential above (211 flats).
- 16 Ludgate C (LHC) – This building would be located towards the south of the Ludgate House site. The 15 storey building (73m AOD) comprises Class B1 office space.
- 17 Sampson A (SHA) – This building would be located on the northern part of the Sampson House site and would comprise of retail at ground floor with residential above (43 flats).
- 18 Sampson B (SHB) – This building would be located in the centre of the Sampson House site, next to the railway arches. The 31 storey building (112.1m AOD) comprises retail (Class A1- A3) space at ground floor level with residential above (118 flats).

- 19 Sampson C (SHC) – This building would be located towards the south of the Sampson House site, next to the railway arches. The 27 storey building would be solely providing residential flats (100 flats).
- 20 Sampson D (SHD) – This building would be located towards the south of the Sampson House site, and would front onto both Southwark Street and Hopton Street. It would be 14 storeys in height and comprise of predominantly offices but also includes a small retail unit fronting Southwark Street.
- 21 Sampson E (SHE) – This building would be a five storey office building that would front onto Hopton Street.
- 22 Sampson F (SHF) – This building would be a six storey office building that would front onto Hopton Street.

Public realm and amenity space

- 23 The proposals include the provision of new public realm and amenity space. The new public spaces proposed include:
- the central square located on the Sampson House site between the railway arches to the west and SHA to the east
 - an improved Rennie Garden towards the north of the Ludgate House site fronting onto Blackfriars Road
 - Invicta Plaza to the south of the Ludgate House site fronting onto Blackfriars Road (located underneath the building overhang of Ludgate C)
 - a children’s garden/play area to the south of SHB.
- 24 Public routes would be created through the site, creating two new east-west routes and one north-south route. The new east-west routes would be created through the opened up railway arches. The first east-west route would link with Upper Ground to the west and the Falcon Point piazza to the east. The second east-west route would link with Blackfriars Road to the west and Hopton Street to the east.
- 25 The north-south route would be situated alongside the railway arches, running from Southwark Street to the south and towards the River Walk.
- 26 The public realm proposals include the opening up of the Thames Path, through the provision of new public space.
- 27 The new private amenity spaces include:
- an elevated residents garden at the terrace level to the east of LHB
 - an elevated residents garden between SHC and SHF
 - a residents garden located between SHB and SHF.

The arches

- 28 The railway arches would either be opened up to create access through the site (as described above) or they will be used for retail, gym, cultural or playspace purposes. The arches to the south of the site (arches 1-5) are currently in use as a nightclub, and implementation of all the new uses would be dependent upon the nightclub being vacated.

Toilet block and retail pavilion

- 29 It is proposed to re-provide the toilets on the site; these will be located within a small retail pavilion to the north of the Sampson House site near to the Blackfriars Station

entrance.

Servicing and car parking

- 30 There would be three vehicle accesses to the site. The first would be an access from Southwark Street. This access would be the main vehicular access into the site upon completion of the development and would be used by the residents and office workers. It would also be the main point of access for service vehicles.
- 31 The second access would be from Blackfriars Road. This access would be for refuse collection but it would also be used by residents and office workers to access the car lifts which would be provided towards the rear of LHB.
- 32 The third access would be an access to the two car lifts provided at Hopton Street.
- 33 200 basement car parking spaces, including 54 disabled spaces are proposed. This would equate to 40% car parking provision. Of the total parking spaces, 4 are proposed for the offices, all of which would be disabled spaces. 196 car parking spaces are proposed for residential use, 37 of these would be disabled and 13 would be concierge disabled spaces.

Phasing

- 34 The applicant has set out the phasing for the development:
Stage 1 – the basement works and substructure for the Ludgate site;
Stage 2 – construction of Ludgate A and B, and the ground floor slab of Ludgate C;
Stage 3 – construction of Ludgate C;
Stage 4 – the basement works and substructure for Sampson and creation of site entrance from Southwark Street;
Stage 5 – construction of Sampson A, B and E and pavilion adjacent to station entrance and northern arches;
Stage 6 – construction of Sampson C and F and southern arches (excluding community spaces in most southerly arches); and
Stage 7 – construction of Sampson D and community spaces in most southerly arches.

Revised plans received:

- 35 On 18 April 2013, the council received revised plans to address a number of comments made by officers, consultees and residents. In summary, the revised plans resulted in a reduction in the number of residential units (by 3 units) as well as incorporating design and landscaping changes and provision of an additional retail unit in the ground floor of Sampson D.
- 36 The revised plans were subject to re-consultation (neighbour letters, consultee letters, press notice).

Planning history

Pulse Nightclub, Invicta Plaza, Southwark Street (railway arches 1-5)

- 37 Planning permission was REFUSED for the continued use as a multi-purpose leisure venue for corporate events and nightclub (sui generis) (ref: 12/AP/1213). An appeal has been lodged against this decision and further consideration of this is considered below at paragraphs 278-282.

Southern abutment to the former west Blackfriars and St Paul's railway bridge, Blackfriars Road

- 38 An application for listed building consent was submitted on 11 February 2013 for the removal of three bollards, adjacent boundary walls and steps and associated structures, in connection with the Ludgate and Sampson house redevelopment (ref 13/AP/0392). This application is subject to a separate report elsewhere on the agenda.

Planning history of adjoining sites

- 39 Many of the surrounding sites have been granted planning permission for substantial developments:
- 1-16 Blackfriars Road: erection of a 50 storey tower, and a 4 and 6 storey building to provide a mixed use development comprising a hotel, 274 flats, retail space (ref 12/AP/1784, granted on 14/12/2012). This scheme is now in the early stages of construction.
 - 20 Blackfriars Road: an office, retail and residential development at part 42 storeys, part 23 storeys (ref: 07/AP/0301, granted by the Secretary of State on 26/03/2009). This permission has been implemented by the carrying out of some works of demolition on site, but no construction has commenced.
 - 231-241 Blackfriars Road: an office development of 20 storeys (ref: 10/AP/3372, granted 15/6/2011). This development has 'topped out' and is nearing completion.
 - Kings Reach Tower, Stamford Street: a mixed use development providing new retail and office space, including the erection of an 11 storey roof extension to the Tower (ref's 11/AP/1071 & 13/AP/1403).
 - Sea Containers House, Upper Ground: a mixed use development retaining the existing Sea Containers building plus erection of an 11 storey office building (ref 11/AP/1955, granted 24/11/2011). This development is currently underway.
 - Wedge House, 32-40 Blackfriars Road: an office development of 11 storeys (ref: 10/AP/2707, granted 13/03/2012). This permission has not been implemented.
 - 6 Paris Gardens, 20-21 Hatfields: a mixed use development comprising of a ballet school and student accommodation in a part 9, part 13 storey building (Ref: 08/AP/2809, granted 11/02/2009). This development is nearing completion.
 - Tate Modern, Bankside: Erection of an 11 level extension to Tate Modern (ref: 09/AP/0039, granted 14/05/2009). This development is underway.
 - Neo Bankside: Erection of a mixed use development of five buildings from 6-24 storeys providing retail, residential and offices, (ref, 06/AP/1481, granted 19/06/2007). This development is nearing completion.
- 40 An application for the erection of a two storey roof extension at No. 144 Southwark Street is also under consideration (ref 12/AP/3715).

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Summary of main issues

- 41 The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:
- i) principle of the proposed development in terms of land use;
 - ii) affordable housing and the principle of a payment in lieu;
 - iii) design issues, including site layout and impact on local and strategic views
 - iv) housing mix;
 - v) impact on trees;
 - vi) the impact on the historic setting of heritage assets;
 - vii) housing mix and density;
 - viii) quality of accommodation;

- ix) impact on the amenities of occupiers of adjoining properties;
- x) impact of adjoining and nearby uses on occupiers and users of the proposed development;
- xi) flood risk;
- xii) traffic issues, including level of car parking;
- xiii) archaeology;
- xiv) planning obligations; and
- xv) sustainable development implications.

Planning policy

- 42 The statutory development plans for the borough comprise the London Plan 2011, the Southwark Core Strategy 2011, and saved policies of the Southwark Plan (2007).
- 43 The site is located within the:
- Central Activities Zone (CAZ)
 - Bankside, Borough and London Bridge Opportunity Area
 - Borough, Bermondsey and Rivers Archaeological Priority Zone
 - Air Quality Management Area
 - Borough and Bankside District Town Centre
 - Bankside, Borough and London Bridge Strategic Cultural Area
 - The Thames Policy Area.
- 44 It has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 6b where 1 is the lowest level and 6b the highest.
- 45 The following Grade listed buildings are adjacent to the site:
- 61 Hopton Street (Grade II)
 - Hopton Street Almshouses (Grade II*)
 - 124 & 126 Southwark Street (Grade II)
 - 1 & 3-7 Stamford Street (Grade II)
 - Blackfriars Bridge (Grade II).

Core Strategy 2011

- 46 The relevant policies of the Core Strategy are:
- Strategic Targets Policy 1 - Achieving growth
 - Strategic Targets Policy 2 - Improving places
 - Strategic Policy 1 - Sustainable development
 - Strategic Policy 2 - Sustainable transport
 - Strategic Policy 3 - Shopping, leisure and entertainment
 - Strategic Policy 5 - Providing new homes
 - Strategic Policy 6 - Homes for people on different incomes
 - Strategic Policy 7 - Family homes
 - Strategic Policy 10 - Jobs and businesses
 - Strategic Policy 11 - Open spaces and wildlife
 - Strategic Policy 12 - Design and conservation
 - Strategic Policy 13 - High environmental standards
 - Strategic Policy 14 - Implementation and Delivery

Southwark Plan 2007 (July) - saved policies

- 47 The relevant policies include:
- Policy 1.1 Access to Employment Opportunities

Policy 1.4 Employment Sites
 Policy 1.7 Development within Town and Local Centres
 Policy 2.5 Planning Obligations
 Policy 3.1 Environmental Effects
 Policy 3.2 Protection of Amenity
 Policy 3.3 Sustainability Assessment
 Policy 3.4 Energy Efficiency
 Policy 3.6 Air Quality
 Policy 3.7 Waste Reduction
 Policy 3.9 Water
 Policy 3.11 Efficient Use of Land
 Policy 3.12 Quality in Design
 Policy 3.13 Urban Design
 Policy 3.14 Designing Out Crime
 Policy 3.18 Setting of Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites
 Policy 3.19 Archaeology
 Policy 3.20 Tall Buildings
 Policy 3.28 Biodiversity
 Policy 3.29 Development within the Thames Policy Area
 Policy 3.31 Flood Defences
 Policy 4.1 Density of Residential Development
 Policy 4.2 Quality of Residential Development
 Policy 4.3 Mix of Dwellings
 Policy 4.4 Affordable Housing
 Policy 4.5 Wheelchair Affordable Housing
 Policy 5.1 Locating Developments
 Policy 5.2 Transport Impacts
 Policy 5.3 Walking and Cycling
 Policy 5.6 Car Parking
 Policy 5.7 Parking Standards for Disabled People and the Mobility Impaired

London Plan 2011

48 Policy 2.5 Sub-regions
 Policy 2.9 Inner London
 Policy 3.1 Ensuring equal life chances for all
 Policy 3.3 Increasing housing supply
 Policy 3.4 Optimising housing potential
 Policy 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments mayors flat sizes set out
 Policy 3.6 Children and young people's play and informal recreation facilities
 Policy 3.8 Housing choice
 Policy 3.10 Mixed and balanced communities
 Policy 3.11 Definition of affordable housing
 Policy 3.12 Affordable housing targets
 Policy 3.13 Negotiating affordable housing on individual private residential and mixed use schemes
 Policy 3.14 Affordable housing thresholds
 Policy 3.18 Healthcare facilities
 Policy 3.19 Education facilities
 Policy 4.1 Developing London's economy
 Policy 4.12 Improving opportunities for all
 Policy 5.1 Climate change mitigation
 Policy 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
 Policy 5.3 Sustainable design and construction

Policy 5.5 Decentralised energy networks
 Policy 5.6 Decentralised energy in development proposals
 Policy 5.7 Renewable energy
 Policy 5.9 Overheating and cooling
 Policy 5.10 Urban greening
 Policy 5.11 Green roofs and development site environs
 Policy 5.12 Flood risk management
 Policy 5.13 Sustainable drainage
 Policy 5.15 Water use and supplies
 Policy 5.18 Construction, excavation and demolition waste
 Policy 5.21 Contaminated land
 Policy 6.1 Strategic approach (Transport)
 Policy 6.2 Providing public transport capacity and safeguarding land for transport
 Policy 6.3 Assessing transport capacity
 Policy 6.9 Cycling
 Policy 6.10 Walking
 Policy 6.11 Smoothing traffic flow and tackling congestion
 Policy 6.12 Road network capacity
 Policy 6.13 Parking
 Policy 7.1 Building London's neighbourhoods and communities
 Policy 7.2 An inclusive environment
 Policy 7.3 Secured by design
 Policy 7.4 Local character
 Policy 7.5 Public realm
 Policy 7.6 Architecture
 Policy 7.7 Location and design of tall and large buildings
 Policy 7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology
 Policy 7.11 London View Management Framework
 Policy 7.12 Implementing the London View Management Framework
 Policy 7.14 Improving air quality
 Policy 7.15 Reducing noise and enhancing soundscapes
 Policy 7.21 Trees and woodlands
 Policy 8.2 Planning obligations
 Policy 8.3 Community infrastructure levy

49 The Revised Early Alterations to the London Plan 2013 have also been published, but, at the time of writing have not yet been adopted as formal revisions to the London Plan.

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

50 The NPPF came into effect on 27 March 2012 and is a material planning consideration. Relevant sections are:

- Section 1: Building a strong, competitive economy
- Section 2: Ensuring the vitality of town centres
- Section 4: Promoting sustainable development
- Section 6: Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes
- Section 7: Requiring good design
- Section 8: Promoting healthy communities
- Section 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
- Section 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
- Section 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

Relevant SPDs/SPGs

- 51 Section 106 Planning Obligations SPD July 2007
 Design and Access Statements SPD September 2007
 Sustainable Transport Planning SPD September 2008
 Residential Design Standards SPD October 2011
 Affordable Housing SPD September 2008
 Draft Affordable Housing SPD June 2011
 Sustainable Design and Construction SPD February 2009
 Sustainability Assessment SPD February 2009
 Draft Bankside, Borough and London Bridge SPD February 2010
 Draft Blackfriars Road SPD June 2013
 London View Management Framework 2012 (SPG to the London Plan)
 Housing SPG 2012 (SPG to the London Plan)
 Use of planning obligations in the funding of Crossrail 2010
 Providing for Children and Young People's Play and Informal Recreation 2008 (SPG to the London Plan)

Principle of development

- 52 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on 27 March 2012. 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 to deliver homes.
- 53 The NPPF promotes the delivery of a wide choice of high quality homes, seeks to widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities. It encourages the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed and also promotes mixed use developments.
- 54 The NPPF also states that permission should be granted for proposals unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the framework as a whole.

Opportunity Area

- 55 London South Central is a strategic regeneration priority area identified in the London Plan. It stretches across the northern part of three boroughs of central London south of the Thames (Southwark, Lambeth, and Wandsworth) and contains four Opportunity Areas, one of which is the Bankside, Borough and London Bridge Opportunity Area within which the application site is located.
- 56 Policy 2.13 of the London Plan states that developments within Opportunity Areas in London should:
- support the strategic policy directions for the opportunity areas and intensification areas;
 - seek to optimise residential and non-residential output and densities, provide necessary social and other infrastructure to sustain growth, and, where appropriate, contain a mix of uses;
 - contribute towards meeting (or where appropriate, exceeding) the minimum guidelines for housing and/or indicative estimates for employment capacity;
 - realise scope for intensification associated with existing or proposed improvements in public transport accessibility, such as Crossrail, making better use of existing infrastructure and promote inclusive access including cycling and walking; and
 - support wider regeneration (including in particular improvements to environmental quality) and integrate development proposals to the surrounding areas.

- 57 Strategic Targets Policy 2 of the Core Strategy underpins the London Plan in terms of Opportunity Areas and states that Southwark's vision for Blackfriars is:
"Blackfriars Road will continue to have a mix of shops, services and offices serving both a local and wider need. There will be a cluster of tall buildings around the northern end of Blackfriars Road providing high quality offices, housing, hotels and shops. These buildings will be of exceptional design and will enhance the look of the area and provide new public spaces".

Central Activities Zone (CAZ) and Borough and Bankside District Town Centre

- 58 The site is located within the CAZ which covers a number of central boroughs and covers London's geographic, economic, and administrative core. Strategic Targets Policy 2 – Improving Places of the Core Strategy states that development in the CAZ will support the continued success of London as a world-class city as well as protecting and meeting the more local needs of the residential neighbourhoods. It also states that within the CAZ there will be new homes, office space, shopping and cultural facilities, as well as improved streets and community facilities.
- 59 In addition, the site is part of the Borough and Bankside District Town Centre where saved policy 1.7 of the Southwark Plan states that within the centre, developments will be permitted providing a range of uses, including retail and services, leisure, entertainment and community, civic, cultural and tourism, residential and employment uses. Strategic Policy 3 of the Core Strategy advises that the network of town centres will be maintained and that at Borough and Bankside district town centre, the council will support the provision of new shopping space.

Bankside, Borough and London Bridge (consultation draft) SPD 2010

- 60 The council consulted on the above SPD in February 2010 and again in September 2010. Further work on the above SPD/OAPF has been on hold while the Bankside Neighbourhood Forum prepares a Neighbourhood Plan in line with the Government's Localism Act. Following this, the intention is to review the SPD in collaboration with the GLA and produce a joint document which the Mayor of London can endorse as an Opportunity Area Planning Framework (OAPF). As such, the current draft SPD would have limited weight in decisions on planning applications due to its early stage in the adoption process and likelihood of revisions being made to the current document.

Draft Blackfriars Road (consultation draft) SPD 2013

- 61 The council consulted on the above SPD earlier this year (from 21 June to 12 September 2013). Due to the scale of growth proposed along Blackfriars Road, the SPD has been drafted to ensure that development takes place in a coordinated way and that Blackfriars Road reaches its potential as a destination with its own identifiable character and identity.
- 62 The SPD states that opportunities to increase the amount and type of development will be maximised, particularly opportunities for flexible innovative business space. Cultural, leisure, arts and entertainment uses will also be encouraged which will benefit local residents and help make Blackfriars Road a destination, linking to the many cultural facilities along the South Bank, The Cut and at Waterloo. Social and community infrastructure will continue to be improved where opportunities arise as part of mixed use developments. There is also the intention to work with Network Rail to refurbish space under railway arches to provide a range of uses including small businesses, shops, cafes and restaurants. The SPD goes on to state that there will also be many new homes on the upper floors of commercial developments, offering a

range of housing types and sizes.

Bankside, Borough and London Bridge Strategic Cultural Area

- 63 The Strategic Cultural Area recognises the concentration of existing attractions within the north of the borough and links in with other attractions in Lambeth, Westminster, the City and Tower Hamlets. The area has been designated to protect and enhance the provision of arts, culture and tourism.

Conclusion on policy designations

- 64 The principle of a large scale development containing a mix of uses including retail, offices and cultural uses would support the role and functioning of the Central Activities Zone and the Borough and Bankside District Town Centre as well as being consistent with the policies for the Opportunity Area and the draft Blackfriars Road SPD. The acceptability of each of the individual uses is considered below.

Mix of uses

- 65 The proposal is for a mixed use development comprising of residential, offices, retail, cultural uses and a gym. The proposed mix of uses is considered to be in conformity with the aspirations of the Opportunity Area, Central Activity Zone, Town Centre and Strategic Cultural Area which support the range of uses proposed. Each of the individual uses are considered below.

Loss of offices

- 66 As described in paragraph 58 above, the site falls within the CAZ, which contains London's geographical, economic and administrative core, including the largest concentration of London's financial and globally oriented business services. The London Plan states that almost a third of all London jobs are based in the CAZ. The London Plan does not protect office floorspace in the CAZ, it simply identifies office use as an appropriate land use in the CAZ.
- 67 Core Strategy Strategic Policy 10 Jobs and Businesses states that the council will increase the number of jobs in Southwark and create an environment in which businesses can thrive. The policy goes on to state that existing business floorspace would be protected and the provision of around 400,000sqm-500,000sqm of additional business floorspace would be supported over the plan period in the Bankside, Borough and London Bridge Opportunity area to help meet central London's need for office space.
- 68 Saved Policy 1.4 Employment sites outside the Preferred Office Locations and Preferred Industrial Locations is also relevant, and states that development will be permitted provided that the proposal would not result in a net loss of floorspace in Class B use. An exception to this may be made where:
- a) the applicant can demonstrate that convincing efforts to dispose of the premises, either for continued B Class use, or for mixed uses involving B Class, including redevelopment, over a period of 24 months, have been unsuccessful; or
 - b) the site or buildings would be unsuitable for re-use or redevelopment for B Class use or mixed use, having regard to physical or environmental constraints;
 - c) the site is located within a town or local centre, whereby suitable Class A or other town centre uses will be permitted in the place of Class B uses.
- 69 The proposal does not meet any of the exceptions criteria listed within the policy, in that the buildings are occupied, and the site is suitable for continued office use. The existing floorspace in both Sampson and Ludgate House amounts to 78,083sqm. As

proposed, this would reduce to 42,163sqm (GIA), resulting in a loss of 35,920sqm. The reduction in office space predominantly arises from the loss of Sampson House, without adequate office replacement provision. The re-provision of office floorspace on the Ludgate house site has been achieved, albeit with a minor reduction of 81sqm.

- 70 Sampson House is currently leased to IBM from which they operate a 'Business Continuity and Recovery Service'. This comprises IBM leasing out individual suites for the purposes of data storage and/or disaster recovery. Within the building, some rooms are used for data storage and some rooms are empty, fitted out as office suites but not occupied, save for disaster recovery purposes.
- 71 The applicant has advised that approximately 35 IBM staff are present on site (technicians and sales/account management staff). In addition, part of the building is also leased to Lloyds TSB and Balfour Beatty. These tenants provide a further 63 employees. The break-clause for the lease occurs in 2018, after which it is expected that the building would be vacated, with all occupiers finding alternative premises.
- 72 The existing Sampson House building is considered to be of a poor quality, having limited fenestration including narrow windows, limited floor to ceiling heights, deep and inefficient floor plans. The floorspace is generally outdated and unattractive. Due to the quality of the building, it is likely that it would only be attractive to temporary users such as disaster recovery. Employees are only there for a short time whilst the disaster recovery function is taking place. Once the disaster recovery has taken place, employees return to their permanent office location elsewhere in London.
- 73 Whilst the building could be used as permanent office floorspace owing to being laid out as office suites, it is unlikely that there would be any commercial interest in the building, due to its poor quality internal environment. It is recognised however that the building has not been marketed to test whether there would be any interest. The replacement provision of a total of four new office buildings on the site would provide for modern and efficient offices that could be suited to a variety of occupiers such as large scale multinationals but also small to medium enterprises. For example, Ludgate C and Sampson D (at 15 and 14 storeys respectively) would be more suited for use as Headquarter buildings where as the Sampson E and F buildings (at 5 and 6 storeys respectively) would suit small to medium enterprises. The replacement offices would also be modern, high quality and more efficiently laid out and thus would be more usable than the existing offices. It is therefore considered that the best efforts have been made to replace the offices, while balancing other development plan objectives such as providing for other town centre uses such as retail and housing.
- 74 The legal agreement would contain provisions to ensure that Sampson E and F are constructed and delivered at the same time as the Sampson B and C residential buildings, with no occupation of the residential until the office buildings have been constructed. The slab of the larger office buildings (Ludgate C and Sampson D) would be delivered before occupation of Ludgate A & B and Sampson B respectively, and would proceed to be built once marketing has been undertaken to find an occupier. Buildings of this size are only ever likely to be built out once a pre-let has been secured for a specific occupier. There will be obligations in the legal agreement to ensure that the developer uses all reasonable endeavours to obtain an occupier as soon as possible and will keep the council advised of progress with the marketing programme.
- 75 In terms of job creation, the existing uses on the site currently provide approximately

2,188 jobs (full time equivalent). The redevelopment could provide for 3,649 jobs (full time equivalent). The development, assuming that the office accommodation is constructed and occupied, would therefore provide higher levels of employment than existing. The total additional jobs created of 1,461 represents 6% of the 25,000 new jobs proposed in the Core Strategy vision for Bankside, Borough and London Bridge by 2026. The increase in jobs is therefore welcomed. If full replacement of the offices were to be required, then there would be a reduced likelihood of a scheme coming forward owing to the constraints that would be placed on the site.

- 76 In recognition of the loss of office space, the applicant has offered to provide additional contributions towards employment and training over and above the section 106 toolkits normal requirement. This would enable additional training to be provided for local workers in the area in the form of apprenticeships, internships and work placements.

Retail uses

- 77 The development would include new retail units (A1-A5) at ground floor level of the new buildings and also within the viaduct arches. In total, 2,407sqm of retail floorspace is proposed, which would help to off-set some of the office reduction under Saved Policy 1.4. The provision of new town centre uses such as retail is supported by saved Southwark Plan Policy 1.7 since the site lies in a town centre.

- 78 The retail units would activate the ground floor of the development, serve the proposed increase in population and contribute to the vitality and viability of the district town centre. The site currently has no active frontages or retail space whereas the proposal would create a much more attractive and vibrant street environment than currently exists. There are also opportunities to provide tables and chairs outside, encouraging visitors to stay for longer periods. The amount and scale of provision is considered to be acceptable and would help to meet the needs of residents and workers in the area.

- 79 In order to protect the amenities of the area, it is suggested that a cap be placed on the amount of floorspace that could be used for Classes A4-A5 (drinking establishments and hot food take aways). A condition will be attached to this effect.

Cultural space

- 80 The proposal would include the provision of cultural and leisure floorspace within the lower floors of Ludgate A and also under the railway arches. The provision of cultural space is supported given the Strategic Cultural Area designation and accordingly is a positive aspect of the scheme.

- 81 The main cultural space would be spread over the three lower floors of Ludgate A, fronting out onto the Thames Path. At the time of writing, no cultural user has been found, but the open plan layout and high ceilings should allow the space to be attractive to a range of potential of occupiers. There is also scope for the introduction of a small cafe in association with the space.

- 82 A smaller cultural space has been proposed within the viaduct arches. Again, no cultural user has been identified but as with the space in Ludgate A, could create linkages with other cultural attractions nearby such as the Tate, Oxo Tower, National Theatre and Shakespeare's Globe. The applicant has suggested that the spaces could become a drop in cultural offer for the daytime tourist visitor walking the Thames Path through a visual arts/performance art use.

83 Further details would be required by legal agreement in relation to the level of fit out of the spaces, and also the extent to which the space could be made available for free at certain time periods. Local groups such as Better Bankside and the Tate may want to be involved in the process of finding suitable tenants, so that the cultural offer complements the attractions found nearby.

Fitness centre

84 A new fitness centre is also proposed, which would add to the mix of uses and is a further benefit of the scheme. The centre would be provided within the railway arches, and would be open on commercial terms to residents and members of the public.

85 The delivery of the benefits arising from the range of uses such as the cultural space and the fitness centre within the arch spaces is not assured at the present time since the Applicant is yet to reach any agreement with Network Rail. Further reference will be made to this later in the report.

Provision of housing

86 The proposed development comprises 489 new homes. The provision of residential accommodation is supported by the London Plan, the saved Southwark Plan and the Core Strategy.

87 London Plan Policy 3.3 Increasing Housing Supply sets a minimum target of 20,050 additional homes to be provided in Southwark over a period from 2011-2021. Strategic Policy 5 of the Core Strategy seeks high quality new homes in attractive environments. It states that development will provide as much housing as possible whilst also making sure that there is enough land for other types of development. The policy sets a target of 24,450 net new homes between 2011 and 2026. A key objective is to provide as much new housing as possible and create places where people would want to live. In addition, saved Policy 1.4 of the Southwark Plan supports the provision of additional floorspace in town or local centres for residential use.

88 The proposed 489 new residential units would contribute towards meeting an identified housing need and accords with local, regional and national policy priorities. Issues relating to the quality of accommodation, and affordable housing, are discussed further below.

Conclusion on land use

89 The proposal involves a substantial reduction in office floorspace, owing to the demolition of Sampson House. However, the office space is considered to be out dated and unsuited to meet modern requirements and the replacement buildings provide high quality modern offices with active ground floors. As such, the loss of the office space is acceptable since it facilitates the provision of a mixed use scheme including new housing.

90 The proposed development includes a mix of uses that are considered to be appropriate for the site's location within the CAZ, Opportunity Area, Strategic Cultural Area and town centre. As well as the retail and cultural uses, which will support the cultural and visitor functions of the area, it will provide a significant number of new homes, which is a priority of the current Government as well as local and London-wide planning policies.

Environmental impact assessment

- 91 Applications where an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is required will either be mandatory or discretionary, depending on whether they are found in Schedule 1 (mandatory) or Schedule 2 (discretionary) of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999 (the 'EIA Regulations').
- 92 In this case, the proposal falls within Section 10(b) of Schedule 2 of the Regulations. The threshold for 'urban development projects' is a site area exceeding 0.5ha. The site is 2.15 hectares and the development is likely to generate significant environmental effects by virtue of its size, based on a review of the Schedule 3 selection criteria for screening Schedule 2 Development.
- 93 Prior to the submission of the planning application, the applicant requested a 'Scoping Opinion' under Regulation 10 of the EIA Regulations (then 1999) to ascertain what information the Local Planning Authority considered an Environmental Statement (ES) should include (ref: 12/AP/1744).
- 94 Regulation 3 of the EIA Regulations 2011 precludes the granting of planning permission unless the council has first taken the 'environmental information' into consideration. The 'environmental information' means the ES, including any further information, any representations made by consultation bodies, and any other person, about the environmental effects of the development.
- 95 In accordance with the EIA Regulations, an Environmental Statement (ES) comprising a Non-Technical Summary, Environmental Statement and Technical Appendices accompanies the application. The assessment of the ES and further information and the conclusions reached regarding the environmental effects of the proposed development are set out in Appendix 3.
- 96 Following mitigation measures, there are likely to be some adverse impacts in relation to the development with regards to daylight, overshadowing and solar glare, ecology (in relation to the removal of trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order) and air quality owing to construction activities. However, the impacts are not significant enough to warrant refusal of the application. Information on the specific impacts is included, where relevant, in the various sections of this report.

Affordable housing

- 97 The proposal is to make a minimum commuted sum payment of £65m towards the delivery of affordable housing, rising to up to £100m subject to reviews. No affordable housing would be provided on the application site.

Policy context

- 98 *National*
The NPPF adopted in March 2012 states that local planning authorities should set policies for affordable housing need on site, unless off-site provision or a financial contribution of broadly equivalent value can be robustly justified and the agreed approach contributes to the objective of creating mixed and balanced communities. Such policies should be sufficiently flexible to take account of changing market conditions over time.
- 99 *Regional*
The regional policies and guidance relating to affordable housing are set out in the

London Plan and the Mayor's housing supplementary planning guidance (2012). The London Plan forms part of the development plan for Southwark. The key relevant policies within the London Plan in relation to this aspect of the application are:

- 100 Policy 3.8 Housing choice
The policy requires boroughs to take account of housing requirements and identify the range of needs likely to arise. It sets out a number of factors to take into account including to ensure that:
- new developments offer a range of housing choices
 - provision of affordable family housing.
- 101 Policy 3.12 Negotiating affordable housing on individual private residential and mixed use schemes.
Part A of the policy requires that the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing should be sought with regard to a number of factors including:
- current and future requirements for affordable housing
 - the need to encourage rather than restrain development
 - the need to promote mixed and balanced communities
 - the specific circumstances of individual sites
 - resources available to fund affordable housing, to maximise affordable housing output and the investment criteria set by the Mayor
 - the priority to be accorded to provision of affordable family housing.
- 102 Part B of the policy sets out that negotiations on sites should take account of their individual circumstances including development viability.
- 103 Part C of the policy sets out that affordable housing should normally be provided on-site. In exceptional cases where it can be demonstrated robustly that this is not appropriate in terms of the policies in this Plan, it may be provided off-site. A cash in lieu contribution should only be accepted where this would have demonstrable benefits in furthering the affordable housing and other policies in this Plan and should be ring-fenced and, if appropriate, pooled to secure additional affordable housing either on identified sites elsewhere or as part of an agreed programme for provision of affordable housing.
- 104 The supporting text in paragraph 3.74 repeats part C of the policy setting out that in exceptional circumstances an off-site of cash in lieu contribution may be accepted. Where a cash in lieu contribution is acceptable the text sets out that it should be ring fenced, and if appropriate 'pooled', to secure efficient delivery of additional affordable housing on identified sites elsewhere. These exceptional circumstances include those where, it would be possible to:
- secure a higher level of provision
 - better address priority needs, especially for affordable family housing
 - secure a more balanced community
 - better sustain strategically important clusters of economic activities, especially in parts of CAZ.
- 105 The Mayor's Housing supplementary planning guidance (SPG) (2012) provides further guidance on implementing the London Plan housing policies.
- 106 *Local*
The local policies are saved Southwark Plan Policy 4.4 Affordable housing, and Core

Strategy Strategic Policy 6 – Homes for people on different incomes Further guidance on how to implement the policies is contained within the council’s adopted Affordable Housing SPD 2008 and draft Affordable Housing SPD 2011.

- 107 Core Strategy Strategic Policy 6 'Homes for people on different incomes' requires as much “affordable housing on developments of 10 or more units as is financially viable”. It also sets a minimum target of 8,558 net affordable homes between 2011 and 2026. It requires a minimum of 35% of affordable housing on developments with 10 or more units.
- 108 Saved Southwark Plan Policy 4.4: Affordable housing, is used alongside the overarching Core Strategy policy 6. Parts 4 and 6 of the policy require that:
- iv. the affordable housing provided must be an appropriate mix of dwelling type and size to meet the identified needs of the borough.
 - vi. A tenure mix of 70:30 social rented: intermediate housing ratio for the Central Activities Zone.
- 109 The council’s adopted Affordable Housing SPD 2008 (Section 3.6) together with the draft Affordable Housing SPD 2011 (section 6.3) clarifies the Southwark Plan and Core Strategy policy framework and sets out the approach in relation to securing the maximum level of affordable housing from developments. Specifically, it sets out the sequential tests relating to the delivery of affordable housing, firstly relating to securing on site provision, secondly off site provision and thirdly an in lieu payment. This sequential test, is summarised below.
- On site provision: All housing, including affordable housing should be located on the development site.
 - Off site provision: In exceptional circumstances, where affordable housing cannot be provided on site or where it can be demonstrated that significant benefits will be gained by providing units in a different location in the local area, the affordable housing can be provided on another site.
 - In lieu payment: In very exceptional circumstances where it is accepted that affordable housing cannot be provided on-site or off-site, a payment towards the delivery of affordable housing will be required.
- 110 It is therefore expected that the applicant demonstrate that the steps as set out above are followed in order to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist sufficient to justify the provision of a payment in lieu of on site affordable housing. The SPDs make it clear that a financial appraisal must be submitted to justify an in lieu contribution. As set out in paragraph 6.3.9 of the draft 2011 SPD the appraisal must justify that at least as much affordable housing is being provided as would have been provided if the minimum 35% affordable housing requirement were achieved on-site.
- 111 In line with SPDs, a financial appraisal was submitted to allow an assessment of the maximum level of affordable housing that could be secured. The appraisal was reviewed by the District Valuer (DV) on behalf of the Local Planning Authority. Following the review of the appraisal and the assessment of a number of options testing affordable housing delivery, it has been concluded that based on the development plan as a whole, the best approach is for a commuted sum to be made. This is discussed in detail below.

The justification for a commuted sum payment

- 112 The Core Strategy require as much affordable housing as is financially viable and the London Plan requires the maximum reasonable amount. The commuted sum

proposed by the applicants, as justified through the financial appraisal, meets both of these criteria.

- 113 The NPPF, London Plan and local policies all set out that in exceptional circumstances (the local policy refers to “very exceptional” circumstances) a commuted sum may be acceptable in lieu of on-site or off-site affordable housing. In the case of this application, a commuted sum is the preferred approach as this will deliver the maximum amount of affordable housing to help meet local need. This will help deliver the aspirations of the London Plan, Core Strategy and saved Southwark Plan. The key aspirations and policy requirements that it will help deliver are as follows:
- 114
- It will deliver more affordable housing to help meet housing need. This is in accordance of bullet point 1 of paragraph 3.74 of the London Plan which sets out that a commuted sum may be acceptable if it would “secure a higher level of provision”. It will also help deliver the aspirations of Core Strategy policy 6.
- 115 Similarly bullet point 2 of paragraph 3.74 of the London Plan sets out that a commuted sum may be acceptable if it would “better address priority needs, especially for affordable family housing”. London Plan policy 3.12 requires regard to be taken of current and future requirements for affordable housing with priority being accorded to the provision of affordable family housing. Similarly the Core Strategy policy 6 is underpinned by evidence in the south east London Strategic Housing Market Assessment, and Southwark’s Housing Requirements Study, which highlights a need for more affordable housing, particularly affordable family housing. The acceptance of a commuted sum is likely to ensure more affordable family homes are built. The application site is within an area with a requirement for a minimum of 10% family housing, whilst large parts of the rest of the borough have a requirement for a minimum of 20% family housing.
- 116 It is proposed that the money would be used for new affordable housing which would be council developed and managed, which will subsequently allow greater control over rent levels and management. This could also potentially allow for local lettings – where new housing is let to local residents in priority need, enabling the council to re-let existing homes and create better mobility on estates, and provide people with appropriate housing to suit their needs. It is also proposed that the provision of specialist housing such as accessible, or wheelchair adapted homes, be delivered through the Direct Delivery programme.
- 117
- Maximising resources available to fund affordable housing. London Plan policy 3.12 requires consideration of resources available to fund affordable housing to maximise affordable housing. Accepting a commuted sum will help to maximise affordable housing provision. As an estimate, the cost of providing one unit, with land cost, would be in the region of £250,000. The £65m payment could therefore deliver up to 260 new homes, including land cost. With an upwards review, the maximum amount of contribution secured could be £100m, with up to 400 new homes being delivered. This is considerably in excess of what could be provided on site.
- 118
- Part of an agreed programme for provision of affordable housing. Part C of the London Plan sets out that a commuted sum should only be accepted where this would have demonstrable benefits in furthering the affordable housing and other policies in the London Plan as well as being pooled to secure additional

affordable housing either on identified sites elsewhere or as part of an agreed programme for the provision of affordable housing. Further guidance in the Mayor's Housing SPG (paragraph 4.4.19) also sets out that commuted sums should be ring fenced to enable more additional, or more appropriate provision either off-site or as part of an agreed programme.

- 119 The money secured through the commuted sum would be used to deliver more affordable housing through the council's directly funded housing delivery programme. The council's cabinet initially pledged to build 1,000 new council homes by 2020. A further commitment has also now been made to build a further 10,000 council homes (therefore 11,000 in total) over the next 30 years. The commuted sum secured as part of this application will be paid into the council's Affordable Housing Fund. Money from this fund will be used to deliver the directly funded housing delivery programme. A report was taken to cabinet on 23 October 2012 agreeing a range of priorities and outline delivery mechanisms. Within this report 9 schemes were identified as part of the phase 1 delivery, totaling 286 new council homes. A further report was taken to planning committee at its meeting on 17 September 2013 to note the details of the delivery programme. Further work is currently being carried out to work up these schemes and to identify further schemes. Whilst an applicant is limited to finding sites on the open market, this programme provides the council with the opportunity to provide housing on sites within council ownership or within existing estates which are not appropriate to dispose of on the open market. It provides a coherent strategy for delivering new council homes at affordable social rents to help meet the council's housing need.
- 120 Following the negotiations with the DVS, the applicant has offered to make a commuted payment of £65m in lieu of providing any affordable housing either on or off site. The adopted Affordable Housing SPD (2008) sets out three 'value areas' in the borough, for the purposes of negotiating commuted sums. For the northern-most band, within which this site would fall, the SPD stated that the sum would be the subject of site by site negotiation, based on financial viability (the next 'band' suggested a sum of £100,000 for each habitable room not being provided on site). The draft (June 2011) Affordable Housing SPD does not include the concept of value 'bands', but indicates that a minimum of £100,000 per habitable room will be required, with a viability assessment carried out to determine the exact required amount (above £100,000).
- 121 In accordance with the Affordable Housing SPD, any room over 27.5sqm has been counted as two habitable rooms for the purposes of calculating affordable housing commuted sums. In total, there are 1854 habitable rooms in the scheme, 35% of which equates to 649 habitable rooms. The £65m payment equates to £100,154 per habitable room. The payment would be index linked, and therefore subject to inflation.
- 122 This sum would be paid partly on implementation and partly when 25% of the respective buildings are sold or leased. The below tables set out when the payments would be received.

123	LUDGATE HOUSE	Payment	Cumulative total
	LH construction start	£7,379,989	£7,379,989
	LHA 25% sale or lease of units	£2,287,621	£9,667,611
	LHB 25% sale or lease of units	£19,852,346	£29,519,957

124	SAMPSON HOUSE	Payment	Cumulative total
	SH construction start	£8,870,011	£38,389,968
	SHA 25% sale or lease of units	£4,207,120	£42,597,087
	SHB 25% sale or lease of units	£12,305,825	£54,902,913
	SHC 25% sale or lease of units	£10,097,087	£65,000,000

125 The draft Affordable Housing SPD expects commuted sums to be paid in three stages, with 25% payable on implementation, 50% on practical completion, and 25% on first occupation of the development. In this case, 25% of the sum apportioned to each side would be payable upon commencement of each of the Ludgate and Sampson sides respectively. However, the remainder of the payments would be linked to the sale or lease of the units. In reality, this is likely to mean that the monies would be received earlier than as required by the SPD, since the sale and lease of the units would occur before occupation.

126 It is important to note that the payment of £65m is the minimum guaranteed payment. If the viability allows, the amount secured could rise to up to £100m. However, this would be subject to the outcomes of the review process. Three reviews are proposed, as set out in the table below. In the case of Ludgate House, a review would be triggered if commencement does not occur by December 2016 - vacant possession of the building is expected to occur in 2015, and therefore the timings for the review have been accordingly factored and the commuted sum already allows for some uplift in sales values. Two definite reviews are scheduled for Sampson House. The first within 6 months before or after vacant possession of Sampson House. The second within 6 months of substantial implementation of that building. The table below sets out the position.

127	Timings for review mechanism	
	Ludgate House	If substantial commencement occurs after December 2016
	SHA & B	6 months before or after vacant possession (likely June 2018)
	SHC	Within 6 months of substantial implementation of that building

128 The legal agreement would ensure that once the reviews have been undertaken, that there is no further delay in the construction process. If there is a delay in the construction, then a re-review would need to be undertaken. The review would look at changes in viability due to build cost efficiencies, or more significantly, changes in residential sales prices. LHA & LHB would need to be delivered concurrently, as would SHA and SHB.

129 Accordingly, the monies would be used to fund the delivery of new affordable housing, which will subsequently allow greater control over rent levels and management and provide people with appropriate housing to suit their needs. It is also proposed that the provision of specialist housing such as accessible, or wheelchair adapted homes, be delivered through the Direct Delivery programme.

130 Nine sites have been identified for pilot purposes, one of which is the site of the former housing office on Long Lane, SE1 (Chaucer ward). A register of other potential sites is being developed by the council with the next stage in the process being an assessment of initial capacity followed by appropriate consultation with residents.

Off site provision

131 Throughout pre-application and subsequent discussions, the applicant has been

exploring the option of off-site delivery of affordable housing. The draft SPD states that off-site affordable housing is required to be delivered on a site near the main development; it goes further to state: "we will only consider off-site affordable housing where an appropriate site or sites have been identified near to the development site." As such, the search area was Cathedrals Ward and the Borough, Bankside and Walworth Community Council area. In terms of site capacity, sites with a capacity for 20 or more units or potential gross internal area (GIA) of 15,000 sq ft or more were considered. The methods by which sites were identified were via the Bankside, Borough, and London Bridge Opportunity Area Development Capacity Assessment, property databases and discussions with registered providers.

- 132 Three site search reports were submitted as part of the application. The first site search report was submitted shortly after the application was received (January 2013), the second was received in June 2013 and the third in September 2013. Reports on the potential of a long-list of sites were produced within the documents and investigations have continued concurrently with the consideration of the application. Currently, although a number of sites have been listed and explored, no suitable sites have been firmly identified as available and deliverable, or secured by the applicant.
- 133 Delivering off-site affordable housing is therefore considered to be very challenging, as there are few sites likely to come forward. This has certainly been the experience in relation to the Neo Bankside development. Sites are either not for sale or have recently been sold and are therefore not available for the purpose of off-site affordable housing. The cost of bringing forward off-site affordable housing in the vicinity of the application site may well impact on viability and would limit the number of units that can be provided. It is therefore considered that off-site delivery through the purchase of a site or sites on the open market would not be the optimum approach.
- 134 As referred to in paragraphs 112-130 above, it is considered that the provision of a payment would be the most advantageous method to securing affordable housing, as part of the council's agreed Direct Delivery programme.

On site provision

- 135 The viability appraisal considered a number of options testing the viability of on site affordable housing. This included testing the incorporation of affordable housing in the residential tower of Sampson A but also the smaller office blocks of Sampson E and F.
- 136 Whilst affordable housing could be incorporated on site, there would be a significant impact on viability and therefore only a small number of units could be delivered. Service charges in the development are likely to be higher than average for private units, and significantly higher than average for affordable units. Furthermore, purchase prices for shared ownership units in this high value central London location would make these units unviable to a registered housing provider and unaffordable to local people in housing need.
- 137 Delivering on site provision would therefore be less advantageous and would not maximise the amount of affordable housing that could be delivered. The GLA together a number of residents have commented and queried the lack of on-site affordable housing, but as explained above, it is considered that the Direct Delivery programme would enable the delivery of more affordable housing, and also more family affordable housing, which would better meet the housing needs of the borough's residents.

Conclusion on affordable housing

- 138 Policy in the London Plan, saved Southwark Plan and Core Strategy seek to maximise reasonable and financially viable amount of affordable housing. The NPPF acknowledges that there maybe circumstances where an in lieu payment can be justified.
- 139 Policy at National, Regional and Local levels allow for a commuted sum in exceptional circumstances (the Local policy refers to “very exceptional”). As per London Plan policy, it is clear where the approach would deliver more and more appropriate affordable housing it is acceptable. The direct delivery would mean more affordable housing, more family affordable housing, and is within an agreed programme which the council are committed to delivering.
- 140 The minimum commuted sum payment of £65m is very substantial and could deliver approximately 260 new homes, including land cost which is considerably in excess of what could be provided on site. Accordingly, the acceptability of a commuted sum payment is based on the specific merits of this proposal taking account of all the material considerations highlighted above.
- 141 Given the above, it is considered that the Direct Delivery programme is the most effective way to provide truly affordable housing ensuring mixed and balanced communities, to the extent that any departure from what is normally required by the NPPF, London and Southwark Plan is justified for the above reasons based on the specific merits of this proposal and taking account of all the matters set out above.

Design, including site layout, impact on local and strategic views

- 142 This location at the northern end of Blackfriars Road is undergoing considerable change, as a result of a number of new developments such as No. 1 Blackfriars Road, Kings Reach, 240 Blackfriars Road and the Tate extension. It is a part of the borough where the council are expecting to see continued change, together with exciting and exceptional architecture.
- 143 The site extends from the river and sits on either side of the substantial railway viaduct which disrupts the street pattern of this part of the city and introduces a ‘barrier’ between Blackfriars Road and Hopton Street. Any development on this site has to start with the ambition to improve the permeability in the area, create meaningful public spaces and streets to provide active frontages and engaging buildings that give this part of the city a sense of place. There are also opportunities to open up the railway arches for new uses and create a more legible street layout.
- 144 The proposal is for a comprehensive re-development, following demolition of Sampson and Ludgate Houses. It involves the erection of a total of 9 buildings, 7 of which are considered ‘tall’ by virtue of exceeding 30m in height. These are Ludgate A (13 storeys), Ludgate B (49 storeys), Ludgate C (15 storeys), Sampson A (17 storeys), Sampson B (31 storeys), Sampson C (27 storeys) and Sampson D (14 storeys). Accordingly, the proposal would need to comply with the requirements of Saved Policy 3.20 Tall Buildings of the Southwark Plan, which requires that tall buildings should:
- 145
- i) Make a positive contribution to the landscape; and
 - ii) Are located at a point of landmark significance; and
 - iii) Are of the highest architectural standard; and
 - iv) Relate well to their surroundings, particularly at street level; and
 - v) Contribute positively to the London skyline as a whole consolidating a cluster within that skyline or providing key focus within views.

Landmark significance

- 146 The site is located at the northern end of the Blackfriars Road which is an appropriate location for tall buildings being at the confluence of the arterial routes and the river crossing as well as the focus of many views in this location. The public inquiry for No's 1 and 20 Blackfriars in 2008 considered this issue in detail and found that the area at the junction of Blackfriars Road and Stamford/Southwark Street met the locational criteria stated in the policy.
- 147 The proposed towers are centred around the intersection of Blackfriars Road and Stamford/Southwark Street and would reinforce the emerging 'cluster' at this part of the borough which includes the recently implemented 1 Blackfriars, 240 Blackfriars and Kings Reach developments as well as the consented 20 Blackfriars Road development. The proposed buildings continue the pattern established elsewhere along the river with taller buildings pulled away from the edge of the river.
- 148 Whilst this proposal extends the cluster to the eastern side of the viaduct, the strategic and local views demonstrate that this proposal gives the cluster a stepped three-dimensional appearance. In the views the emerging cluster steps down from the peak at the bridgehead to Tate Modern at the Millennium Bridge crossing and gives this part of the river frontage a highly articulated and undulating profile.
- 149 It is therefore considered that the tall buildings meet the 'landmark significance test', thereby complying with criteria ii) of the saved Policy 3.20.

Contribution to the landscape and relating to surroundings

- 150 This part of Southwark is characterised by busy arterial routes, an important river crossing to the City and a significant piece of transport infrastructure overlaid with important pedestrian thoroughfares. The site is located on the culturally significant Southbank and on one of the many approaches to the Tate Modern Gallery to the east.
- 151 In terms of its contribution to the street scene every building has sought to activate all its edges as far as is possible. The provision of active frontages, together with the opening of the railway arches would improve the street level environment, enhancing natural surveillance, and would be a significant improvement over the existing situation.
- 152 The proposals also seek to significantly improve the permeability and connectivity in the area. The Thames Path would be enhanced under the proposals, with new steps (and lift access) provided down to the Path. In addition, two new east-west routes would be opened allowing greater movement and connections east-west. The new route which aligns with Upper Ground is particularly welcome since it allows pedestrians to continue on this well-used alternative to the busy Thames Path.
- 153 A number of new open spaces are also proposed, including the main public square on the Sampson House site. This is substantial public space in its own right, forming the setting for the substantial tower of Sampson B at the heart of the development and is important in the sequence of spaces that leads on to the Tate.
- 154 The character of this main public square will rely to a great degree on its scale and the quality of its public realm. A mix of soft and hard landscape with mature planting, high quality fixtures and features – benches and water features – will greatly enhance this

space and give it a sense of purpose. The detailed design of this space, its longer term management and even the arrangement of planned activities and events for this important piece of the city can be reserved by condition and agreed in due course.

- 155 In addition to the main public square, the proposal also includes a number of other public spaces, including an enhanced Rennie Garden at the top of Blackfriars Road (although this is dependant on the applicant reaching an agreement with the City of London), a public space underneath the overhang of Ludgate C subject to agreement with Network Rail and also a children's garden on the Sampson side. These spaces have the potential to make a positive contribution to the landscape of the site, and provide opportunities to secure tree planting.
- 156 It is therefore considered that the proposal 'makes a positive contribution to the landscape' and 'relates well to its surroundings', thereby complying with parts i) and iv) of the policy.

Architectural standard

- 157 Buildings of this stature have to demonstrate their contribution to the appearance of the wider area. The highest architectural standard is called for and requires an elegance of proportion, innovation in design, materials and a demonstrable exceptional quality of accommodation.
- 158 Whilst the principle of the towers in this location is not questioned, officers have examined all aspects of the scheme and have encouraged revisions and improvements in particular to give each building its own identity and to ensure that they complement the public realm at their base and the London skyline at the top.
- 159 The base of each tower is a significant feature of the design. Double and treble-height spaces at the base give the taller elements of the group a significant presence at street level. The plan layouts confirm that the bases will be predominantly reception spaces for the towers and retail frontages with servicing located in the basement. This ensures that public spaces are lined with engaging active frontages.
- 160 Three buildings in particular have developed their bases specifically to enhance the spaces around them:
- 161 The significant tower at Ludgate B sets back considerably at the base and has three-storey high colonnade onto Blackfriars Road. The main entrance and retail unit are set back from the road edge to retain the generosity of the public footway. At the base the flank of the core offers an opportunity for a piece of public art to enhance the building.
- 162 Ludgate A is designed with a cultural use at the lower three floors which not only reconciles the changes in level between the public footway at Blackfriars Road and the Thames Path but also establishes a new destination at this important location. This part of the site is the focus of a number of routes and desire lines. It is at the newly created southern entrance to the Blackfriars Station and sits between the road and rail bridges. In this building the base is a celebration of these factors introducing public uses across three floors and giving this building a unique presence on the river.
- 163 Sampson A on the eastern side of the viaduct stands at a pivotal location in the development and has to lead the public round to the Tate Modern entrance but also crucially to complete the sense of enclosure in the main public space. The building has been designed with a double-height base and a cut back at the north east corner

to reinforce its role in the development.

- 164 In relation to Ludgate B, the quality of design is defined in part by the quality of residential accommodation including the communal amenity provided. In many ways this is a vertical community and its needs should to be met within the development and in the body of the tower. The inclusion of communal facilities within the tower not only gives the design an added dimension but also an architectural flourish that adds interest and delight.
- 165 With a proposal like this that includes 7 tall buildings all designed by the same architect, the challenge is to give each building its own identity and avoid a 'sameness' of design. The buildings use of different cladding materials and have a distinctive building design for each building.
- 166 The design establishes three different types of tall buildings across the site. Firstly, the commercial buildings at the southern end of the site (Ludgate C and Sampson D) are clad in glass and metal, each with own distinctive style and rigour which express their functionality. Next the river frontage buildings (Ludgate A and Sampson A) which have been designed with a natural finished metal and masonry finish which give these buildings a tonal variety and a tactile quality that matches other river frontage buildings like Tate and the Oxo Tower. Finally, the tall residential towers (Ludgate B, and Sampson B and C) have been designed as a family of buildings clad in smooth stone, glass and metal. Whilst these buildings share their materiality, each is designed with a distinctive character and geometry which gives each tower its own presence. The close proximity of these towers means that these are viewed as a group in the wider views. The subtle difference in the design of each building will become more apparent as one approaches and the gaps between them will distinguish them appropriately.
- 167 Finally, the smaller buildings on Hopton Street (Sampson E and F) take on the materiality of that street. These buildings, clad in brick, reinforce the character and scale Hopton Street and mediate between the street and the towers that are set back on the Sampson House site.
- 168 The top of any tower is an important feature of the building. This is not simply to give it a distinctive capping but also to demonstrate how it will appear in the views. Each building has been designed with its own distinctive top reflecting its distinctive character reflecting the unique design noted above.
- 169 The most prominent of the proposed buildings is Sampson B. At 169m in height it matches the scale and presence of the implemented 1 Blackfriars Road tower across the way. This tower has an orthogonal design to contrast the expressive character of its neighbour. It has been designed as a slender 'reeded' tower which gives the building a strong verticality. This verticality is balanced with the horizontal members set at a wider spacing and brought closer together as they reach the top to give this building its distinctive and appropriate capping.
- 170 It is therefore considered that the buildings meet the 'highest architectural standard' as required by criteria iii) of the policy.

Contributing to the London skyline and consolidating building cluster

- 171 The scheme has been tested in the local and wider views as well as the strategic views as set out in the London View Management Framework (2012). These accurate visual representation which comply with the requirements of the LVMF demonstrate

the contribution of this proposal to the London skyline.

- 172 The tallest tower on the site, Ludgate B, would be of an identical height to the No.1 Blackfriars Road tower which has now been implemented. The two towers together consolidate the emerging cluster and reinforces the 'gateway' at this important bridgehead.
- 173 The site is located in the backdrop of the townscape view from St James's Park to Horse Guards Road (LVMF View 26A.1) High resolution images of selected views from the bridge have been prepared. At 169m in height the tallest building in the proposal at Ludgate B would be visible in this strategic view.
- 174 Formal objections have been received from English Heritage and Royal Parks with reference to the view from the Blue Bridge which looks across Duck Island in St James Park. Whilst the tallest tower (Ludgate B) could be viewed over Duck Island from the Blue Bridge in St James Park the submitted information demonstrates that it would be hidden behind the recently implemented 1 Blackfriars Road development. As such, 1 Blackfriars would obscure the view of Ludgate B, and since it is implemented and under construction it therefore holds additional weight in the consideration of the impact of the proposal in the view.
- 175 In these circumstances, the impact of Ludgate B in the view is mitigated by the emerging scheme at 1 Blackfriars Road and it would be difficult to substantiate an objection. The GLA have also confirmed that the proposal would be acceptable with respect to this view.
- 176 English Heritage have also objected to the impact on LVMF view 18B.1 from Westminster Bridge. Ludgate B would be visible in this view, appearing over County Hall, behind the implemented 1 Blackfriars Road scheme. It would appear in the distant background of this view which also includes the Shell building. However, the tower would not diminish the horizontal composition of the building. The incursion in the view is considered incidental and does not dominate the strategic view.
- 177 The views have been tested from the World Heritage Sites at the Palace of Westminster and the Tower of London and demonstrate that this proposal has no impact on these sensitive historic settings.

Design Review Panel/CABE

- 178 The scheme was reviewed jointly by Design Council CABE/Southwark DRP in June 2012 and again by the Southwark DRP in March 2013. The Panels raised questions over the following: the character and quality of the public realm; the detailed design of Ludgate B; and the nature of the emerging cluster. They felt the proposal offered a sound masterplan for the site but questioned its detailed design. The scheme was updated and amended in response to these comments. These changes included amendments to the top of Ludgate B and the detailed design of Ludgate C. In addition, the landscape design was revised to emphasize the different identities of the spaces. The detailed design and quality of the landscaping would be reserved by condition and can be developed further at that stage – its scale and purpose was not questioned by the Panel. A fuller extract from their comments is included in Appendix 2.

Conclusion on layout and design

- 179 This proposal is a substantial and comprehensive re-development of this key site. It could deliver a fundamental redevelopment of this part of the city, introducing new

pedestrian links and reinforcing the vitality of the river frontage as well as the commercial and cultural quarter of Southwark. The scheme is led by its substantial contribution to the public realm and enhanced permeability across both sites. The importance of these sites to the experience of residents, workers and visitors will be greatly enhanced by this carefully considered approach to landscape design.

- 180 The proposed development is of exceptional quality of architectural design. Each building complements its urban setting, is unique and distinctive in its design and has a well designed base middle and top. The group of buildings reinforce and consolidate the emerging cluster of buildings such as No. 1 Blackfriars, No. 20 Blackfriars, Kings Reach and 240 Blackfriars.

Impact on trees

- 181 The proposed development requires the removal of six trees, T1-T4, T16 and T17. 11 trees are being retained. These are trees T5-T15, located along Blackfriars Road.
- 182 Trees T1-T4 all front onto Blackfriars Road. Tree T1 (Snow Gum) would need to be removed to facilitate an increase in footpath width at the junction of Blackfriars Road with Southwark Street. Trees T2 (Butterfly Bush) and T3-T4 (both Leyland Cypress) would be located underneath the building overhang of Ludgate C and could not be retained. These trees are in a fair/good condition. Their removal is considered acceptable, subject to replacement planting being secured.
- 183 Trees T16 and T17 (London Plane) have a high amenity value and are protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). These trees are growing in steep planting beds at the top of Blackfriars Road. These are proposed for removal due to the re-grading of the steps to the Thames Path, to improve the pedestrian connection. Work was undertaken to consider whether they could be kept, however their retention would prevent accessibility from the site down to the Thames Path. By allowing their removal, significantly improved access to the Thames Path would be secured. Their removal could therefore be justified provided that replacement planting is proposed to compensate.
- 184 A total of 60 new semi-mature trees are proposed, both to adequately compensate for the six trees that would be removed, plus a series of other trees to contribute to the landscape design. Further details would be needed in terms of maturity and trunk girth, especially since many of the trees would be planted above a substantial basement, however the extent of replacement planting would ensure that there would be increased canopy cover. The proposed species palette offers a well specified response to the scale of the development. Species such as Planes and Oak have been selected, together smaller species of more ornamental interest such as Pear and Birch.
- 185 As well as further details of the replacement planting, details should also be required in relation to how the retained trees would be protected during demolition and construction works. This can be requested by condition.

The impact on the historic setting of heritage assets

- 186 The main designated heritage assets on these sites and in the immediate area include the Grade II listed southern abutment of the Blackfriars and St Paul's Station and No. 61 Hopton Street. The listed abutment is untouched by this proposal. A separate Listed Building Consent is being considered for the adjustments to the Blackfriars Bridge which is listed Grade II.

- 187 The most significant local heritage asset is the Grade II* listed Hopton Almshouses at 1-9 Hopton Street. These have a sensitive relationship with Hopton Street which they face onto. Sampson D as well as the Sampson E and F have been designed to respond to this sensitive setting by echoing the scale of buildings on Hopton Street to reinforce this street and bring much-needed active frontages to this approach from Southwark Street. The taller buildings of Sampson B and Sampson C would be separated from the Almshouses by the lower rise 5 and 6 storey buildings of Sampson E and F, ensuring that the taller buildings do not crowd their setting.
- 188 The landscape proposal should include enhancement of both sides of the street and a development of this scale presents the opportunity to enhance the experience of visitors to Hopton Street. The character and quality of Hopton Street will help to reinforce the architectural and historic significance of the Hopton Street Almshouses considerably.

Housing mix and density

- 189 Saved Policy 4.3 of the Southwark Plan requires a mix of dwellings sizes and types to be provided within major new developments in order to cater for a range of housing needs. There is a particular need for family units in the borough and therefore policy requires that the majority of units should have two or more bedrooms and at least 10% three or more bedrooms with direct access to private outdoor amenity space. At least 10% of the units should be suitable for wheelchair users.
- 190 Strategic Policy 7 of the Core Strategy increases the proportion of two bed plus accommodation to be provided and expects 60% of developments to have more than two bedrooms, and in this area at least 10% 3, 4, or 5 bedrooms. A maximum of 5% as studios and only for private housing. The mix of units provided is shown in the table below.

Table: Unit mix

	Total Units (number)	Total Units (%)
Studios	22	4.5%
1 bed	135	27.6%
2 bed	251	51.3%
3 bed	77	15.7%
4 bed	4	0.8%
Total units	489	100%

- 192 68% of units would have two or more bedrooms; this exceeds the 60% target and is a positive aspect of the scheme. 16.5% of the units would have three or more bedrooms, again exceeding the 10% target. The numbers of studios proposed, at 4.5%, would not exceed the 5% maximum and therefore is acceptable.
- 193 In terms of wheelchair accommodation, 16% (79 units) would be provided. The units would be provided in Ludgate B, Sampson B and Sampson C. The wheelchair flats are provided across a range of unit sizes, with 38% as one beds, 42% as two beds and 20% as three beds. This is considered acceptable and appropriate.
- 194 Policy 3.4 Optimising Housing Potential of the London Plan states that development should optimise housing output for different types of location within the relevant density range shown in Table 3.2 of the Plan. It also requires local context, the design principles and public transport capacity to be taken into account. Strategic Policy 5 –

Providing new homes of the Core Strategy sets out the density ranges that residential and mixed use developments would be expected to meet. As the site is located within the Central Activities Zone, a density range of 650 to 1100 habitable rooms per hectare would be sought. Appendix 2 of the Saved Southwark Plan sets out guidance for how density should be calculated. In order for a higher density to be acceptable, the development would need to meet the criteria for exceptional design as set out in section 2.2 of the Residential Design Standards SPD.

- 195 The development as a whole would have a density 1410 habitable rooms per hectare. Since the maximum upper limit of 1100hrh would be exceeded, the development would need to demonstrate that it would be excellent in relation to housing quality. If it can be demonstrated that an excellent standard of accommodation would be provided, and the response to context and impact on amenity to existing occupiers is acceptable, then it is considered that the high density would not raise any issues to warrant withholding permission.

Quality of accommodation

- 196 Saved Policy 4.2 of the Southwark Plan advises that planning permission will be granted provided the proposal achieves good quality living conditions. The adopted standards in relation to internal layout are set out in the adopted Residential Design Standards SPD 2011.

- 197 The following table sets out the minimum flat size requirements as set out in the adopted SPD 2008 and the Update to the Residential Design Standards 2011, and also the flat sizes that would be achieved.

198	Unit type	SPD (sqm)	Size range proposed (sqm)
	Studio	36	40-42
	1 bed (flat)	50	50-84
	2 bed (flat)	70	91-166
	3 bed (flat)	86	146-304
	4 bed (flat)	106	388-496

- 199 The flat sizes comfortably meet the standards as set out in the SPD. In terms of aspect, 83% of the units would be dual aspect which is positive. Space has been allocated for storage and all kitchens enjoy natural light and ventilation. Overall, it is therefore considered that the flat sizes are acceptable, and would provide for a very good standard of internal amenity.

Internal daylight (daylight within the new flats)

- 200 Of the 1390 habitable rooms tested within the proposed development, 92.1% meet or exceed the required minimum Average Daylight Factor for the room type. 93% of all tested rooms achieve the recommended No Sky Line (NSL). The majority of those that do not meet the standards are within Sampson B. Of the 110 rooms falling short of ADF, a large number either:
- i) are not the primary living area (36 are bedrooms), or
 - ii) are living areas that, whilst falling short of the ADF recommended levels, meet the recommended levels of NSL, or
 - iii) are open plan kitchen/living/dining rooms which achieve the recommended levels of ADF for a living room (1.5%) but fall short of those recommended for a kitchen (2%) (10 living/kitchen/dining rooms).

201 It is therefore considered that the proposed units would achieve a good standard of internal daylight.

Amenity space

202 All new residential development must provide an adequate amount of useable outdoor amenity space. The Residential Design Standards SPD sets out the required amenity space standards which can take the form of private gardens and balconies, shared terraces and roof gardens. Policy 3.6 of the London Plan requires new developments to make provision for play areas based on the expected child population of the development. Children's play areas should be provided at a rate of 10 sqm per child bed space (covering a range of age groups).

203 In terms of the overall amount of amenity space required, the following would need to be provided:

- For units containing 3 or more bedrooms, 10sqm of private amenity space as required by the SPD;
- For units containing 2 bedrooms or less, ideally 10sqm of private amenity space, with the balance added to the communal gardens;
- 50sqm communal amenity space per block as required by the SPD; and
- 10sqm of children's play space for every child space in the development as required by the London Plan.

204 In terms of private amenity space provision, most of the three bed flats would contain at least 10sqm of private amenity space, however there are 6 x three bed flats in Ludgate B that provide 9.8sqm and 6 x three bed flats that provide 7.6sqm. These 12 flats do not provide the minimum 10sqm, but this does not raise any significant concern owing to the provision of the communal amenity space across the site. In addition, the amenity space provided in Ludgate B is all in the form of winter gardens, rather than as more conventional outdoor space.

205 In terms of the two bed flats, most are provided with private amenity space, and in many cases, the amount provided exceeds 10sqm. In addition, most of the one bed flats are also provided with amenity space. Overall, 473 flats (96%) of the units would include private balconies or winter gardens.

206 Where the full recommended provision of 10sqm per residential unit has not been provided, the shortfall has been added to the communal requirement. In this case, a total of 570sqm of communal space would need to be found. This 570sqm comprises of 50sqm per residential block (250sqm) plus the shortfall in private amenity space (320sqm).

Communal amenity space

207 In terms of communal amenity space, the following spaces would be provided in the development:

- i) the central square (Sampson)
- ii) the residents garden (Sampson)
- iii) Rennie garden (Ludgate)
- iv) deck level space adjacent to Ludgate B (Ludgate)
- v) deck level space adjacent to Sampson C and F (Sampson).

208 The extent of communal amenity space provided on the Ludgate side is limited, and therefore relies upon the amenity spaces on the Sampson side. As described in paragraph 34 above, it is proposed that development on the Ludgate side would

commence in advance of development on the Sampson side, which would mean that many residents occupying flats within the Ludgate residential blocks would have no access to amenity space in the interim period. In order to mitigate the impact during this interim period, the applicant has proposed to make a payment of £102,360 towards open space provision if the central square is not delivered by 2022.

Children's play space

209 Children's play areas have been provided on the site, in the following areas:

- i) within the residents garden
- ii) within the deck level space adjacent to Ludgate B
- iii) within deck level space adjacent to Sampson C and F
- iv) a residents garden located between SHB and SHF.

210 638.7sqm of children's play space would be required to be provided, worked out in accordance with the Mayor's Providing for Children and Young People's Play and Informal Recreation SPG. In total, 900sqm of children's play space would be provided, which considerably exceeds the 638.7sqm requirement and accordingly this is a positive aspect of the scheme.

Teenager play space

211 In addition, teenager play space has been provided within the railway arches, likely to be in the form of a climbing wall. The facility would be made available to residents of the development but the applicant has also offered to open it to the wider community on five sessions a week. This facility would further add to the mix of uses provided in the scheme and should be secured within the legal agreement.

Internal amenity spaces

212 In addition to the private, communal, children's and teenager spaces, a series of 'internal' amenity spaces are provided within the buildings on the site. The spaces are provided within the first floor levels of Ludgate B, Sampson B and Sampson C and are spaces which could be used as libraries or for holding parties.

Public art

213 Opportunities have been considered for the incorporation of public art into the masterplan. There are opportunities subject to agreement with Network Rail, for the display of art along the walls of the development including the railway arches, but also within the central square and river walk. As well as public art, the central square could also hold programmed events such as film screenings, performing arts and other cultural events. Although no ideas have been firmed up, the applicant has set out the intention for partnership working with local community and business groups in the area. The details of a public art strategy will be secured via the legal agreement.

Conclusion on amenity

214 Overall, the amount of amenity space is considered acceptable. Whilst there are 12x3 bed flats that do not meet the 10sqm requirement for private amenity space, the amount and variety of communal and children's play space is considered positive. Space has been specifically set aside for teenagers and in addition, a series of internal amenity spaces are provided in the development for other uses.

215 The proposed development provides accommodation that is considered to be of an exemplary standard, particularly in relation to the large apartments, and that this is sufficient to support the high level of density on the site.

Impact on the amenities of occupiers of adjoining properties

216 Daylight

A daylight and sunlight report has been submitted as part of the Environmental Statement. The report assesses the scheme based on the Building Research Establishments (BRE) guidelines on daylight and sunlight.

217 The BRE sets out three 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.

218 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.

219 Another method of calculation is the Average Daylight Factor (ADF) which is a more detailed assessment and considers the amount of sky visibility on the vertical face of a window, but also the window size, room size and room use. The recommendations for ADF in dwellings are 2% for kitchens, 1.5% for living rooms and 1% for bedrooms. The BRE recommends that whilst ADF is an appropriate measure for new buildings and master planned areas, VSC/NSL should be principally used to assess impact on existing buildings.

220 The submitted report has taken into account the impact of the development on the daylight for the existing buildings, and has also modelled the impact on other consented schemes.

221 The daylight report has considered a large number of rooms around the site. It assessed 2286 windows for daylight amenity, which serve 1317 rooms within 36 properties. Of the 1317 rooms assessed 1268 (96%) would satisfy the BRE recommended levels for VSC and /or NSL.

222 A more localised assessment which focuses solely on the Falcon Point and Hopton Street buildings (the most closely affected neighbours) is set out below.

223 For the localised assessment, 116 (41%) out of 286 rooms have windows which fully comply with the VSC. The remaining 170 rooms have therefore been considered in terms of the NSL, of which 157 will meet the BRE guidelines for NSL. Therefore, 273 (95%) rooms (116 + 157) would meet the BRE criteria for VSC and/or NSL. Whilst the VSC considers the levels of daylight experienced at the window face, the NSL analysis provides the true daylight position (given the internal subdivision is known) within the rooms behind the apertures.

224 Whilst some rooms see reductions in their daylight, it should be noted that 17% of rooms experience an improvement in NSL. Where some rooms do not meet VSC criteria alone, many do not meet the BRE criteria in their current condition and others suffer losses less than 30% of the VSC guidelines.

225 The results of the applicant's assessment are included below. Officers appointed an external daylight consultant to verify that the figures were correct.

1-30 Falcon Point

226 There are a total of 44 rooms in these properties. Out of these 44, 39 (89%) would meet the BRE guidelines for VSC and/or NSL and therefore the impact to these rooms is considered negligible in significance.

227 Each of the remaining 5 rooms is served by one window each which have existing low levels of VSC. 4 rooms have windows with existing levels of VSC below 3% (from between 0.94 to 2.57) which is as a result of architectural features such as deep enclosed balconies and recesses that limit the potential view of the sky dome to these windows. The remaining window has a VSC of 15.71%. Therefore, as a result of the marginalised existing daylight levels, any further increase in massing on the site would result in a disproportionate alteration triggering a reduction of more than 20%. With regard to NSL, each of these rooms would also experience a reduction of between 40.57% to 97.79%.

228 The layout of Falcon Point is such that each flat is understood to be dual aspect with windows overlooking the river to the north as well as windows to the south overlooking the site. Accordingly, the windows that would suffer BRE breaches by having losses of more than 20% would be likely to be dual aspect living rooms with additional windows to the north overlooking the river. As the windows to the north elevation overlooking the river would continue to enjoy very good levels of daylight, it is considered that on balance these rooms would remain adequately day-lit.

229 The impact to these 5 rooms is therefore considered to be minor adverse in significance. The overall impact to 1-30 Falcon Point is considered to be negligible.

31-42 Falcon Point

230 19 out of the 20 rooms (95%) will meet the BRE guidelines for VSC and/or NSL. The remaining room is on the second floor and is served by one window which has an existing VSC of 2.39%, which is well below the recommended 27%. Therefore any increase in massing would have a disproportionate alteration in VSC. As proposed, the figure reduces to 1.57% which is a 34.31% reduction. Using NSL, a 25.4% reduction would be experienced. The overall impact to this one room is minor adverse.

43-110 Falcon Point

231 There are 87 rooms which do not meet the VSC test, many of which do not meet the existing BRE standard of 27%. However, none of the windows experience losses of more than 10%. In relation to NSL, all of the rooms meet the NSL standard.

65 Hopton Street

232 114 rooms (202 windows) face onto the site. The majority of flats within the building are single aspect, and therefore do not have windows that face in a direction away from the site.

233 Out of the 114 rooms that face onto the site, 112 would meet the BRE guidelines for VSC and/or NSL.

234 The remaining two rooms (one at 6th and one at 7th floor level) are served by a single window, having VSC values of 29.34% and 32.37%. These values would reduce to

16.92% and 24.62% which equates to reductions of 23.94% and 42.33%, which exceeds the 20% recommended by the BRE.

235 The results of the NSL assessment also indicate that both windows would experience a reduction beyond 20%, at 20.6% and 20.5% respectively, which are only just over the permissible 20% and accordingly the impact to both rooms is considered minor adverse.

236 In applying the ADF test, the results demonstrate that many of the rooms within the building retain ADF at levels of around 2% and above, meeting the required standard for kitchens. It is therefore considered that overall, the impacts to the rooms within the building are considered to be minor adverse.

69 Hopton Street

237 17 out of 22 rooms assessed would meet the BRE guidelines with respect to VSC and NSL. Each of the remaining 5 rooms is served by a single window, and all 5 would experience reductions of between 23% to 30%. These are two rooms at second, one room at third, one at fourth and one at fifth. Four of these windows have existing VSC levels of below 27%, with values from 9.88% to 20.64%, with the remaining room having 30.27%.

238 One of the 5 rooms has a NSL reduction above the 20% (20.55%) limit set by the BRE guide, with the four other rooms having smaller reductions of between 13.1% to 16.54%.

239 Whilst these remaining 5 rooms would experience losses, it should also be noted that 9% of the rooms experience an improvement in NSL, because of the new gaps created through the buildings on the Sampson House side. Accordingly, the impacts are considered to be minor adverse.

1-6 Hopton Gardens

240 There are 13 rooms within these buildings which have been considered. Following the development, 12 (92%) would comply with the BRE standard for VSL and/or NSL. The one room that would not comply is located at ground floor level fronting Hopton Street. This has an existing VSC of 17.37% by virtue of a high brick wall in front of it. After the development, this would reduce by 32% to 11.87%. In relation to NSL, the reduction would be 49% and therefore the impact is considered to be of moderate adverse significance.

Neo Bankside

241 149 out of the 150 rooms assessed would meet the BRE guidelines for VSC and/or NSL and therefore the impact to these rooms would be of negligible significance. The remaining room is a bedroom on the 4th floor which could be considered less sensitive in daylight terms when compared to other rooms such as living rooms and kitchens. The existing VSC is 5.41% which is some way below the 27% target. As proposed, this would reduce to 3.41% which equates to a reduction of 36.97%.

242 Under NSL, there would be a reduction of 24% which is only just over the 20% suggested by the guidelines. The proposed development would have a minor adverse impact upon this room only.

1-26 Friars Close, Bear Lane

243 Of the 58 rooms tested, 48 would meet the criteria for VSC and/or NSL and therefore

these rooms would not experience any noticeable reductions in daylight. The remaining 10 rooms (first and second floor) are served by windows which have existing levels of VSC which are below the recommended 27% - at 4.44 to 11.74%. This is as a result of balconies that overhang the building which limit the view of the sky to the windows. In such circumstances, any alteration in the existing massing upon the site would result in a disproportionate alteration in VSC. The proposed VSC levels are 2.67% to 7.96% with percentage losses of between 25% and 50%. In relation to NSL, the reductions would be of a similar extent.

Edward Edwards House, Nicholson Street

- 244 Of the 20 rooms, 18 (90%) would meet the BRE guidelines for VSC and/or NSL. The remaining two rooms are served by 4 and 1 windows respectively, all of which have very low existing levels of VSC. The existing levels are very low, at 1% to 1.76%, with reductions of 41.48% and 88%. In regard to the NSL results, one room would experience a reduction of 23.4% which is only just above the 20% recognised by the BRE. The second room would experience a reduction of 36%.

1-99 Rennie Court

- 245 142 out of 164 rooms comply with the BRE guidelines in respect to VSC and/or NSL. The other 22 rooms are served by a total of 25 windows, 23 of which have existing levels of VSC below the recommended 27%. The reductions would be large, with up to a 50% reduction, which is more than the accepted 20%. These rooms would therefore have a moderate adverse impact.

1 Blackfriars Road

- 246 At the time the application was lodged, the planning application for the 1-16 Blackfriars Road development (ref 12/AP/1784) had not been granted. Nonetheless, a study was undertaken to consider the daylight impact upon this development using the Vertical Sky Component test. The assessment shows that a significant proportion of the 50 storey residential building receives 27% VSC or more, thus complying with the BRE guidelines.

- 247 However, the lower levels of the building (from ground to the 10th floor) would receive less than the 27% target, with an estimated 11% VSC being received. The facade of the building is highly glazed and is part of planned cluster of tall buildings around the northern end of Blackfriars Road. The developer of 1 Blackfriars (St George) is fully aware of the proposal and has raised no objections to the development. On this basis, it would be inappropriate to raise any concern or withhold the granting of permission.

1-87 River Court

- 248 All of the 202 rooms within the building would meet the BRE guidelines with respect to VSC and NSL. 189 of the rooms would retain at least 27% VSC or at least 80% of their baseline VSC value. The remaining 13 rooms retain at least 80% of the baseline NSL value. Accordingly, the scheme would be fully BRE compliant with respect to this building.

Conclusion on daylight

- 249 The results of the daylight assessment do reveal that there would be a number of rooms that would not meet the relevant daylighting standards of the BRE, with those flats towards the east of the site particularly affected (Falcon Point, Hopton Street). However, the proposed development does provide for gaps between the buildings, which would allow flats to obtain views and glimpses through the buildings. The site

layout would also allow for these flats to obtain views of the open spaces within the development, such as the central square, and therefore this is considered to represent an improvement over the existing situation. In addition, there should also be some acknowledgement that the site is in an Opportunity Area within a Central London location and accordingly the standards should be applied with some degree of flexibility.

250 The consultants study as referred to in paragraph 225, accepts that the figures produced in the daylight report are accurate and correct. The study noted that there is no recognised criteria of what should be termed 'minor adverse' or 'moderate adverse' but accepted that 'moderate adverse' would normally require mitigation.

251 In conclusion, it is considered that whilst the impacts to some rooms would fail to meet the relevant standards of the BRE, other factors such as the gaps through the buildings, the views of open spaces and the urban environment should be given weight, and accordingly would be sufficient to consider the level of impact, on balance, acceptable.

Sunlight

252 All of the windows within 90 degrees of due south have been assessed with regards to impact on sunlight. The BRE guide states that if a window can receive 25% of summer sunlight, including at least 5% of winter sunlight between the hours of 21 September and 21 March, then the room would be adequately sunlight.

1-30 Falcon Point

253 There are 49 windows that face onto the site that are located within 90 degrees of due south. 44 (90%) of the windows would meet the BRE criteria. Of the remaining 5 windows which do not comply, 4 serve kitchens or dining rooms. All but one of these windows would maintain summer sunlight greater than 17% (all between 17-21%) and winter sun above the recommended 5%, at 6-7%. The remaining window would receive 10% summer sunlight and no winter sunlight.

31-42 Falcon Point

254 Of the 24 windows assessed, 20 (83%) would achieve BRE compliance. The 4 windows that do not meet the BRE serve kitchen/dining rooms and would receive summer sun of between 13-20% and winter sun of between 3-6%.

43-56 Falcon Point

255 28 of the 30 windows meet the BRE guidelines for sunlight. The remaining 2 windows serve kitchens. One window experiences a reduction from 12% to 6% of summer sunlight. The other is 36% to 24%. Winter sunlight is retained to both of these windows, at 6%.

52-72 Falcon Point

256 Of the 34 windows assessed, 29 (85%) would meet the BRE guidelines. The remaining 5 windows all have existing marginalised existing levels of sunlight. All but one window would retain more than 5% of winter sunlight.

65 Hopton Street (bankside lofts)

257 Of the 153 windows required for assessment, 114 (75%) would achieve BRE compliance. Of the 39 that would not meet the criteria, 27 would retain an annual APSH of at least 18% and 4% winter sun. Of the 39 windows, 31 would experience minor transgressions. The remaining 8 have existing levels of annual and winter sun

which is below the recommended levels.

69 Hopton Street

- 258 31 windows were assessed. 29 windows (90%) would meet the BRE guidelines following the development. The three windows that fail all serve bedrooms, and by virtue of their use do not have the same requirement for sunlight when compared to living rooms. All 3 windows would retain good levels of sunlight of at least 14% and have existing marginalised levels of winter sunlight.

Neo Bankside

- 259 There are 210 windows that face 90 degrees of due south. 208 out of the 210 comply with the guidelines. The other two have low levels of winter and total sunlight which are well below the recommended levels in the BRE. Therefore any increase in massing would have a disproportionate impact on sunlight.

1-99 Rennie Court

- 260 There are 30 windows within the property that face within 90 degrees of due south. 29 (97%) of the 30 windows would meet the BRE criteria following implementation of the development. The remaining window would retain high winter sunlight, at 14%, which is almost triple the 5% recommended by the BRE. In terms of summer sunlight, the window would fall marginally short, at 21.74%.

1-87 River Court

- 261 169 out of 171 windows assessed would meet the BRE guidelines. The other two windows would retain total sunlight of 22% and winter sun between 2 and 4%. Accordingly, they would be only marginally below the 25% and 5% levels for sunlight and winter sunlight respectively.

1-16 Blackfriars Road

- 262 A sunlight facade study has been prepared to consider the sunlight that would be available to the building. The facade study illustrates that a substantial proportion of the building would meet the requirements for 25% total sunlight and 5% winter sunlight. A small proportion of the building from ground to 20th floor level would receive below 5%. This is because this part of the building is orientated north and so would not need to be tested and would not receive any direct sunlight. Accordingly, the sunlight impacts to this building are considered acceptable.

Conclusion on sunlight

- 263 As with daylight, there are a number of windows which would not meet the BRE guidelines for summer and winter sunlight. In some cases, this is because of existing marginalised levels of sunlight. However, the extent of non compliance is considered minor overall, owing to creation of gaps between the proposed buildings and the central London environment.

Overshadowing

Permanent overshadowing

- 264 A total of 9 areas of open space have been assessed. These are Falcon Point Piazza, the Thames Path, Doggets Pub garden (north and south), Christchurch Gardens, Hopton Gardens, Neo Bankside, Causton House, One Blackfriars public square and 20 Blackfriars.

- 265 The BRE states that in order for an amenity space to appear well lit throughout the year, no more than two fifths (40%) and preferably no more than a quarter (25%) of

any garden or amenity area should be prevented from receiving any sun at all on March 21st. Following completion of the development, all of these external areas would achieve full BRE compliance.

Hours in sun

- 266 The BRE guidelines suggest that for a garden or amenity area to appear adequately sunlit throughout the year, no more than half of the area should be prevented from receiving 2 hours of sun on 21 March and/or a reduction of less than 20%. All 9 external areas achieve full compliance with the guidelines, and therefore there would be no adverse impacts.
- 267 However, there are some concerns about the spaces within the development itself. Areas 2, 3 and 4 (Central Square, Residents Garden and Childrens Square and the Ludgate elevated garden) would not achieve the criteria with only a small proportion of each area receiving two hours of sunlight on 21 March. This is due to the placing of tall buildings to the south of the spaces, and could impact on their usability and influence landscape design options.

Overlooking

- 268 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.
- 269 These distances would be met. To the north of the site across the highway, towards Falcon Point, there would be a distance of 18m. This exceeds the minimum 12m distance required by the SPD. To the east of the site, across Hopton Street, there would be a distance of 13.5m, again exceeding the minimum SPD requirement of 12m. To the west of the site, there would be a considerable 36m distance to the No. 1 Blackfriars Road development, which as described in paragraph 39 above, is in the early stages of construction. There would be no residential windows facing south of the site, so no overlooking issues that need consideration.
- 270 In conclusion, the development would protect the privacy of neighbouring residential properties by virtue of the minimum overlooking distances being exceeded.

Noise and vibration

- 271 The noise impacts from the site would be highest during the demolition of the existing buildings and substructure works (which would include excavation and piling works) and lowest during the internal fit out and landscaping. Traffic noise from construction would increase noise levels, particularly along Southwark Street and Hopton Street. As stated in paragraph 317, a construction management plan would be prepared to reduce excessive noise as far as is possible. The noise impacts from demolition and construction would be temporary in nature and it is not envisaged that any long term disturbance would be caused.
- 272 The predicted change in traffic flow on surrounding roads is considered low, and therefore there should be no increase in noise levels from vehicles. The noise from plant and machinery installed would fall below background noise levels and therefore would protect residential amenities.
- 273 There would be an increase in the number of residents, visitors and workers as a result of the new homes, retail and cultural attractions and new offices. However, it is unlikely that there would be any demonstrable harm caused to residential amenities

from their comings and goings. The site is located in a busy central London environment where some noise should be expected.

Air quality

- 274 The site lies within an Air Quality Management Area. The air quality assessment addresses the exposure in the air quality management and refers to the need for mechanical ventilation. The proposal also includes the provision of two energy centres with CHP and gas boilers. Details will therefore be required for how any pollutants and emissions would be managed. Subject to these details being secured, it is not expected that there would be any impact on air quality levels.

Lighting

- 275 Details of any external lighting should be submitted by condition. This is to ensure that any of the surrounding residential properties, especially those located to the east of the site on Hopton Street do not experience any light pollution. In addition, careful consideration should be given to the type of lighting along the river walk, as any lighting should not over-spill on to the adjacent foreshore areas, in order to limit disturbance to feeding wildfowl.

Wind

- 276 A microclimate assessment has been submitted as part of the application, which considers the impact of the development on the wind conditions both on the site and surrounding the site.
- 277 The development would need mitigation in order to produce wind conditions satisfactory for sitting. The types of mitigation proposed include low level planting, lobby recesses, tree planting, increased balustrade height and screens. The mitigation will have to play an important role in sheltering the amenity spaces from the winds and accordingly it is recommended that these details be secured by condition.

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

278 Pulse Nightclub

As referred to in paragraph 37 above, planning permission was refused for the continued use of the Pulse nightclub at railway arches 1-5, because of concerns over the impacts on the residential amenities of existing and future occupiers in relation to noise and disturbance. An appeal has been lodged against the council's refusal, which is scheduled to be heard on 13 November 2013.

- 279 The nightclub is currently still operating under a 24 hour premises licence granted in June 2011. The venue has operated as a live music venue, corporate party venue and caters for events such as product launches and fashion shows. Club nights are usually at the weekend with parties during the day and corporate function bookings occurring during the week. It should be noted that whilst planning permission for the nightclub was granted back in 2006 (ref 05/AP/0638), and again in 2008 (ref 07/AP/1878), the use is not considered to have become established as the first permission was never implemented and the second was unlawfully implemented as two pre-commencement conditions were not discharged.
- 280 The plans submitted with the application assume that the nightclub would vacate the site, since the railway arches are shown to provide a number of new uses rather than the nightclub. These uses are teenager playspace, a cultural facility and retail uses as described in paragraph 28 above. In addition, the proposed ground floor night club

plan includes the provision of a new storage area within Arch 5. However, Arch 5 is proposed to be opened up as part of the scheme in order to provide one of the new east-west routes. If the appeal is allowed, then doubt would be cast over the deliverability of the uses and also over the provision of the second east-west route, as the nightclub could remain in place. However, the council is aware from documents held by the Land Registry that the nightclub currently has a 30 year lease from Network Rail. There is a right in the lease allowing Network Rail to determine in certain circumstances but again the applicant will need to reach an agreement with Network Rail relating to this and it is unclear whether negotiations have progressed to this stage.

281 In coming to the decision to refuse planning permission for continued use, regard was attached to the changing residential character of the area, in relation to the provision of 274 new residential units as part of the No. 1 Blackfriars scheme, and also the 489 units proposed as part of this application. It was felt that the harm to existing residents (such as those within River Court and Rennie Court) as well as future residents was significant and in the absence of suitable controls and mitigation, would be of detriment to the existing and future residents of the surrounding area.

282 There could be a scenario whereby the appeal would be allowed, with the nightclub remaining on the site and continuing to operate. Given this circumstance, and also taking into account that the applicant has yet to reach an agreement with Network Rail, more limited weight should be attached to the provision of the playspace, cultural and retail uses. In addition to the uses, it is also likely that the both new east-west routes could not be provided. The new uses within the railway arches are also a further key benefit, adding to the mix and diversity of uses provided. It is accordingly recommended that the provision of these uses, together with the new route is given more limited weight for the purposes of decision making. It is required that a development agreement with Network Rail is approved by the council and entered into before any works on site commence, in order for there to be confidence that these uses can be delivered.

Titan House, 144 Southwark Street

283 Paragraph 30 above refers to the application received for the erection of a roof extension at Titan House, which shares a boundary with the site, located on the corner of Hopton Street and Southwark Street. One floor of the extension is proposed for office use and the top floor for residential use.

284 Whilst the application is still under consideration, an initial assessment indicates that the roof extension would not impact upon the development in terms of daylight, privacy or outlook. Sampson D would be the closest building to the extension and this comprises wholly offices (rather than residential uses which are considered more sensitive). A gap would be retained between the buildings which would ensure that neither development would be compromised in terms of daylight or outlook. Accordingly, should the application for the roof extension be granted, then it is considered that both developments could co-exist together without causing any harmful amenity impacts.

Flood Risk

285 The site is located within Flood Zone 3 which is considered to be an area of high risk of flooding due to the proximity of the tidal River Thames. However the site is protected by the Thames Barrier and related defences. A flood risk assessment has been submitted with the application and the associated breach analysis demonstrates

that the site would not flood in the event of a breach of the Thames tidal defences. The Environment Agency were consulted on the application and they have advised that they would have no objection to the proposal subject to the attachment of conditions in relation to contamination and the request for the submission of a surface water drainage scheme. The Environment Agency also advise that the scheme should incorporate ecological benefits, such as green walls/roofs, soft landscaping and bat and bird boxes. This is considered below at paragraph 362.

Traffic issues

- 286 Saved policy 5.1 of the Southwark Plan seeks to ensure that development is located near transport nodes, or where they are not it must be demonstrated that sustainable transport options are available to site users, and sustainable transport is promoted. In addition, saved policy 5.6 of the Southwark Plan requires development to minimise the number of car parking spaces provided and include justification for the amount of car parking sought taking into account the site Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL), the impact on overspill car parking, and the demand for parking within the controlled parking zones.

Public transport accessibility

- 287 The site has the highest level of public transport accessibility with a PTAL level of 6b, rated on a scale of 1-6 where 1 represents low accessibility and 6b the highest accessibility. There are several railway and London Underground stations located within the vicinity of the site; Blackfriars South, Southwark and Blackfriars. Waterloo and London Bridge stations are all relatively close at around 20 minutes walk. The site is well connected to the London bus network, cycle routes and walking routes.

Site layout

- 288 The proposed site layout would improve pedestrian routes in the area, in particular providing two new east-west routes and a north-south route through the development between Southwark Street and the River Walk. A “Legible London” wayfinding strategy is proposed, which is welcomed. The re-provision of public toilets at the south of the Blackfriars Station entrance is also welcomed. The management of the toilets would fall to the applicant and would be free for the public to use. This should be secured through the S106 agreement.
- 289 Upon completion of the development, there would be three vehicle access points into the development:
- Left in/left out on Blackfriars Road to provide access to the residential car parking for Ludgate House via two vehicle lifts;
 - A new entrance from Southwark Street which would be the main vehicle access into the site. This would ensure that servicing and refuse vehicles would be confined to the strategic road network. The junction also provides alternative access for Ludgate House residential basement parking.
 - A third access via vehicle lifts from Hopton Street, for use by residents.
- 290 While it is the council’s normal approach to seek the adoption of routes that will be used as public highway, including pedestrian and cyclist routes, in this case the proposal to maintain them as private land is acceptable subject to the safeguarding of public access. This can be secured through the legal agreement.
- 291 As part of the proposals, the existing coach bay on the south side of Southwark Street would need to be relocated 70m to the east. The detailed design for the relocation would also form part of the legal agreement.

- 291 A taxi/residential drop off facility for Ludgate House would be provided on the internal highway within the development to be accessed from Blackfriars Road.

Pedestrian lifts

- 292 The proposed provision of lifts (one on the River Walk and one on the northern east-west route) to address larger level differences is welcomed. However, the introduction of steps for smaller level differences should be avoided where possible, and generous ramps provided for wheelchair users where it cannot. The landscape details required by condition should seek to address this point, by avoiding the inclusion of steps where possible.

Servicing and Waste Management

- 293 Upon completion of the development, 139 servicing trips per day are estimated, all using the Southwark Street access. In common with many recent applications, when estimating servicing trips there seems to be no account taken of the growth in deliveries of online grocery shopping (i.e. by supermarkets) and of other online shopping. While courier companies will be able to exercise a degree of consolidation, there are many such companies leading to many individual trips. This issue should be addressed with vehicle trips expected from grocery and courier companies properly accounted for in the delivery and service plan.

- 294 A draft deliveries and servicing plan has been provided, but it gives very little detail on the potential measures to manage and reduce the number of servicing trips. Accordingly, a full deliveries and servicing plan should be required by condition. It must include provision for concierge staff to refuse taking deliveries at ground floor level, instead directing delivery staff to the service yards.

Car parking

- 295 Saved Policy 5.6 (Car Parking) of the Southwark Plan and Core Strategy Policy 2 (Sustainable Transport) state that residential developments should be car free. For office use, a maximum of one space per 1500sqm is permitted which would equate to a maximum of 24 spaces. No parking (except disabled provision) is permitted for retail or culture uses.
- 296 Parking for the residential element is proposed at 0.4 spaces per unit, or 40% provision, equating to a total of 200 spaces, all provided at basement level. This includes provision of an accessible space for each wheelchair accessible home. For Ludgate House B, residents with mobility impairments would have the choice of a designated accessible parking space, or to have their vehicle parked by a concierge service. Four accessible spaces are proposed for commercial use, two within the Ludgate basement and two within the Sampson basement close to the lift cores. Two further accessible spaces are proposed on the western side of Hopton Street, on street, for use of the retail and cultural/gym space. However, these spaces could not be reserved for users of the development and would be available for use by any person with a mobility impairment.
- 297 During negotiations, the applicant was asked to reduce the quantum of car parking included within the scheme. However, the applicant has advised that those people in the market who purchase high-end residential apartments (such as those provided by the development) often have a requirement for a parking space. However, this is primarily to store a car and they only use the car occasionally e.g. family visits, holidays etc rather than use it on a daily basis for travelling to work or shopping.

- 298 The applicant has also pointed to car parking usage surveys, and a study recently produced by WSP on behalf of the Berkeley Group entitled 'Does Car Ownership Increase Car Use?' (2011) which suggests that most London residents who have access to good public transport or live within accessible locations will walk, cycle or use public transport for their peak period journeys such as commuting to work.
- 299 Therefore, parking at new residential Central London developments with a high PTAL such as at Sampson House and Ludgate House generate relatively few vehicle trips in the peak periods compared to those with a low PTAL. The high PTAL, planned improvements to the public realm and provision of cycle parking and facilities would provide attractive alternatives to the car, particularly in the peak periods.
- 300 The Transport Assessment submitted in support of the planning application concludes that the proposed development would have a negligible impact on traffic flow and junction capacity. A full Travel Plan would be prepared to maximise the opportunities for sustainable travel (including provision of significant cycle parking).
- 301 Further mitigation would comprise of funding for off-site sustainable travel initiatives to reduce background traffic in order to mitigate the additional car trips that the development would impose upon the network. An equitable way of securing this would be for a sum of money to be held as a bond (£261,000), and for penalties/fines to be deducted from the amount should the number of predicted vehicle trips exceed those as set out in the transport assessment. The bond offered has been pro-rated against the car parking mitigation payment made for the One Tower Bridge development (Ref: 10/ap/1935).
- 302 The penalties would then be used to to promote and deliver sustainable transport measures such as enhancing cycle docking stations, installing way-finding signage, improving cycling facilities at junctions or other measures to reduce car usage. Timings and trigger points for the car trip surveys need to be agreed as part of the s106 discussions.
- 303 Therefore whilst the provision of such a high quantum of car parking would not normally be acceptable, the proposal contains sufficient mitigation to overcome the provision and accordingly it would be very difficult to sustain a refusal on this basis. The mitigation in the form of a bond would be secured, with penalties deducted should the number of trips exceed those as set out in the transport assessment. The development would need to incorporate sufficient infrastructure to allow the monitoring of vehicle movements. A travel plan would also be prepared to promote sustainable travel.
- 304 New residents and commercial occupiers of the development should be excluded from eligibility for on-street parking permits and for contracts in the council's off-street car parks.
- 305 The existing motorcycle bay on Hopton Street would be re-provided.
- 306 20% of the car parking spaces would be fitted with electric vehicle charger points. A further 20% passive provision would also be available i.e. spaces that could be converted to electric charging at a later date should demand require it.

Cycling

- 307 The site is well served by designated cycle routes, Blackfriars Road and Southwark Street are part of the National Cycle Network and connects to Westminster Bridge to the west to the Cycle Super Highway on Southwark Bridge to the east.
- 308 A total of 927 cycle parking spaces would be provided. Sheffield stands for residential visitors, retail, gym and cultural elements would be provided at grade. The office and residential cycle parking would be provided at basement level and would comprise a mixture of two-tier cycle parking (around 47%) and single tier stands (53%) to provide residents with a choice of cycle parking. The proposed mix of stands with a good proportion of Sheffield stands (53%) is positive, though this good proportion should be provided at each cycle parking store.
- 309 All cycle parking is provided in the basement with access via the car lifts. It is recommended that access is allowed via the vehicle ramp from Southwark Street as well, in order to make access more convenient to users.
- 310 Amendments were received during the course of the application to revise the basement layout, to reduce corridor length and the number of doors to access the cycle store. The changes result in a better layout, and accordingly would be more convenient for cycle users.
- 311 It is noted that the commercial cycle parking is to be supported by provision of lockers and showers, which is welcomed. The cycle storage areas should also have pumps and tools available. This can be required by condition.
- 312 A request has come through from Transport for London, asking the applicant to investigate whether the northern east-west route could be adapted to allow for cyclists to use the route, so as to connect to Upper Ground to the east and Hopton Street to the west. The applicant has looked at this in some detail, but constraints relating to the creation of level access (the difference in levels across the route is 4m), and also the likelihood of further trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order needing to be removed along Blackfriars Road, would make this difficult to achieve. Transport for London may comment on this issue further in their Stage II report.

Cycle docking station

- 313 It is proposed that the existing Barclays cycle docking station be relocated from Southwark Street, to Hopton Street, because the existing docking station would interfere with the new servicing entrance into the development. Transport for London have agreed the relocation, and have requested a sum of £60,000 towards provision to enhance the cycle hire station. The applicant has accepted the request for payment, which would be secured by the legal agreement.

Car clubs

- 314 The proposals include the provision of two car club spaces to serve the development and the local community. Commitment to providing free membership of the car club to all appropriate residents for a three year period will also be secured.

Waste storage

- 315 Waste storage is provided at basement level, accessed using the main servicing access on Southwark Street. A total of 7 loading bays, five of which are accessible by HGVs and the remainder LGVs, are proposed.

Construction traffic

- 316 The precise construction programme has not been provided at the time of writing but the total construction period has been given as approx. 7 years and 9 months. Development is anticipated to commence on the Ludgate side prior to Sampson. At a peak, in year 5, it is estimated that 9 two-way vehicle movements would be required per hour for Ludgate House, with 15 two-way vehicles per hour for Sampson house. No long term road closures are envisaged, short-term closures may be required to establish and remove tower cranes, deliver large items of plant and to complete highways and landscaping works. There may also be a need for short-term or full closures of footways surrounding the site, including the eastern footway of Blackfriars Road outside Ludgate House. TfL raise concern over this footway closure and request alternatives be considered. Construction hours have been given as between the hours of 8am and 6pm Monday to Friday and 8am to 1pm on Saturdays. This accords with the council's agreed normal working hours. The routing for construction vehicles has also been provided, using principally A roads. As referred to above, Ludgate House is expected to be built first, with construction vehicles using Hopton Street access to access Ludgate House from underneath the railway arches. Delivery vehicles for Sampson House construction would be using the Southwark Street access.
- 317 A draft Construction Logistics Plan has been provided but the document contains very little detail. A full Construction Environmental Management Plan which should be secured by condition. This should specifically require measures to mitigate the increased risk to pedestrians and cyclists arising from construction vehicle operation, through provision of equipment on vehicles, driver training, licence checks, etc. following best practice established by the CrossRail project.
- 318 Many residents have objected on the grounds of impacts during construction, and have raised concerns over dust, noise and traffic movements along Hopton Street. The construction plan should include measures to mitigate against noise and dust. The plan should also set out that construction vehicles would use the strategic roads for heavy traffic. The applicant has advised that the use of Hopton Street would be minimised in order to protect the amenities of the Hopton Street residents as far as possible. Accordingly, the full Construction Management Plan required by condition would need to ensure that this is carried through.
- 319 Indicative construction routes have been provided in the TA which includes Blackfriars Road and one of the access points for construction vehicles entering and exiting the site will be located on this road. The TA states that the council and local residents will be consulted on the final construction routes and this will provide an opportunity to further develop ways to reduce any potential cumulative effects arising during construction.
- Blackfriars Road Improvement Scheme/Way finding schemes/Cycle SuperHighway
- 320 In partnership with Transport for London, a scheme is being developed to enhance Blackfriars Road. This is aimed at improving the overall quality of the environment along Blackfriars Road including the junction re-design at Blackfriars Road/Southwark Street, pedestrian and cycling improvements, tree planting and materials. Transport for London have indicated that they would expect the development make a contribution towards this scheme. A sum of £750,000 has been requested by TfL but this has not yet been accepted at the time of writing.
- 321 In addition, TfL are developing a way finding scheme in this area as part of the wider Legible London programme. In order to ensure new signage can be provided, a

contribution of £50,000 is offered by the applicant.

Travel plans

- 322 The travel plans are largely acceptable subject to referencing the Better Bankside Travel Planning Group, which operates in the area (<http://www.betterbankside.co.uk/travel>). The group offers a transport forum and initiatives for local businesses and residents, and the travel plans should link with this forum. The plan should also detail how the parking spaces can be re-allocated should take-up be low – e.g. extra car club spaces, motorcycle or cycle parking, etc. There should also be commitments to monitoring, such as undertaking reviews at relevant periods. The travel plan should be secured by the legal agreement.

Conclusion on transport

- 323 The layout of the site is considered acceptable, with the main vehicle service entrance point located on Southwark Street. The provision of the new east-west routes are also welcomed.
- 324 The proposal to provide such a high level of car parking is contrary to policy, and under normal circumstances could amount to a reason for refusal on the scheme. However the scheme does include appropriate mitigation in the form of a car park mitigation bond, where penalties would be collected if the number of vehicle trips exceeds the predicted numbers.
- 325 The proposal includes a high quantum of cycle parking spaces, both for residents, staff and visitors. The existing Barclays cycle docking station on Southwark Street would be relocated to Hopton Street, and would include an increased capacity of cycles to reflect the additional demand arising from the development. Proposals have been included for car clubs and electric vehicle charging points.
- 326 Further information such as detailed construction management plans and travel plans would be required by condition and legal agreement respectively.
- 327 The applicant needs to confirm acceptance of the TfL request of £750,000 towards the Blackfriars Road Improvement Scheme.

Archaeology

- 328 Sampson and Ludgate House are located within the Borough, Bermondsey and Rivers Archaeological Priority Zone.
- 329 Sampson House is assumed to include the site of the Swan Theatre. Sampson House has two levels of basement that cumulatively, together with foundations, have severely impacted upon buried archaeological remains on site. There is very little chance of any archaeological survival on the site of Sampson House.
- 330 The proposals for Ludgate House have a greater potential to impact upon buried archaeological remains, however these are also likely to have been severely impacted by modern developments.
- 331 Proposals to construct a link under the viaduct between the existing basement areas underneath Sampson and Ludgate, will also have an impact upon buried archaeological remains. Any archaeology in this area will already have been significantly impacted by the construction of the viaduct, however, strips may well remain between structural elements.

332 For the area of Ludgate House it is recommended that any site investigation works are archaeologically monitored to design the archaeological scheme. Following the demolition of the building it would be necessary to undertake an archaeological evaluation of the site. The purpose of this evaluation will be to design future archaeological mitigation measures for the construction works. Mitigation may range from a watching brief over areas of significance or potential to the full excavation of the entire area.

333 For the tunnel connecting the two basements it is highly likely that any construction work within the viaduct will be preceded by an examination of the foundations and structure of the viaduct. Any investigative ground works in this area will require archaeological monitoring. This should provide information to design suitable archaeological mitigation measures for works in this area.

334 It is accordingly recommended that conditions be attached in relation to archaeological evaluation, mitigation and reporting.

Planning obligations (S.106 undertaking or agreement)

335 Saved Policy 2.5 of the Southwark Plan and Policy 8.2 of the London Plan advise that planning obligations can be secured to overcome the negative impacts of a generally acceptable proposal. Saved Policy 2.5 of the Southwark Plan is reinforced by the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on Section 106 Planning Obligations, (which sets out in detail the type of development that qualifies for planning obligations), and Circular 05/05, which advises that every planning application will be judged on its own merits against relevant policy, guidance and other material considerations when assessing planning obligations. Strategic Policy 14 – Implementation and delivery of the Core Strategy states that planning obligations will be sought to reduce or mitigate the impact of developments.

336 The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations came into force on 6th April 2010. The regulations state under 122 – “Limitation on use of planning obligations” that it is unlawful for a planning obligation to be taken into account when determining a planning application for a development, or any part of a development, that is capable of being charged CIL if the obligation does not meet all of the following tests:

- necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- directly related to the development; and
- fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

337 The applicant has submitted a proposed Heads of Terms based on the council’s Planning Obligations SPD. The following table sets out the contributions payable based on the Section 106 Planning Obligations SPD and what the applicant has proposed to offer.

Topic area	S106 SPD	Applicant’s S106 offer
Affordable Housing	0	£65,000,000 minimum payment, rising to £100,000,000 subject to reviews
Education	£478,297	£478,297
Employment in the development	£36,123	£36,123
Employment during	£402,555	£402,555 (or in kind works through

construction		provision of work place co-ordinator to value of £402,555)
Employment in the development: additional contribution to training	£0,00	£300,000
Employment during construction management fee	£31,548	£31,548
Public open space	£173,806	£173,806
Children's play equipment	£65,490	£65,490
Sports development	£424,138	£424,138
Transport Strategic	£271,786	£271,786
Transport Site Specific	£281,250	£281,250
Public Realm	£403,500	£403,500
Archaeology	£16,135	£16,135
Health	£552,030	£552,030
Community Facilities	£77,885	£77,885
Community Project Bank	£0,00	£500,000
Admin charge	£62,145	£70,145.43
Total	£3,276,688	£4,084,688.43

- 339 A sum of £500,000 has been offered towards the community project bank, which could be pooled with other contributions to deliver community projects as listed within the council's Bankside and Borough project bank.
- 340 Given the significant reduction in office floorspace, a sum of £300,000 has been offered by the applicant which would be used to provide additional training initiatives for residents in the borough. The other contributions are standard toolkit items.
- 341 As noted in the GLA's stage 1 report, the applicant has been asked to consider the provision of additional public benefits in the form of an open space or other use on the redundant pillars on the Thames. The GLA later advised that a sum of money towards the project would be required, but have not yet determined what the amount would be. In the event that agreement on a sum is reached, this payment should be added to the other payments to be collected. In the event that the project does not go ahead, then the sum should be directed towards another public realm project.

Network Rail

- 342 Running through the centre of the site are the railway lines approaching to the new

Blackfriars South station. Accordingly, all demolition and construction activity would need to be carefully planned to ensure that operation of the railway is not compromised. The railway arches are also proposed for re-use and adaption under the proposals owing to the provision of new uses and the formation of the two new east-west routes; these arches are to remain in Network Rail's ownership and so it is clear that Network Rail would need to be party to the legal agreement. Whilst it is understood this is agreed in principle, Network Rail are unlikely to accept the possibility of any meaningful obligations until such time as terms have been agreed in relation to a development agreement.

343 In addition, it should be noted that Ludgate C oversails the railway line by 28% due to the overhang in its design, and therefore the applicant would need to acquire suitable licenses to ensure that the building can be constructed safely.

344 In order to ensure that the scheme can be delivered, it is required that the applicant be required to submit details of the agreement with Network Rail before commencement of the development. The agreement should include confirmation that the following items have been secured:

- the over-sailing of Network Rail land by Ludgate C;
- grant of head lease so Carlyle Group can exercise the right to break the Pulse lease (as referred to in paragraph 262);
- grant of rights of way to allow the two east / west routes, and
- use of the arches.

City of London

345 A small part of the site along the northern part of Blackfriars Road falls within the City of London's ownership, and is proposed to be redeveloped in order to provide the new 'Rennie Street garden'. As noted in Appendix 2 of this report, the City Corporation have lodged objections to application, on the basis that the proposals seek a radical adaption of the space and seek to remove mature trees which have a landscape and amenity value. They also comment that there been no suitable proposals regarding the management and upkeep of the space.

346 Since the City lodged their objection, discussions have been taking place to resolve these issues. As discussed in paragraphs 182 and 184 above, replacement planting is proposed to mitigate the removal of the trees and there has also been progress with agreeing a sum for on going maintenance of the space. It is also proposed that the City Corporation be party to the legal agreement, since they are landowner of this part of the site and the delivery of the garden is considered fundamental to the scheme.

Other heads of terms

347 In addition to the terms set out above, the legal agreement would also secure the following:

- The provision of two car club parking spaces
- Travel plans for both the residential and commercial elements
- Parking management plan
- Car club membership for three years
- Delivery of new east-west routes and north-south routes
- Provision of public access within the new routes and public spaces
- Phasing plans
- Additional public open space contribution of £102,360 if central square not delivered by Q4 2022

- Public art
 - Securing the delivery of the office buildings
 - Car park mitigation, with £261,000 bond held
 - Re-provision and management of public toilets
 - Television reception mitigation
 - Cultural strategy
 - Review mechanisms in case of a delayed commencement and for each subsequent phase to secure an increased proportion of affordable housing if viability has improved.
- 348 In addition to those listed above, the following heads as requested by the GLA and TfL should be secured:
- Contribution towards the Blackfriars Piers Project (amount to be required is subject to negotiations with the GLA)
 - Contribution towards the wayfinding and signposting strategy (£50,000)
 - Contribution towards the expansion of the Barclays cycle docking station (£60,000)
 - Contribution towards the Blackfriars Road Improvement Scheme (TfL have requested £750,000 but applicant yet to confirm payment)
 - Relocation of coach bay and RV1 bus stop on Southwark Street.
- 349 It is considered that the planning obligations sought meet the planning tests of Circular 05/05 and the CIL regulations. The contributions would be spent on delivering new school places as a result of the development, job creation during construction and in the final development, improvements to open spaces and sports facilities, improvements to increase the capacity of transport provision across the borough, improvements to the public realm, funds to secure archaeological monitoring, new health facilities and improvements to community facilities. The affordable housing contribution would be secured for delivering new affordable housing in the borough.
- 350 In accordance with the recommendation, if the Section 106 Agreement is not signed by 31 March 2014, the Head of Development Management is authorised to refuse planning permission, if appropriate, for the reason below:
- 'In the absence of a signed Section 106 Agreement, there is no mechanism in place to avoid or mitigate the impact of the proposed development on affordable housing, public realm, public open space, sports facilities, education, health, affordable housing, the transport network, community facilities and employment and the proposal would therefore be contrary to Saved Policy 2.5 'Planning Obligations' of the Southwark Plan and Policy 14 – 'Implementation and delivery' of the Southwark Core Strategy, the Southwark Supplementary Planning Document 'Section 106 Planning Obligations' 2007, and Policy 8.2 Planning obligations of the London Plan 2011.
- Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)
- 351 The Mayor's CIL came into effect in April 2012 and apply a financial levy against all developments which will go towards the delivery of Crossrail. The levy is not discretionary and must be applied to all developments at a rate of £35 per square metre in Central London and will be prioritised over all other planning obligations.
- 352 The levy against the proposed development falls within a range of between £1,833,125 and £3,926,545.

£1,833,125 [proposed total floorspace 135,210sqm – existing total floorspace 82,835 x £35); or

£3,926,545 (proposed total floorspace 135,210sqm – existing Ludgate floorspace x £35).

- 353 This is because the applicant would need to demonstrate whether Ludgate House would have been lawfully used for six months at time of the discharge of the final pre-commencement condition.

Sustainable development implications

- 354 The energy statement demonstrates how the energy hierarchy has been applied to the proposed development in order to achieve the carbon reduction targets set out in Strategic Policy 13 of the Core Strategy and the London Plan. The Core Strategy and the London Plan also state that there is a presumption that all major development proposals will seek to reduce carbon dioxide emissions by at least 20% through the use of on-site renewable energy generation wherever feasible. In addition, the London Plan expects developments to achieve a reduction in carbon dioxide emissions of 25%. Strategy Policy 13 also requires developments to achieve a minimum Code for Sustainable Homes standard of 'Level 4' and a BREEAM standard of 'Excellent'.

Energy Efficiency

- 355 A range of passive design features and demand reduction measures are proposed to reduce the carbon dioxide emissions of the proposed development. These include air permeability, high efficiency lighting and mechanical ventilation with heat recovery. The demand for cooling will be minimised through facade optimisation and solar shading. This should achieve a 3% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions.

District heating

- 356 The applicant has identified that the proposed South Bank Employers Group district heating network is within the vicinity of the development and is proposing to connect to the network if or when it becomes available. A condition has been included requiring the development to contain the necessary infrastructure to allow connection. The development therefore is designed to allow connection to the network.

Combined Heat and Power (CHP)

- 357 Two energy centres are proposed for the development to provide CHP units, one within the basement of Ludgate A and the other within the basement of Sampson A. It needs to be confirmed that all of the residential and non-residential uses would be connected to the energy centre, this can be required by condition.

- 358 The applicant is proposing to install a 220 kilowatt gas fired CHP unit in Sampson A and a 175 kilowatt gas fired CHP in Ludgate A. The units are sized to provide the domestic hot water load as well as a proportion of the space heating. A reduction in carbon dioxide emissions of 22% would be achieved.

Renewable energy technologies

- 359 The applicant has investigated the feasibility of a range of renewable energy technologies and is proposing to install 250sqm of solar photovoltaic panels across the roof area of the buildings in the development. A further 1% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions would be achieved. The 1% reduction is a considerable way short of the 20% target but it would be very difficult to achieve any more than this given the

savings already secured by energy efficiency and the CHP, and the limited roof areas.

Overall carbon dioxide savings

- 360 An overall saving of 26% in carbon dioxide emissions would be achieved overall, which exceeds the London Plan target of 25%. The overall strategy has maximised the savings as far as possible, and accordingly is considered acceptable.

Code for Sustainable Homes (CfSH) and BREEAM

- 361 The development expects to achieve a code level 4 rating, which meets the minimum standard. A BREEAM 'excellent' is proposed for the non residential development, including the offices, retail units and cultural space, again meeting the minimum . Greywater and rainwater recycling have been incorporated into the design.

Green roofs

- 362 Green roofs have been proposed on the roofs of Ludgate A, Sampson A, Sampson B and Sampson C. The inclusion of these roofs would provide additional biodiversity and sustainability benefits and accordingly are welcomed.

Other matters

- 363 The Twentieth Century Society have objected to the demolition of Sampson House, since they regard it as a non-designated heritage asset. They have commented that there has been no assessment of the heritage merit of Sampson House, and no evidence that alternative uses for the building have been fully explored. An application to list the building was made to English Heritage, however, they rejected the application since it did not meet the stringent criteria for a building of such a recent date (1979). Therefore, a comprehensive assessment of its heritage merit was carried out and it would not be appropriate to object to the demolition of the building.
- 364 The Port of London Authority has requested that a condition be attached requiring the provision of riparian life saving equipment on the River Thames. Aquiva Digital Communications have also requested that a condition be attached requiring the siting of high cranes to be submitted and approved. It is considered that neither of these conditions would meet the required tests for conditions as set out in Circular 11/95 The use of conditions in planning permissions, and accordingly it is recommended that they are not included as conditions on the draft decision notice.
- 365 The GLA, in their stage 1 report (see Appendix 2) requested that an equalities impact assessment should be provided to assess the impact of the loss of the nightclub that operates within the arches. The GLA later confirmed that this assessment would not be required since planning permission for the continued use of the nightclub had already been refused (12/AP/1213).
- 366 The applicant has also submitted an associated listed building consent application for the demolition of three bollards, adjacent boundary walls and steps and associated structures belonging to the Blackfriars and St Paul's railway bridge (ref 13/AP/0392). The application is subject to a separate report on the agenda where it is recommended that, should planning permission be granted for the main development, that listed building consent also be granted for alterations to the listed bridge.

Conclusion on planning issues

- 367 The redevelopment of the site is supported and welcomed in principle. The principle of housing on the site is also accepted, and would be in line with policy aspirations to increase the number of new housing units in the area.

- 368 The reduction of a significant proportion of office floorspace is also considered acceptable, owing to the high quality of the replacement floorspace, the range and type of office buildings that would be provided and the increase in job creation that would result. It is also acknowledged that requiring full replacement of the office floorspace would limit options for providing housing and other uses which are appropriate in the Central Activities Zone.
- 369 The principle of a payment in lieu of on site affordable housing is acceptable in the specific circumstances of this case, and is considered to be the mechanism capable of providing the maximum quantum of affordable housing, of a type and affordability most suited to meet identified housing needs.
- 370 The proposed mix of uses will add to the vibrancy of the area which is complemented by the substantial public realm improvements with the creation of two new east-west routes which will significantly improve permeability and connectivity in the area. The proposal would provide an extensive improvement of the streetscape together with new active frontages which would improve the experience for pedestrians, and provide for natural surveillance.
- 371 The buildings are considered to be of a high quality design and are considered to make a positive contribution to the skyline of London creating distinctive buildings which consolidate the emerging cluster of tall buildings around the Blackfriars Road bridgehead. Having had regard to the LVMF SPG, it is considered that Ludgate B would not cause material harm to any strategic view.
- 372 The loss of the trees, including two trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order, is considered acceptable on account of the improved permeability that would arise, and subject to adequate replacement planting being secured.
- 373 The impacts of the scheme in relation to daylight and sunlight, are on balance considered acceptable, and whilst there would be departures from the BRE guidelines, other factors such as the gaps created through the buildings, views of open spaces and the Central London environment should be given weight.
- 374 It is considered that the quantum of car parking proposed, at 40%, can be satisfactorily mitigated through the securing of a bond, with penalties deducted to be used to deliver sustainable transport mitigation.
- 375 It is therefore recommended that permission be granted, subject to conditions as set out in the attached draft decision notice, completion of a S106 agreement on terms as set out above, and referral to the GLA.

Community impact statement

- 376 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.
- 377 A statement of community involvement has been submitted with the application. The document has set out the pre-application consultation that has been carried out with

neighbouring properties, businesses, members of Southwark Council, key community groups such as the South Bank Employers Group, Hopton's Almhouses residents, Tate Modern, Falcon Point and Bankside Lofts residents, Better Bankside and Bankside Residents Forum. The scheme was also presented informally to members of the planning committee in October 2012.

- 378 In terms of the consultation carried out, two newsletters were distributed to 2,500 homes and businesses in the area informing local people of the proposals and inviting them to exhibitions. The exhibitions were held on 22 May 2012 and 26 September 2012. Meetings took place with the local MP and also key community groups. A consultation website was also set up to provide up to date information on the development and providing individuals with a chance to comment.
- 379 Many of the respondents welcomed the proposal to demolish Sampson House and the provision of new public realm and landscaping. However, there was concern expressed in relation to construction impacts, pressure on car parking, the heights of the buildings and their impact on neighbouring properties.
- 380 The submitted statement has summarised the responses received during consultation and has set out how it has responded to any issues and concerns raised. The revisions made include lowering the heights of the buildings along Hopton Street (Sampson E and F), alterations to the footprints of the buildings to make them more slender and amending the servicing arrangements so that the main access is from Southwark Street rather than Hopton Street.

Consultations

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

Consultation replies

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

Summary of consultation responses:

- 383 26 residents have raised objections on the following grounds:
- The height, scale and density of development is wholly inappropriate and creates an impenetrable wall of buildings
 - Ugly development, dull facade treatments
 - Sampson A should be deleted from the proposals and an open space provided instead
 - Impact on the view of St Paul's Cathedral
 - No on site affordable housing
 - The public spaces are very small
 - Increase in risk of plane/helicopter accidents and risk of terrorist attacks
 - Noise from railway currently shielded by Sampson House
 - Overlooking
 - Sense of enclosure
 - Impact on daylight and sunlight
 - Loss of views
 - Increase in noise and light pollution
 - Impact on wind conditions

- Increase in traffic, especially along Hopton Street
 - Disruption during construction, traffic, noise, dust
 - Do not see need for another cultural attraction
 - Lack of mix of uses, not enough space allocated for cultural use
 - Query whether more office space is needed
 - Flats will be sold to investors who will not occupy them
 - A pedestrian bridge platform should be created across the river using the old station columns/piers
 - Lots of stairs used in the routes and to the riverside path
 - The amount of car parking is excessive
 - The amount of parking is not enough
 - Object to demolition of Sampson House
 - Failures in public consultation – views expressed by residents not carried forward or led to amendments in scheme
 - Lack of contribution to the community – the scheme offers nothing apart from very expensive flats, some offices and some sandwich shops.
- 384 One letter of comment received:
- Sampson A should be removed from the scheme and replaced with a green space
 - Hopton Street should not become a service road and no service vehicles should enter Hopton Street
 - Residential amenity should be protected during construction, and compensation offered for dirt and noise.
- 385 Two letters of support received:
- Welcome removal of Sampson house and Ludgate house
 - Improved east west links and public spaces are commendable
 - The area needs the redevelopment.
- 386 The Greater London Authority have commented on the lack of justification for the non provision of affordable housing. In relation to the impact on strategic views, the GLA have advised that the scheme is on balance acceptable.
- 387 Transport for London have advised that the level of car parking should be reduced and that confirmation of a number of section 106 payments is required.
- 388 CABE (Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment) welcome the new routes but have queried the relationship of Ludgate B and No. 1 Blackfriars.
- 389 The Design Review Panel made comments on an earlier version of the scheme. The key points made related to the uniformity of architectural expression, the relationship with No. 1 Blackfriars, the design of the top of Ludgate B and the need for the public realm to have a clear purpose.
- 390 The City of London (City Surveyor's Department) have objected on the basis that no suitable proposals have so far been put forward for the City's formal consideration, for the future of Rennie Garden. (Note that the City of London Planning Department raised no objections to the application).
- 391 Lambeth Council wish to see on site affordable housing and a reduction in car parking.

- 392 Twentieth Century Society have objected to the demolition of Sampson House.
- 393 English Heritage have objected to the impact on the landscape of St James Park and the impact on the setting of the grade II* listed former County Hall.
- 394 The Royal Parks Agency objects for having an adverse effect on protected views from St James's Park.
- 395 BROAD (Bankside Residents for Appropriate Development) have objected and have requested the removal of Sampson House A, a reduction in the heights of the buildings and also raised concern over the traffic impacts of the scheme.
- 396 A number of other statutory consultees have either made comments or decided not to comment on the proposals.

Re-consultation

- 397 Seven objections received on the following grounds:
- Inappropriate height and design
 - Impacts from construction
 - No plans to re-use redundant piers
 - Sampson House should be re-used
 - Impacts on wind conditions
 - Increase in noise
 - Excessive parking
 - Overlooking
 - Overshadowing
 - Impacts on television/internet reception
- 398 Two letters of support received:
- The development completes the redevelopment of the riverside in this area of London
 - Increase in jobs
 - Increase in retail and leisure floorspace
 - The application will create jobs for local people and increase the retail opportunities for those who live and work in the area
 - The public realm will be significantly enhanced and pedestrian access will be much improved

Human rights implications

- 399 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.
- 400 This application has the legitimate aim of providing a new mixed development including the provision of new housing, offices, retail and cultural uses. 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

401 None.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Site history file: TP/1519-J & 1390-245 Application file: 12/AP/3940 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 5513 Council website: www.southwark.gov.uk

APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	Consultation undertaken
Appendix 2	Consultation responses received
Appendix 3	Environmental Impact Assessment
Appendix 4	Neighbour consultee map
Appendix 5	Images
Appendix 6	Recommendation

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Simon Bevan, Director of Planning	
Report Author	Kiran Chauhan, Team Leader Strategic Applications Team	
Version	Final	
Dated	26 September 2013	
Key Decision	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments sought	Comments included
Strategic director, finance & corporate services	No	No
Strategic director, environment and leisure	No	No
Strategic director, housing and community services	No	No
Director of regeneration	No	No
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team		27 September 2013

Consultation undertaken

Site notice date: 17/01/2013

Press notice date: 17/01/2013 & 20/06/2013

Case officer site visit date: Most recent on 31/07/2013

Neighbour consultation letters sent: 09/01/2013 & 18/06/2013

Internal services consulted:

Archaeology Officer
Environmental Protection Team
Public Realm
Planning Policy
Transport Planning Team
Design Review Panel
Urban Forester
Ecology
Housing Regeneration Initiatives
Economic Development

The scheme was also presented to the following members in October 2012: Councillors Nick Dolezal, Adele Morris, Geoffrey Thornton and Darren Merrill.

Statutory and non-statutory organisations consulted:

Transport for London
Metropolitan Police
Environment Agency
London Fire & Emergency Planning
Thames Water
EDF Energy
Department for Communities and Local Government
Greater London Authority
London Borough of Westminster
London Borough of Lambeth
London Borough of Camden
London Borough of Islington
London Borough of Greenwich
London Borough of Lewisham
London Borough of Tower Hamlets
London Borough of Haringey
City of London
Arqiva Digital Telecommunications
BAA Safeguarding Team
English Heritage
Royal Parks
Natural England
Twentieth Century Society
Historic Royal Palaces
Civil Aviation Authority

Countryside Commission
CABE (Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment)
Port of London Authority
Network Rail
Southwark NHS

Neighbours and local groups consulted:

Bankside Residents Forum
Southwark Cyclists
Southbank Employers Group
Coin Street Community Builders
Waterloo Community Development Group
Team London Bridge
Falcon Point Tenants and Residents Association
Cathedrals Residents Forum
Conservation Area Advisory Committee

See also neighbour consultee map at appendix 4

Re-consultation:

All statutory and non statutory organisations, neighbours, local groups and internal consultees were consulted on the revised plans.

Consultation responses

Internal services

Ecology:

- The bat assessment and ecological extended Phase 1 habitat survey are considered acceptable. Unless the site remains undeveloped for a period of over a year, no further surveys are required.
- Ecological enhancement measures welcomed. At least 30% of the planting in the new open spaces should use native species.

Southwark Public Health:

- There appear to be many positive and well thought out features to this development and the desktop health impact assessment is helpful in picking up the key issues.

Environmental Protection:

- Air quality: The air quality assessment and report addresses the development of new homes and exposure in the air quality management and refers to need for mechanical ventilation. It is noted that the development is to be served by Combined Heat and Power (CHP) and gas boilers. Details will be required of these CHP flues. Details also be required of the means of ventilating the underground park and the relationship of any extracts to fresh air intakes / openable windows on residential or office accommodation.
- Noise and vibration: Concern that some residential accommodation will suffer noise and vibration owing to the railway line.
- Land contamination: All issues have been satisfactorily considered. Conditions recommended.
- Lighting: Some properties in Hopton Street may suffer from light pollution, Recommended that internal blinds are installed as mitigation.
- Construction: Issues which should be discussed and included in the final construction plan include details of the height and acoustic insulation of the site hoarding to the east boundary, proposed location and potential for acoustic enclosure of the on site concrete crusher for the demolition and phase, average and Maximum acceptable boundary noise levels and monitoring regime for noise / vibration and dust.

Planning Policy:

- Loss of offices: The Planning Statement provides some explanation of the loss of floorspace, stating that the refurbishment of Sampson House would not be viable.
- Cultural space: The cultural spaces are supported, but query whether the applicant has had any meaningful discussions with organisations about whether there is any real genuine interest expressed in locating here.
- Retail floorspace: The quantum seems appropriate, given that the site is in a district town centre location and we not have a target of retail floorspace in this area. Need to ensure that there is a genuine mix of uses; there should not be a predominance of one type of use.

Urban Forester:

- The proposal includes residential gardens and pocket spaces include seating, lawns and other planting consisting of hedging, flowering perennials and trees.
- A water feature and art work are proposed to animate and provide interest to landscaped areas in front of the residential entrance to blocks.
- The different zones combine to form a green ribbon connecting and offering routes through the railway arches, into the central square, raised gardens and the wider network of spaces including the river walk and proposed adjacent Bankside Urban Forest projects.
- The proposed development requires the removal of six trees T1 - T4, T16 and T17.
- Trees 16 and 17 have high amenity value and are protected by a TPO. These will unavoidably be lost due to the re-grading of the steps. Other trees within the TPO group are retained, as are 11 other good quality mature specimens within the development. Any new planting should be conditioned such that suitable soil volume and tree pit design is provided to ensure maturity of landscape. Overall, the quality and quantity of trees removed is comfortably mitigated by proposed new planting throughout the site.
- Greater detail is also necessary at Invicta Plaza where four street trees are proposed as a key feature on the corner of Southwark Street and Blackfriars Bridge Road. Here, the trees will need to be set back a sufficient distance to avoid conflicting with the adjacent building. A more detailed cross section is needed at Central Square to show how sunken water features and large rootballs can be installed.
- The proposed species palette offers a well specified response to the scale of the development and desired seasonal and aesthetic qualities. Larger longer lived species such as Planes and Oak are joined with smaller species of more ornamental interest such as Pear and Birch.
- Due to the number, quality and protected status of retained trees a condition is needed to ensure these are not damaged during demolition and construction. This needs to specifically include recommendations within the submitted arboricultural report together with site supervision.

Archaeology:

- Sampson and Ludgate House are located within the Borough, Bermondsey and Rivers Archaeological Priority Zone. The applicants have submitted a desk-based assessment as part of their environmental impact assessment.
- Sampson House is assumed to include the site of the Swan Theatre. This theatre is shown on Aldwell's map of 1627 covering Paris Gardens Manor. This locates the theatre to the west of Green Walk (future Hopton Street), south of Upper Ground, and, south of the link to the Paris Garden's Manor House. From examining later maps this link to the manor house remains as a continuation of Holland Street until the construction of Samson House over this link. Aldwell's map, whilst schematic in its representation of buildings, similar in the disposition of streets with other, later maps, for example the location of Paris Garden Stairs is to the north of Green Walk, therefore the location can be considered to be relatively secure for the theatre.
- Sampson House has two levels of basement that cumulatively, together with foundations, will have severely impacted upon buried archaeological remains on site. Levels of the upper basement are included in the desk-based assessment and these are shown to be set well below OS datum. The second, lower basement level reduces potential in this part of the site to an entire storey further below. There is very little chance of any archaeological survival on the site of Samson House.

- Proposals for Ludgate House have a greater potential to impact upon buried archaeological remains, however these are also likely to have been severely impacted by modern developments. Views of the former Blackfriars goods station indicate levels well below the track bed for moving good around the station, however this area of the site has preserved an archaeological potential.
- Proposals to construct a link between the two basement areas, under the viaduct, will also have an impact upon buried archaeological remains. Any archaeology in this area will already have been significantly impacted by the construction of the viaduct, however, strips may well remain between structural elements.
- For the area of Ludgate House it is recommended that any site investigation works are archaeologically monitored to inform future archaeological proposals. Following the demolition of the building it will be necessary to undertake an archaeological evaluation of the site. The purpose of this evaluation will be to design future archaeological mitigation measures for the construction works. Mitigation may range from a watching brief over areas of significance or potential to the full excavation of the entire area.
- For the tunnel connecting the two basements it is highly likely that any construction work within the viaduct will be preceded by an examination of the foundations and structure of the viaduct. Any investigative ground works in this area will require archaeological monitoring. This should provide information to design suitable archaeological mitigation measures for works in this area.
- Conditions are recommended.

Transport Group:

- Trip Generation: For the purposes of this exercise the trip generation is acceptable.
- Car Parking: The Southwark Plan requires that residential development in this location is car-free (aside from disabled parking places and car-club parking places). The proposed provision of a large number of car parking is clearly contrary to policy. If car parking is to be included, mitigation should be put in place such as seeking funding for off-site sustainable travel initiatives to reduce background traffic in order to mitigate the additional car trips that the development will impose upon the network. An equitable way of securing this funding is to charge users (other than disabled drivers) for each journey made, recorded as each entry or exit from the car park, and this also provides a small disincentive to car use to meet the aims of the council's car-free policy.
- Public Realm: The proposed site layout will improve pedestrian routes in the area, in particular providing east-west routes in the area between Southwark Street and the river walk. A "Legible London" wayfinding strategy is proposed, which is welcomed. The proposed inclusion of public toilets is welcomed. The proposed provision of lifts to address larger level differences is welcomed. However, the introduction of steps for smaller level differences should be avoided where possible, and generous ramps provided for wheelchair users where it cannot. While it is the council's normal approach to seek the adoption of routes that will be used as public highway, including pedestrian and cyclist routes, in this case the proposal to maintain them as private land is acceptable subject to the safeguarding of access. Hopton Street should be maintained with two-way traffic. This will require some minor changes to the proposed layout.
- Servicing and Waste Management: A draft Deliveries & Servicing Plan has been provided, though this is little more than heads-of-terms for a full DSP which should be secured by condition or obligation. In particular it gives very little detail on the potential measures to manage and reduce the number of servicing trips.

It must include provision for concierge staff to refuse deliveries at ground floor level, directing delivery staff to the service yards instead.

- Construction: A draft Construction Logistics Plan has been provided, though this is little more than heads-of-terms for a full Construction Environmental Management Plan which should be secured by condition or obligation. This should specifically require measures to mitigate the increased risk to pedestrians and cyclists arising from construction vehicle operation, through provision of equipment on vehicles, driver training, licence checks, etc. following best practice established by the CrossRail project.
- Cycle Parking: All cycle parking should be provided through the use of Sheffield stands to spacing and dimensions set out in best practice guidance. The proposed departure from this requirement to provide stands that are accessible to all (i.e. regardless of physical strength, dexterity and mobility, and suitable for all styles of cycle) has not been justified. A robust justification should be provided. However, the proposed mix of stands with a good proportion of Sheffield stands (53%) is positive, though this good proportion should be provided at each cycle parking store. Some plans of cycle stores show that certain stands will be inaccessible or very inconvenient to use. Much of the cycle parking is along long corridors, some requiring turns and door opening. For convenience cyclists should be able to cycle to a point very close to the point at which they will park their bike. These cycle stores should similarly be conveniently accessed from the buildings' cores. It is believed that there is ample opportunity to reconfigure spaces to enable the cycle stores to meet these criteria.
- Cycle Hire: The relocation of the existing cycle hire docking station to a nearby location on Southwark Street is supported. Provision to enhance the cycle hire scheme is supported.
- Car Club: Commitment to providing free membership of the car club to all appropriate residents is welcomed, but confirmation should be given that this will be for a minimum of three years. Space has been identified on Hopton Street for two car club vehicles, which is acceptable.
- Travel Plan: The travel plans are largely acceptable however certain aspects of the travel plans need to be clarified.

Statutory and non-statutory organisations

Greater London Authority: The Mayor considers that the application generally complies with the London Plan subject to the following issues being addressed:

- Consideration should be given to the provision of additional benefit in the form of an open space or other use on the redundant pillars on the Thames.
- The increase in jobs from 2,188 full time jobs to 3,649 full time jobs, representing an increase of 1,461 jobs. The increase in jobs is welcomed. The new office space would be flexible to adapt to changing future requirements.
- An equalities impact assessment should be provided to assess the impact of the loss of the gay nightclub that operates within the arches. Subject to this assessment, the mix of uses, including the cultural uses, is welcomed.
- The applicant is proposing to adopt a similar approach to that on nearby sites and proposes to deliver off-site affordable housing. London Plan 2011 paragraph 3.74 sets out that affordable housing provision is normally required on-site. In exceptional circumstances, it may be provided off site through a cash in lieu contribution ringfenced, and if appropriate polled, to secure efficient delivery of new affordable housing on identified sites elsewhere. In this instance it is considered that there is no justification for the non provision of on-site affordable housing and this will need to be the subject to further discussion prior

to the application being referred back to the GLA.

- The proposals provide a range of large scale and tall buildings up to 49 storeys. The cluster of tall and large buildings at Blackfriars Road north is beginning to establish itself with Kings Reach tower, Sea Containers House, 231-241 Blackfriars Road and also 1 Blackfriars Road. Having regard to London Plan policy which supports a plan led approach to tall and large scale buildings in Opportunity Areas and both the Core Strategy Policy 12 and emerging policy in the form of the draft Borough, Bankside and London bridge SPD (2010), as well as the existing physical circumstances on the site and surrounding the site, the principle of a tall building is accepted subject to detailed tests of impact on townscape, heritage (including the World heritage Site) and strategic views.
- The heritage analysis illustrates that whilst the buildings will be visible from many of the surrounding conservation areas and listed buildings, in most cases, it will be viewed as a high quality development. Generally it is the tallest tower (Ludgate B) that is the most visible, particularly in the strategic and river prospect views. The views testing confirms that it would not be visible above the parapet from the courtyard of Somerset House, or from the inner courtyard at the Tower of London. The proposal would be partially visible in the context of Westminster World Heritage Site, but the analysis of the impact is generally accepted. Whilst the tallest tower would be visible in the setting of both world heritage sites at the Tower of London and Westminster, the outstanding universal value would be preserved.
- In terms of the townscape views defined in the LVMF, the specific case of the view from St James's Park footbridge to Horse Guards Road requires some detailed analysis. The implemented planning permission for Kings Reach, 1 Blackfriars and Doon Street are material considerations in the assessment of the case and since the grant of permission for these schemes, there has been a significant change in the interpretation and management guidance. Like the implemented permissions, the building would be visible in both summer and winter above Duck Island. There remains however particular circumstances which result in this proposal being largely obscured from view from the assessment point itself. The construction of 1 Blackfriars Road would largely obscure the proposal from the view, and similarly, the Doon Street tower would also obscure both 1 Blackfriars and the proposal from the view point. In the circumstances therefore the impact is mitigated by the emerging scheme at 1 Blackfriars and it would be difficult to substantiate an objection on that basis.
- The new east-west routes and the north-south spine is highly successful in establishing new routes and opportunities for a range of unique spaces. Some consideration is needed regarding level changes to the south west corner of the site from street level and internally to Ludgate C. The north south route should be carefully controlled and a lighting and management strategy would need to be agreed.
- In relation to residential layouts, some of the studio and 1 bed units do not meet the minimum space standards. Subject to this issue being addressed, the general approach to design quality is high, with intimate cores and balcony and winter garden space. Communal garden space is provided but two blocks, Ludgate A and Sampson A do not have any communal or play space provision. A strategy for access to the larger space on the Sampson side is therefore required.
- The public realm improvements are substantial. The area around Blackfriars Station may benefit from revisiting with Network Rail.
- The mix of architectural styles across the towers and blocks uses a palette of materials and forms to create a common language that works well in the context

of the existing structures on the Southbank.

- The new passenger lift and the new wider accessible staircase beside Blackfriars Bridge is welcomed, but only one lift is provided and a second one should be introduced to cope with expected and future capacity. Step free access to the upper level of the cultural facility within Ludgate A should be provided, so that the public do not need to use the cafe.
- Carbon dioxide savings exceed the targets set within the London Plan.
- The flood risk assessment identifies that run-off from the development will be reduced by less than 10% compared with the current development. This approach falls below the level required by the Mayor's Sustainable Design and Construction SPG. This is particularly concerning as there are areas at risk from surface water flooding in the surrounding locality.
- More information on noise is required in relation to units facing the railway lines.
- Further consideration must be given to the provision of additional public benefits in the form of an open space or other use on the redundant pillars on the Thames.

Transport for London:

- For the car parking element, 196 car parking spaces are proposed, at a ratio of 0.4 spaces per home. TfL request this is reduced.
- The principle of a left in/left out access to the site from Blackfriars Road is acceptable subject to a road safety audit. The Southwark Street access are also acceptable in principle subject to a road safety audit.
- A financial payment to the Blackfriars Road Urban Realm Improvement Scheme is required.
- The relocation of a coach bay on Southwark Street, 50m to the east, is acceptable in principle. The relocation of the RV1 bus stop on Southwark Street is also acceptable.
- The removal and relocation of the existing Poured Lines Cycle Hire Docking Station is required – with the new location on Hopton Street. An additional 15 cycle hire docking points would be required to meet the additional demand generated by the site and accordingly £60,000 contribution is required to secure the additional capacity.
- The provision of a taxi pick up/drop off facility on both Blackfriars Road and Hopton Street is welcomed. The Hopton Street facility is within the carriage-way and therefore further information regarding the capacity of this facility and parking controls in place to ensure access for taxis can be maintained at all times.
- The closure of the eastern footway on Blackfriars Road during construction is a concern and alternative solutions should be explored.
- In relation to servicing, the majority of servicing trips should take place outside peak times.

CABE (Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment): An earlier version of the scheme was presented to CABE on 30 May 2012. The following comments were made:

- Diagram and site layout: Welcome the provision of new routes through the site. Query the southern east-west route which appears constrained and perhaps the rigorous geometry should be relaxed to offer a diagonal connection to the river.
- Public space: The landscape analysis is promising. Question the main square adjacent to the train station; this is north facing and would be affected by train noise. Also suggest exploring whether a direct route from the square to the river

could be opened up. The residents garden is awkwardly positioned in between the tall buildings and likely to be overshadowed for most of the day. Appropriate wind tests need to be carried out.

- Massing and architecture: The principal tall building (Ludgate B) is appropriate but with No. 1 Blackfriars opposite creates unfortunate competition between the two. A more dynamic relationship between the two buildings needs to be created. The composition of other buildings appears confused and needs further refinement to fit into the context. Urge the team to reassess the character of the local streets, the impact of the railway arches and what makes the special identity of this part of London. The design team, should consider the small block in the riverfront and perhaps remove it and create a larger space in front of the tower. The large office block (Ludgate C) is likely to create an overbearing canyon effect along Blackfriars Road and would benefit from redistributing the massing, simplifying the building heights and potentially reassessing the size and scale of the development.
- A place to live: The design team should ensure that the organisation and articulation of the blocks would generate good housing quality, dual aspect flats and appropriate amenity space.

Design Review Panel: The current scheme was presented to the Design Review Panel on 12th March 2013. The following comments were made:

- Welcomed this substantial development and acknowledge that this is an appropriate location for tall buildings in Southwark, but raise raised questions over the quality and character of the public realm, the scale, articulation, and relationship of the individual towers and the character of the architecture proposed.
- The first question raised by the Panel related to the character and quality of the public realm. Whilst the improved permeability was welcomed, the proposed public realm lacked ambition and had a neutral character without a clear sense of purpose. The current proposal treats each of these spaces uniformly and fails to respond to the unique role that each space has to play in its context and respond to the ambitions for the site. For example they questioned why the tallest building did not have a direct relationship with the main public space. They asked the designers to draw from the rich heritage of this part of Bankside to give each public space and route its own purpose and character.
- The Panel questioned the scale and architectural expression of the Ludgate B tower. They felt a question remained over the relationship of this building with the 1 Blackfriars Road tower across the road. Both have a role to play in the 'emerging' cluster around the southern bridgehead however, by aligning these two towers across the road and by matching their heights exactly, the designers have equated the two towers deliberately. They challenged the architects to make adjustments to the height and location of the tower in order to give each of these significant landmark buildings its unique role in the cluster.
- The Panel questioned the overall disposition of the massing of the cluster, the uniformity of architectural expression across the site, and the commonality of materials and designs used across the development. Whilst they acknowledged the benefit of improved permeability across the railway line they felt the cluster was rather static and lacked any dynamic, and that the commonality of expression across the two sites did not reflect the varying urban grain and distinctive character of these two parts of Bankside. The proposal to site nine new buildings on these two unique sites presented the tremendous opportunity to give each building its own character and the designer/s a chance to better reveal the different urban characters that can be found on either side of the railway line.

- Finally, they questioned the ‘top hat’ feature at the crown of the Ludgate B tower. They felt the rectilinear character and solid appearance of this feature did not compliment the recessive nature and sculptural qualities of the 1 Blackfriars Road top and as a result it appeared taller and more strident than its distinctive neighbour in some views. The top of any tower is its most prominent feature and normally plays a very important role in the London skyline. The current design is for a simple stone capping which encloses the plan room. The Panel felt the current design for the top was poorly resolved and did not distinguish the tower sufficiently in the London Skyline.
- In conclusion, the Panel welcomed the redevelopment of these two sites and acknowledged the substantial benefit that the improved permeability would bring to this important part of Southwark. However they raised significant questions over the quality and purpose of the public realm, the height and top of Ludgate B and the uniformity of scale and architectural expression across the site.

Heathrow Airport Limited: Confirm that there are no safeguarding objections to the proposed development.

Port of London Authority (PLA): No objection to the proposed development but following comments are made.

- Given the location of the development a condition should be placed on any grant of planning permission requiring the submission and approval of a scheme to maximise the use of the river for the transport of construction materials to and waste materials from the site. The use of the River in this way would accord with London Plan policy which seeks for development proposals close to navigable waterways to maximize water transport for bulk materials, particularly during demolition and construction phases.
- The PLA is pleased to see that the framework travel plans have considered the location and use of Blackfriars Pier and has set targets which seek increased use of the river for the transport of passengers from year 1 to year 5. Measures should be put in place to promote river use, such as the provision of a free seven day pass and river guide. Such an approach would accord with planning policy which seeks to increase the use of the Blue Ribbon Network for passenger and tourist services.
- Given the proximity of the development to the River, the PLA would wish to see a condition imposed on any grant of planning permission requiring submission and approval of all external lighting to ensure that it is not a hazard to navigation and that it would not have a detrimental impact on river ecology.
- Finally the PLA would recommend that if it is not already at the site that a condition is imposed on any grant of planning permission requiring the provision of riparian life saving equipment (such as grab chains, access ladders and life buoys) to a standard recommended in the 1991 Hayes Report on the Inquiry into River Safety.

Thames Water: Comments made.

- Thames Water has been unable to determine the waste water infrastructure needs of this application. Should the Local Planning Authority look to approve the application ahead of further information being provided, it is requested that a condition be applied to request further details.
- The existing water supply infrastructure has insufficient capacity to meet the additional demands for the proposed development. Thames Water therefore recommend the a condition be imposed to request impact studies of the existing water supply. The studies should determine the magnitude of any new

- additional capacity required in the system and a suitable connection point.
- A condition should also be attached requiring further details of piling.

Natural England: Comments made.

- The proposal does not appear to affect any statutorily protected sites or landscapes, or have significant impacts on the conservation of soils. The proposed development is in an area that Natural England considers could benefit from enhanced green infrastructure provision. Multi-functional green infrastructure can perform a range of functions including improved flood risk management, provision of accessible green space, climate change adaptation and biodiversity enhancement.
- The protected species survey has identified that bats, a European protected species may be affected by the application. In this regard, please refer to our standing advice. Please use the standing advice to assess the impact on the following species: badgers, barn owls, breeding birds, water voles, widespread reptiles or white-clawed crayfish.
- Natural England notes that this proposal falls within the following World Heritage Sites: The Tower of London and The Palace of Westminster, Westminster Abbey and St Margaret's Church; therefore we advise that a Landscape and Visual Assessment (LVIA) is carried out to ensure no detrimental impact on these sites.
- The Thames Path National Trail is not allowed any closures during or after the works. However, temporary variations are allowed if agreed in advance with the council and there is suitable signage provided during the duration of the works.

Environment Agency: No objection.

- No objection to the proposal subject to the attachment of conditions in relation to contamination and the request for the submission of a surface water drainage scheme.
- The Environment Agency also advise that the scheme should incorporate ecological benefits, such as green walls/roofs, soft landscaping and bat and bird boxes.

Twentieth Century Society: Object to demolition of Sampson House.

- Sampson House is regarded as a non designated heritage asset. No significant assessment has been submitted of the heritage merit of Sampson House, and no evidence that alternative uses for the building have been fully explored.

Westminster City Council: No comment.

- Does not wish to comment on the proposals. An objection would have been lodged had permission not been granted for the towers at Doon Street and 1 Blackfriars Road.

Camden Council: No objection.

Islington Council: No comment.

City of London (Planning Department):

- The proposed scheme would not have a detrimental impact on the City of London and therefore have no observations.

City of London (City Surveyor's Department): Recommend refusal.

- The proposed scheme at Blackfriars Road encompasses the City's Rennie Garden which it maintains as a garden and public open space on the southern

approach to Blackfriars Bridge. It is of fundamental concern to the City to protect all of its public open spaces and to preserve them for public benefit.

- The development proposals appear to include wholesale adaptation to Rennie Garden and the City's open space, the removal of significant and mature plane trees from the garden which have considerable landscape and amenity value, removal of a low level highway wall which is in keeping with the style and character of the City's adjoining Grade II Listed Blackfriars Bridge, and the introduction of lifts and other hard landscaping features onto City property to which the City has not consented. The proposed works would therefore have a significant impact upon the amenity of the open space.
- It is understood and appreciated that one of the aims of the scheme's external works is to enhance public access to the walkway alongside of the southern embankment of the river and to enhance the riverside amenity, which in principle the City would not wish to frustrate.
- However, no suitable proposals have so far been put forward for the City's formal consideration, addressing its concerns for the future of Rennie Garden and the public open space, nor the on-going maintenance and management of the garden and use of the area and the protection of the area.
- Therefore at this stage the City is opposed to the intended redesign of its garden and structures, which is seemingly integral to the proposed external works, in which case the City is opposed to the external works in their present form and as submitted for consent, and requests refusal.

Royal Borough of Greenwich: No objection.

Lambeth Council: The London Borough of Lambeth does not wish to raise objection to the proposal, but makes the following comments:

- Unless exceptional circumstances justify otherwise, Lambeth would wish to see an on-site provision of affordable housing so as to promote a mixed and balanced community in this location;
- So as to reduce dependence on the private car and in light of existing local congestion during peak periods, Lambeth would wish to see the on-site parking provision reduced (as far as is practicable) unless exceptional circumstances justify otherwise; and
- Lambeth requests that Southwark satisfies itself that the retail offer would appropriately reflect current development plan policy and promote mixed and balanced communities. It would be unfortunate if that offer was skewed towards food and drink uses at the expense of a meaningful A1 (shops)/A2 (financial and professional services) provision that would be of benefit to the wider community.

English Heritage: Raise significant concerns.

- The existing buildings at the Sampson House/Ludgate House redevelopment site are of limited historic or architectural interest and therefore English Heritage welcomes the principle of demolition and redevelopment.
- The height of the very tall building (169m) means that it would have a significant impact on London's historic environment including on the setting of highly graded assets in Whitehall Conservation Area when viewed from the bridge in the grade I registered landscape of St James Park – it would rise above the Duck Island tree line. The view from the Blue Bridge is of extraordinary quality. The scale and style of the buildings in the background have fortuitously added to the intended romantic landscape architecture of the park. The proposed development would be of a scale, mass and form that has the potential to detract from, rather than add to, the picturesque qualities of the view. Acknowledge that

the current building would be obscured by the previously consented towers at 1 Blackfriars and Doon Street if they are constructed. However, we raised significant concerns about the impact of these buildings at the time they were proposed. Should either of the schemes not proceed or be significantly amended to reduce the harm they cause, this proposal would become more prominent and therefore more harmful.

- The tall building would also have an impact on the setting of the grade II* listed former County Hall, which is a significant component of the protected LVMF view (18B.1) from Westminster Bridge by appearing above the horizontal roofline of the grade II* listed former County Hall. This building is an architecturally impressive composition. The visual intrusion of such a tall building diminishes the visual prominence of the former County Hall, causing harm to its setting and the contribution it makes to the river view from the bridge.
- The public benefits offered by the wider development scheme, including substantial business and residential capacity and the potential for improved public realm and townscape are acknowledged. However, whether the harm caused by the very tall element of the proposals is necessary to deliver those benefits is not clear.

Royal Parks: The Royal Parks Agency objects to this planning application.

- The proposals do not appear to be in keeping with the Mayors London Plan 2011 concerning Open Spaces, with the height having an adverse effect on protected views from St James's Park.
- All Royal Parks are a safe haven from the hectic urban sprawl, and any form of high rise building that can be seen from the Parks would diminish the ability for London's citizens to place themselves in a calming environment.

Arqiva Digital Communications: Comment.

- In examining this proposal, the final form of development should not adversely affect any of our signals. However, Arqiva does have a link between Croydon and Alexander Palace which traverses approximately 300m west of Blackfriars Road.
- The development proposed is east of Blackfriars Road and it is possible that during the construction phase large cranes positioned around the site that could block this link, which is between two major broadcast installations. If this link were broken, there could be a major impact on broadcast television services in the London area.
- In the circumstances we request that if planning permission is granted it be subject to a condition requiring the council's approval (in consultation with Arqiva) to the siting of any high cranes required for the construction of the building proposed. In making this request, I draw your attention to paragraph 44 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

London City Airport: No safeguarding objection to the proposed development, however make the following comments from a safety perspective:

- All landscaping plans and all plantations should be considered in view of making them unattractive to birds so as not to have an adverse effect on the safety of operations at the Airport by encouraging bird feeding/roosting and thereby presenting a bird strike threat to aircraft operating at the airport. Expert advice should be sought on trees and shrubs that discourage bird activity as described above.
- Also in the interests of reducing the potential for bird strike hazards at the airport, the following waste management measures should be considered:

- i) Details regarding refuse/recycling facilities to ensure that these do not provide a source of food for wildlife
- ii) Provision for the proper disposal of food wrappers and other rubbish at the site to be provided to prevent the attraction of birds.

Network Rail: Support the application.

- Network Rail have been in discussions with the applicant and their design team since late 2011. In summary, Network Rail has no objection in principle to the proposed buildings, subject to review and approval of detailed design information.
- Furthermore, Network Rail is excited about the opportunities that the redevelopment provides for improvements to the public realm and retail facilities in and around the viaduct arches. The scheme also offers welcome improvements to the accessibility of the new Blackfriars Station entrance on the South Bank.

London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority:

- A full building consultation will take place once a formal building consent application is received.

Local groups

BROAD (Bankside Residents for Appropriate Development). Object to the proposal and have the following concerns:

- The Environmental Impact Assessment may establish acceptability at a technical level, but recent developments have undoubtedly made living in the area noisier, windier and lighter at night. As part of the planning condition, acoustic, light levels and wind level measurements before and after should be taken to establish the true effect of the proposed new development. The environmental quality of the area should be enhanced and improved, not made worse by any new buildings.
- The proposed Sampson House Building A should be omitted completely. In its place we propose that a continuous linear park is created between Blackfriars Bridge, Falcon Point Piazza and the Tate Modern.
- The proposed redevelopment should be no higher or nearer than the current building to the existing buildings on Hopton Street or Falcon Point. Perhaps Sampson House Building B, C or Ludgate House Building B could increase slightly in height to Blackfriars Bridge Road to offset the loss of floor area if required.
- With one of the world's most important museums on our doorstep we do not see the need for another "cultural attraction" in the area, or are convinced by the developers assertion that this is desired by the local community.
- The final scheme should result in less traffic movement on Hopton Street. Access should therefore be from the south or west of the site and not from Hopton Street, including those for residential parking spaces. We do not understand the developer's assertion how a new 144,571 m² development will only result in "slight" increase in traffic movement in Hopton Street.
- As a general point, many of us who live in the area have been subjected to nearly constant building work over the past fifteen years. This will be yet another hugely disruptive and noisy construction period.

Conservation Area Advisory Committee: Comment.

- The proposal should investigate the possibility of a shared surface on Hopton

Street.

- The existing bridge piers should be retained but Ludgate 'A' tower could block off this possibility as it sits near, and directly on axis, with the old bridge piers. If Ludgate 'A' cannot be moved or adjusted, at very least the space below this tower should be opened up to create a 'bridgehead' for the potential re-use of these old piers. This could be a new 'inhabited bridge' for London one day, helping further connect Southwark with the City of London.

Better Bankside: Welcome principle of development, but provide comments.

- The scheme should encourage greater north/south movement away from the river. The aspiration is to spread the benefits of regeneration away from the riverside.
- The proposals turn their back on Southwark Street; the lack of active frontage is disappointing. It is also disappointing that the main servicing for the development is undertaken from Southwark Street.
- Greater clarity is required regarding the new open space to be created, the area of space that would be public and the area of hard and soft landscaping. There should also be a consideration of the sustainability benefits of the spaces i.e. are there any permeable surfaces?
- The emerging Bankside Neighbourhood Plan has identified the ghost bridge by between Blackfriars Road and rail bridges as having potential to accommodate a linear park. Suggest there is an opportunity to amend the design of the cultural building that fronts the river, to enable this park to extend into the site into the future.
- Empty retail units should be avoided since they have a negative impact on the public realm. A planning condition should secure an interim use for any empty units.
- More clarity on the retail strategy is required – how has this informed the design of the retail floor-plates in the different buildings?
- The forecast mode shares and net trip generation data, being between five and seven years old is outdated. Data available to Better Bankside or collected by us suggest higher levels of cycling and walking. The target figures for cycling are accordingly very low.
- The cycle parking provision may be adequate for 2013 but inadequate given the trend towards greater cycling in the future. An increase in cycle parking needs to be planned for.
- Allocation of spaces for retail, cultural and gym uses is low. Would welcome cycle parking solutions that offer a higher specification than Sheffield stands.
- The provision of residential car parking is excessive and at odds with the London Plan and Southwark Plan.
- A condition should be added to maximise the use of the river for the transport of construction and waste materials.
- Where construction traffic is road-borne, welcome the opportunity to comment on the choice of construction routes. In particular, routes with high levels of footfall from residents and employees alike excluded and should avoid peak times.
- Encourage the use of specific contract clauses to ensure all HGN drivers have received cycle awareness training, including an on-road element.

Trustees of the Tate Gallery: Tate is generally supportive of the proposal, but make the following comments:

- Tate is keen to get involved in discussions to find a suitable occupier for the cultural space in Ludgate A to ensure it complements the existing offer.

- Support the design approach to each building but considers there is more opportunity to differentiate the design.
- The tallest building, Ludgate B needs to be of exemplary design quality.
- The scheme inadequately addresses the Southwark Street frontage, and consider there are opportunities to articulate the facades.
- The public realm in and around the site should be fully made available for public use.
- The north south route through to Southwark Street is narrow and secluded and does not adequately connect to Southwark Street and that there are further opportunities to improve linkages south into the borough.
- There is an opportunity to incorporate public art into the development. Better Bankside is preparing a Public Artwork Strategy and the developers are encouraged to become involved in this project.
- The new retail uses and active frontages are welcomed, however the proliferation of a single retail use would be considered unacceptable.

Neighbours

26 objections have been received.

Sumner buildings (first line of address not provided):

- Main objection is there is no affordable housing in the development and no alternative site identified. The amount of commuted sum payment is negotiated behind closed doors.
- There is no justification for the 200 car parking spaces.
- Lack of mix of uses.
- Overdevelopment of the site.
- Lack of contribution to the local area.
- Inappropriate height and massing.
- Poor design.
- Impact on the view of St Paul's Cathedral.

Flat 8, Falcon Point:

- Sampson House should be saved as it is an interesting building.
- Concern over increase in noise.
- The sheer height of the buildings is unpleasant.
- Sampson A does not fit in at all.
- The parking is insufficient.
- Impact on wind conditions.
- The opening of railway arches is welcomed.

Apartment 7, Horseshoe Wharf, 6 Clink Street:

- In view of the council's tall building policy, there appear to be only limited grounds for objection.
- The east west links and public spaces are commendable.
- The aim of locating tall buildings near main line stations was intended to reduce commuting times, but many of the buildings are residential rather than commercial, defeating this aim.
- There is an opportunity to create a pedestrian bridge platform across the river using the old columns to support a deck.
- The width and number of stairs to the River Walk are disproportionate to the importance and attractiveness of the space.
- The Southwark Street elevation is disappointing and is treated as a service frontage.

- The amount of car parking is excessive.

606 Bankside Lofts, 65 Hopton Street:

- Concern over increase in traffic on Hopton Street and Holland Street.
- If Hopton Street access is maintained then there should be a time limit imposed on its use in the evening, suggest 8pm. It should be made clear that it is a subsidiary entrance.
- Construction traffic should not use Hopton or Holland Street.

406 Bankside Lofts, 65 Hopton Street:

- The design quality and height of Sampson A is poor, out of keeping with surrounding buildings. The footprint of the building should also be reduced, or it should be deleted from the plans entirely to provide more open space.
- The new buildings on Hopton Street (including their balconies) should at the very least be no nearer (or higher) than the current building to either Bankside Lofts or Falcon Point.
- Welcome the positions of the servicing and car parking accesses.

3 Falcon Point, Hopton Street:

- Concern over noise and vibration caused from demolition and construction.
- Loss of daylight and privacy.
- Increase in traffic.

Bankside Lofts, Hopton Street (flat number not provided):

- There is no information showing what the roofs of Sampson E and Sampson F would look like. The roofs are the fifth elevation of the development and are important.
- The application does not detail the type of plant or equipment to be located on the roofs of Sampson E and Sampson F, therefore it is unclear whether it would disrupt the right to quiet enjoyment of our flat.
- Whilst servicing is proposed from Southwark Street, many deliveries will come to Hopton Street. There are no measures in place to ensure that this type of nuisance will not occur.
- Plans for any widening of pavements, including tree planting, should form part of the legal agreement.

6 Falcon Point, Hopton Street:

- Poor design of buildings, the heights are unacceptable and do not fit in the area.
- The intensity of development is a concern, the increase in traffic and people will place demand on existing amenities.
- Impact of noise, dirt and dust pollution.
- Creation of a wind tunnel effect.
- Loss of daylight, increased overlooking.
- The application will contribute nothing to the local area.

Purdy Hicks Gallery Limited:

- The noise and mess will adversely affect our business.
- Road access along Hopton Street should be maintained as we have daily deliveries and heavy artworks that cannot be carried should road access be restricted.

314 Bankside Lofts, Hopton Street:

- Impact on quality of life given noise, dirt and road blockages.
- Also agree to the issues and concerns raised by the BROAD group.

24 Gallery Lofts, 69 Hopton Street:

- The residential character of Hopton Street would be seriously damaged by the proposed mixed use development.
- Loss of privacy.
- Rise of anti social behaviour given increased pedestrian traffic and new routes through the site.
- Sampson House protects residents from the noise and pollution of the railway.
- Changes in wind, noise and light should be measured before and after the development.
- Buildings are far too high and will swamp the cultural icon that is the Tate Modern. No building should exceed 15 storeys.
- Sampson A should be deleted from the scheme and be merged with the Falcon Point piazza to form a new open space.
- The new buildings on Hopton Street should be no higher or nearer than the current buildings on either Gallery/Bankside Lofts or Falcon Point.
- Impact of construction should be minimised.

1 Quadrant House, 15 Burrell Street:

- Construction traffic should be from Blackfriars Road/Southwark Street rather than Hopton Gardens.

46 Falcon Point:

- Oppose the 27, 31 and 49 storey building as they are out of keeping and will dwarf the existing offices, flats and bars.
- There is no mention of any affordable housing.
- Overshadowing of neighbouring buildings.
- The buildings are glass monstrosities.
- More demand for car parks and servicing.
- Increase in pollution and noise.
- Loss of views and risk of plane/helicopter accidents.
- Applicant has ignored the comments made at pre-application stage.

Bankside Lofts, 65 Hopton Street (flat number not provided):

- Ludgate and Sampson House protect us from traffic and other noise, including noise from trains.
- Loss of views of the sky.
- There is hardly any noise nuisance from Sampson House as its offices and no traffic either.
- Reduction in value of property.

Gallery Lofts, 69 Hopton St (flat number not provided):

- The last 15 years have been disruptive owing to the major building works at Blackfriars Station, Neo Bankside etc.
- Southwark has repeatedly extended noisy working hours without consulting residents.
- Air and noise pollution has not been monitored during these works.
- No use of river transport has been undertaken to remove building materials.

404 Bankside Lofts, Hopton Street (two letters received):

- Object to Sampson A as it would remove sky visibility, sunlight, view and cause a loss of privacy. The existing building, whilst ugly, is stepped back and allows a sky and city line view.
- The proposed density of housing together with other local new builds will greatly increase traffic in our local area. Hopton St is a quiet street and all these new flats and offices will have an impact.
- The development does not visually tie in with other buildings in the area. It really is quite ugly.
- Applaud the removal of Sampson House but feel that these proposed very high buildings crowd the waterfront and dwarf the adjacent regenerated buildings of Bankside Lofts and the Hopton Street Almshouses.
- Increase in light pollution, noise and traffic.
- Impact of construction works.

Flat 41, 69 Hopton Street:

- Object to impact on traffic on Hopton Street and Holland Street.
- Sampson E and F need to be small in scale and well set back to preserve unique character of this quiet street.
- Sampson A should be deleted and replaced with a new public space.

215 Bankside Lofts, 65 Hopton Street:

- Inappropriate height of buildings.
- Too many buildings on the site.
- Access should be from Blackfriars Road rather than Hopton Street.
- Impact on wind conditions.
- Increase in noise.
- Loss of light.
- There is already lots of cultural space in the area.

Flat 413 Bankside Lofts, 65 Hopton Street:

- The new buildings on Hopton Street should be no higher or nearer than the current building. If necessary, the buildings on Blackfriars Road could be increased in height to compensate.
- The traffic impact from the scale of offices and residential will cause a nuisance. To avoid this, Hopton Street should not be used.
- Sampson A should be removed entirely and the space joined with the Falcon Point piazza and the Tate landscape.

Flat 505, Bankside Lofts, 65 Hopton Street:

- Sampson A should ideally be removed from the plans and replaced with open space.
- If Sampson A remains, it would result in overlooking, loss of daylight and loss of views.

Flat 701, Bankside Lofts, 65 Hopton Street:

- Sampson A should be removed from the plans and replaced with open space.
- The increase in traffic will be intolerable.
- The height and scale of the buildings is excessive. The heights of buildings on Hopton Street should be no taller than the existing.
- The applicants are claiming credit for introducing cultural space but there are plenty of cultural attractions in the area.
- Hopton Street and Holland Street has been a building site since 1995.

Restrictions should be imposed on construction covering matters such as working times, noise, dirt and road closures.

Flat 703, Bankside Lofts, 65 Hopton Street:

- The size of the development is wholly unsuitable.
- Concern over noise, loss of privacy and overshadowing.
- The buildings will dominate the open space south of Falcon Point and the Tate public space.
- Sampson A should not be constructed. At the very least it should be no higher than the existing building.

Flat 407 Bankside Lofts, 65 Hopton Street:

- The plans will have great environmental impact, with additional noise, wind and light.
- Sampson A should be removed from the plans and replaced with open space.
- The heights of buildings on Hopton Street should be no higher than existing.
- The traffic impact will be excessive.
- Increase in dirt and noise.
- Loss of privacy.

Flat 101 Bankside Lofts, 65 Hopton Street:

- The proposals are on an excessive scale.
- Support comments made by BROAD group.
- Sampson A should be removed from the plans and replaced with open space.
- Loss of light, increase in overlooking, increase in noise and light pollution.
- The public consultation exercise has been cynical, no real consideration has been given to local concerns.
- Vehicle access should not be from Hopton Street.
- The area has endured endless building work and reassurance is required regarding construction activity.

No address:

- Welcome removal of Sampson House but the development should not provide more bulk than the existing building.
- Buildings height should be no taller than the existing buildings on Hopton Street.
- Sampson A should be removed from the plans.
- Vehicle access should not be from Hopton Street.

No address:

- The development is far too dense.
- The new offices do not generate a better area, rather deaden it. Are more offices really needed?
- Sampson A would be a disaster environmentally and should be replaced with open space.
- The developer is being greedy without consideration for the residents of the area.
- Concern about noise and dirt disruption during construction.

One comment received.

Flat 205, Bankside Lofts, 65 Hopton Street: On balance support the scheme subject to amendments and conditions being applied.

- Sampson A should be removed from the scheme and replaced with a green space. The building overlooks Bankside Lofts.

- Hopton Street should not become a service road and no service vehicles should enter Hopton Street.
- Residential amenity should be protected during construction.
- Development on the Sampson House side should commence first.
- Compensation should be offered to residents for dirt and noise.

Two letters of support received.

111 Southwark Street (John Robertson Architects):

- The redevelopment with a mix of uses will contribute to the continuing regeneration of the Bankside and north Southwark.
- Like the ideas for permeability and improving the public realm.

109 Bankside Lofts, 65 Hopton Street:

- The area needs the development.

Re-consultation comments

Internal consultees

Environmental protection:

- Conditions should be applied in respect of sound insulation between commercial and residential units.
- Condition should be attached in relation to securing office blinds – to prevent light pollution to residents on Hopton Street.

Statutory and non-statutory organisations

London Borough of Lewisham: Does not wish to raise an objection.

English Heritage: Do not wish to make any further comments. Previous comments made still stand.

Neighbours

7 further objections received.

UBM Media (current occupiers of Ludgate House): No objections but concern over construction impact of the scheme.

- Given the long period of construction and close proximity of the proposed development to 240 Blackfriars Road, no unacceptable harm and disturbance should be caused to UBM and their operations. Further, are concerned as to the potential cumulative construction impact on the local area given the planned development at One Blackfriars Road.
- Concern over the following construction impacts; air pollution, vibration, noise and traffic.
- Robust conditions should be put in place to manage construction.
- Request that UBM be referred to as a key 'stakeholder' in the construction plan and request to be consulted on the plan once it is received by the council.

6 Falcon Point, Hopton Street:

- Continue to object to the scheme.
- The amendments are hard to read from the plans, a model should be made available.

Flat 7 Horseshoe Wharf, 6 Clink Street:

- The amendments do not incorporate the possibility of using the redundant bridge piers to provide a pedestrian bridge across the river. The bridge could form a

linear park and provide opportunities for stalls to accommodate various fairs and other events.

Flat 8, Falcon Point, Hopton Street:

- Sampson House does not need to be demolished. An alternative use should be found for it such as housing, a designer hotel, a swimming pool or theatre/exhibition space.
- The tallest building is plain idiotic looking, and is boring. It will look clumsy on the horizon.
- Impact on wind conditions.
- Increase in noise.
- Sampson A is too close to Falcon Point and should be swapped in position with the main square behind it.
- Parking levels are still excessive.
- The developer is not compensating local residents in terms of double glazing or garden roofs.
- A Waitrose shop would be preferred over Sainsbury's.

5 River Court, Upper Ground:

32 River Court, Upper Ground:

- The scheme will cause overshadowing to our flat and also nearby public spaces such as the pub on the river.
- The towers will reduce the amount of blue sky visible.
- The buildings form and facade lack articulation.
- The tallest building (Ludgate B) is the same height as 1 Blackfriars. Other buildings have stepped up to the height of 1 Blackfriars.
- The tall buildings would create a very poor back drop to views of St Paul's Cathedral.
- Construction traffic will cause disruption to the area.
- The amount of dust generated will have a detrimental impact on health.
- Internet and TV reception will be damaged.
- The development is over dense, with unsatisfactory spaces in between and inadequate open space.
- Ludgate A is far too high and should not exceed the height of River Court.
- Overlooking impact.
- The development will form a canyon like environment.

3 Falcon Point, Hopton Street:

- Overlooking from the balconies in Sampson A.
- Sampson A should be removed and not built.
- Green spaces will be more concrete grey than green.
- The new 'Lego' towers will be watched over by doormen making you feel unwelcome.
- The new residents will be arrogant and greedy.
- The proposal is another example of gentrification.
- The flats will be occupied by the uber rich who will only live in them for a couple of weeks a year. Neo Bankside is 95% unused.

Two letters of support

Flat 84 Rennie Court, 11 Upper Ground:

- The development completes the redevelopment of the riverside in this area of London. After Sea Containers House, King's Reach Tower (South Bank Tower)

and One Blackfriars, Sampson and Ludgate House is another piece in the jigsaw puzzle to reinvigorate a prime London area in need.

- The application will create jobs for local people and increase the retail opportunities for those who live and work in the area.
- It will contribute to the vitality of the neighbourhood. The public realm will be significantly enhanced and pedestrian access will be much improved.

Kings Reach Flats Management Ltd:

- The company that represents the interests of the 198 lessees of River and Rennie Courts, to express our support for the proposed redevelopment of Ludgate and Sampson Houses by the Carlyle Group.
- Believe that this development has many attractive features and successfully counterpoints the approved development plans for the 1 Blackfriars site. Impressed with the plans that they have put forward which provide through routes on the site and activate the ground floor areas for retail and leisure. During the consultation process with local residents several issues were raised which have been adequately considered in the current application.
- The proposed development successfully completes the redevelopment of the North end of Blackfriars Road and urge you to approve the application.

Environmental Impact Assessment

1. The Environmental Statement (ES) details the results of the EIA and provides a detailed verification of potential beneficial and adverse environmental impacts in relation to the proposed development, including the following areas of impact (in the order they appear in the ES):
 - Demolition and construction
 - Socio-economics
 - Traffic and transportation
 - Wind (Microclimate)
 - Daylight, Sunlight, Overshadowing, Light Pollution and Solar Glare
 - Air Quality
 - Noise and Vibration
 - Water Resources and Flood Risk
 - Ground Conditions
 - Buried Heritage Assets
 - Ecology
 - Electronic Interference
 2. Information includes a prediction of the impact (methods/assumptions and underlying rationale/ interpretation of facts, opinions, judgments based on facts/ confidence limits associated with the prediction and the characteristics and dimensions of the impacts i.e. nature, magnitude, extent, timing, duration, reversibility, likelihood and significance) and the certainty of the impact (worst case/ impact range and risk assessment).
 3. Reference to cumulative effects includes the combined effects of different types of impact, for example, noise, dust and visual impacts, impact interactions and impacts from several developments, which individually might be insignificant, but when considered together, could amount to a cumulative impact. Potential positive and negative residual effects remaining after mitigation measures have been identified and incorporated are also included in the ES in order to assess their significance and acceptability.
 4. As per the Regulations, consideration is given to alternative proposals , and a summary of the design evolution.
 5. Additional environmental information was received during the course of the application; in accordance with Regulation 22 of the EIA Regulations 2011, all consultees and neighbours were re-consulted and press notice re-issued.
 6. The assessment of the ES and further information and the conclusions reached regarding the environmental effects of the proposed development are set out below.
- Demolition and Construction
7. The demolition and construction works are anticipated to take approximately 7 years and 9.5 months. Demolition is expected to take 12 months for Ludgate House and 14.5

months for Sampson House. The main construction activity is for the superstructure works, expected to last 34.5 months for the Ludgate House side and 30 months for Sampson House. The core working hours have been given to be 8am to 6pm Monday to Friday and 8am to 1pm on Saturdays. The demolition and construction works would need to be carried out within these periods at all times. An Environmental Management Plan would be prepared which will include the mitigation measures such as;

- procedures for keeping residents informed about demolition and construction activity and the formulation of a complaints procedure;
- production of a plan for the phasing of the works;
- informing residents of activities likely to result in disturbance;
- traffic management, such as details of proposed routes for HGV's travelling to and from the site;
- the setting of noise, vibration and dust controls;
- protection of ecological, archaeological and water resources including protection of trees; and
- the preparation of a site waste management plan, detailing how demolition and construction waste would be managed and disposed of.

Socio- economics

- 8 This chapter of the ES provides an assessment of the economic and social impacts (employment, local spending, housing provision, education, healthcare, playspace and open space) of the proposed development.
- 9 The demolition and construction phases are expected to generate a number of socio economic impacts. The primary potential impact would be the creation of construction employment. It has been estimated that 550 to 650 workers would be on site each year. There would also be additional employment generated indirectly through the construction supply chain, creating an estimated total of 765 demolition and construction phase related jobs, on average, per year. The construction phase of the development would therefore have an overall short-term residual impact of **minor beneficial** on the Greater London economy.
- 10 In the completed development, the development would contribute 489 residential units to the existing housing stock. This results in a **minor beneficial** long term residual impact on housing provision.
- 11 Whilst no affordable housing has been offered as part of the development, the applicant has committed to contributing by providing affordable housing units off site. On the basis of the off site mitigating any negative impacts, the overall residual impact has been considered to be of **negligible significance**.
- 12 In relation to healthcare, the indicators are that GP surgeries are accepting new patients. It should be noted that the applicant has proposed to make a s.106 contribution towards healthcare provision.
- 13 In relation to education, the development would generate the demand for school places. As with healthcare, the applicant has proposed to make a s.106 contribution towards education.
14. The development is expected to generate 2,862 jobs in the completed development (full time equivalent) through a mix of land uses including offices, retail/food uses, gym and cultural activities. Additional employment at a minor level would also be generated

through concierge services and estate management. The proposed development is expected to generate an additional 1,460 jobs above the existing. This would create a minor beneficial impact on the London economy.

15. There are also opportunities to improve local spending. It has been estimated that the development would generate £21,944,801 in local spending which in the long term would be moderate beneficial.
16. The site lies within an area of local public park and open space deficiency. The proposed development would create 9.535sqm of landscaped publicly accessible open space. In addition, the River Thames and its environs (i.e. the walkway beside the Thames) also constitute a considerable existing open space resource immediately adjacent to the site. Three areas of publicly accessible children's playspace is also proposed, totaling 900sqm. As there is no publicly accessible space or children's play on the site as existing, this is considered to be of minor beneficial significance on open space in the local area.
17. Cultural space as well as a gym and fitness centre is also proposed, for use by residents and the general public. In addition, improvements to the surrounding public realm in terms of layout and access would benefit the Tate cultural quarter. On this basis, the proposal would have a residual impact of minor beneficial significance.

Traffic and Transportation

18. In terms of demolition and construction, all vehicles are likely to be moved by road. Vehicles will be phased and will be controlled by means of a vehicle arrival and departure management plan to achieve an even spread of vehicle movements during the day. Demolition and construction vehicle movement should therefore not have a material impact on the highway network and is considered to be a residual impact of negligible significance. In relation to pedestrian movement during demolition and construction, a short term negligible impact will occur due to the need for partial or full closure of the footways. The worst case would be on the eastern footway on Blackfriars Road outside Ludgate House for approximately 7 years and 2 months. Pedestrians travelling north-south will be diverted, resulting in a minor increase in distance and journey time for pedestrians. The residual impact is considered to be minor adverse for a temporary period.
19. In the completed development, the extent of traffic flow generated would result in an increase of vehicles of 3% or less on the main strategic roads (Blackfriars Road, Southwark Street) surrounding the site. The traffic increase on the side streets, such as Hopton Street result in higher percentage increases but this is because of the relatively low flows that currently occur. Overall, the residual impact on the highway network will be of negligible significance.
20. The assessment of the potential impact arising from the proposed development and cumulative demand from other development schemes, on the public transport network including National Rail, London Underground and bus services is considered to result in minimal increase in passenger numbers and trips relative to future demand and capacity of these services. The resulting residual impact is considered to be of negligible significance.
21. The proposal would provide greater permeability, movement and connectivity for pedestrians by opening up the site to a greater extent than currently exists, providing a

pleasant and well lit walking environment, as well as improving the public realm in terms of landscaping and layout. The proposed development would have a residual impact of major beneficial significance on the pedestrian movement.

- 22 Cycle parking and associated facilities will be provided, encouraging cycling as a mode of sustainable travel, resulting in a moderate beneficial impact. Travel plans have been prepared aimed at minimising the environmental impact of travel.

Wind microclimate

- 23 Wind tunnel tests have been undertaken to assess the pedestrian wind environment. Wind speeds were measured at up to 145 locations across the site including proposed entrances, amenity areas and thoroughfares within and around the site. The development would need mitigation in order to produce wind conditions satisfactory for sitting. The types of mitigation proposed include low level planting, lobby recesses, tree planting, increased balustrade height and screens. The overall residual impact on wind microclimate is expected to be negligible to moderate beneficial.

Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing, Light Pollution and Solar Glare

Daylight and sunlight

- 24 The daylight and sunlight assessment has focused upon the closest surrounding residential properties including those along Falcon Point, Hopton Street, Hopton's Gardens, Neo Bankside, Friars Close, Edward Edward's House and Rennie Court. The impacts have been assessed with regard to the Building Research Establishments (BRE).
- 25 The existing daylight conditions for the properties identified a number of properties experiencing non compliance with the BRE. On completion of the development, the modeling has demonstrated that approximately 1268 (9%) of the 1317 rooms modeled would satisfy the BRE guidelines recommended levels in terms of the daylight and therefore the residual impact to these rooms would be of negligible significance. Of these, 55 rooms (4%) would see an improvement in their daylight levels.
- 26 Of the remaining 49 rooms, 23 (2%) would experience reduced levels of daylight of minor adverse significance. A further 26 (2%) would experience a residual impact of moderate adverse significance.
- 27 In terms of sunlight, there are 1239 windows that face within 90 degrees of due south of the site and therefore require testing for sunlight. 1176 windows (95%) would achieve BRE compliance following implementation of the development and therefore the residual impact to these would be negligible significance. Of the 63 windows which do not meet the BRE guidelines, 51 windows (4%) will experience a residual impact of minor adverse and 12 windows (1%) of a moderate adverse significance.

Overshadowing

- 28 A series of amenity spaces were tested, including those proposed as part of the development (total of 5) and also existing amenity spaces nearby (total of 9). Following construction of the development, the existing spaces nearby would achieve full compliance with the BRE and therefore the residual impact of the development is of negligible significance.
- 29 The new spaces proposed as part of the development would also achieve BRE compliance, as less than 40% of the areas would be in permanent shadow. The residual

impact of the new amenity spaces would be of **negligible** significance.

Temporary Overshadowing – Sun on ground

- 30 This assessment determines how much sun the amenity areas/gardens receive. The BRE guidelines suggest that for a garden or amenity area to appear adequately sunlit throughout the year, no more than half (50%) of the area should be prevented by buildings from receiving 2 hours of sunlight on 21st March.
- 31 With the development in place, all 9 existing amenity areas would achieve full BRE compliance by reference to receiving 2 hours of direct sunlight to over 50% of the area assessed on the 21st March and/or a reduction of 20% (the permissible guideline figure). The proposed development is therefore considered to result in a residual impact of **negligible** significance to the surrounding amenity space.
- 32 In terms of the new spaces created within the development, the 5 areas would not achieve the required levels of direct sunlight under the 2011 BRE guidelines. Two of the areas would achieve 2 hours of direct sunlight to 45.1% and 48.8% of the areas respectively (the Rennie Garden and the residents Garden), for these the impact would be considered of **minor adverse** significance while the remaining areas would be of **major adverse** significance.

Temporary Overshadowing – Gradient Levels

- 33 The date of 21st March has also been used to assess the ‘gradient levels’ of light, which represents the quality of light within an amenity space. The majority of the existing external areas surrounding the site currently receive a high level of direct sunlight. As proposed, the amenity spaces would also experience direct sunlight, with some areas receiving over 6 hours of direct sunlight on 21st March, and so the residual impact would be of **negligible** significance.
- 34 The amenity spaces within the proposed development, including Rennie Garden, Central Square, Resident Garden and the amenity area to the front of Ludgate B would receive high levels of direct sunlight and provide a residual impact of **minor beneficial** significance. The remaining areas will have a residual impact of **negligible** significance.

Temporary Overshadowing – Transient Overshadowing

- 35 Modelling was also undertaken to show the location of the temporary shadows that are created at different times of the day and year (i.e. Spring Equinox – 21st March; Summer and Winter Solstice – 21st June and December respectively), referred to as ‘Transient Overshadowing’. The shadow moves constantly throughout the day.
- 36 The shadow cast by the proposed development will, depending on the time of year, fall across and onto the River Thames and the Thames river walkway, as well as across the external and internal amenity spaces. Using the date of June as an example date for comparison, the shadow cast would fall on the River Thames between the hours of 11.00 and 14.00, and across Hopton Gardens between the hours of 17.00 and 18.00.
- 37 In all of the scenarios tested, the River Thames and Thames river walkway would receive some transient shadow during the day, with the greatest period experienced in March between the hours of 08.00 and 18.00 hours. In December during the winter months, no shadow would be cast by the proposed development over Hopton Gardens or Falcon Point Piazza. The residual impact of the transient shadows cast by the proposed development, on all areas considered and for each time of the year, is

considered to be of minor adverse significance.

Light pollution

- 38 The light pollution assessment was undertaken in line with the Institute of Lighting Engineers (ILE) Guidelines. The guidance provides suggested maximum light pollution levels before and after curfew times. The suggested time after which stricter requirements (for the control of obtrusive light) apply is 23.00 hours.
- 39 When considering the pre-curfew (pre 23.00 hours) method of assessment, the proposed development would not cause light pollution to nearby existing residents and therefore the impact would be negligible. Post 23.00 hours, there would be some minor instances of light pollution (i.e. beyond the permissible levels) for the residential properties of Causton House and Hopton Gardens, causing minor adverse significance.
- 40 For the proposed development itself, some mitigation would be required on the lower residential levels in the form of blinds, so the significance of the residual impact would be negligible.

Solar glare

- 41 The solar glare assessment examines the occurrence and duration of reflected solar glare throughout the year when the sun is shining. The assessment has identified that there are several locations which are potentially sensitive in terms of solar glare. The impact is however restricted for a limited time period at certain times of the year, and during the day. Mitigation proposed in the form of a fritting pattern on the external facade of the proposed development, would reduce this impact so that the residual impact would be of negligible to moderate adverse significance.

Air quality

Demolition and construction

- 42 Changes in air quality have been modeled, including activities such as additional road traffic from demolition and construction vehicles, dust generation, exhaust emissions from plant etc. The impacts arising during demolition and construction on local air quality have the potential to be adverse in their significance, however, they are largely temporary in duration and the consideration is of the magnitude of the impact.
- 43 An Environmental Management Plan (EMP) would be prepared prior to commencement for any on-site works and will include a suite of measures to minimise any dust generation and exhaust emissions, including erecting solid barriers on the site boundary, locating machinery away from sensitive receptors, and the regular maintenance of vehicle engines and regular cleaning of vehicles. The potential residual impacts would be between negligible and minor adverse significance.

Completed Operational Development

- 44 The potential sources of impacts to air quality once the development is completed are from road traffic, heating and plant power emissions. Traffic flows associated with the proposed development are not expected to result in a significant increase resulting in a residual impact of negligible significance.
- 45 The emissions from heating and plant, providing hot water and electricity is predicted to have a residual impact of negligible significance on long term air quality.

Noise and vibration

- 46 The impact of noise during demolition and construction works has been assessed, together with the impact once the development is completed and occupied. The types of noise considered include noise from demolition and construction, vehicle movements, vibration levels and future road traffic conditions.

Demolition and construction

- 47 The noise impacts from the site would be highest during the demolition of the existing buildings and substructure works (which would include excavation and piling works) and lowest during the internal fit out and landscaping. Traffic noise from construction would increase noise levels, particularly along Southwark Street and Hopton Street. As stated in paragraph 317 above, a EMP would be prepared to reduce excessive noise as far as is possible. The noise impacts from demolition and construction would be temporary and accordingly would have a residual impact of **negligible** significance.

- 48 In terms of vibration, the closest building, No. 144 Southwark Street (offices) would experience impacts of **moderate adverse** significance. The residential buildings on Hopton Street are expected to experience some temporary vibration impacts of **minor adverse** significance.

Completed operational development

- 49 The predicted change in traffic flow on surrounding roads is considered low, and therefore of negligible significance to surrounding sensitive receptors. The noise from plant and machinery installed would fall below background noise levels and therefore would be of **negligible** significance. Vibration from plant would be controlled by the use of anti-vibration measures, and therefore the impact would be **negligible**.

Water resources and flood risk

- 50 The proposal has been assessed with regard to the impact upon the water environment – the River Thames, shallow groundwater, deep groundwater, water supply network and foul and surface water drainage. The site lies within Flood Zone 3, which is classified as a high risk zone comprising land assessed as having a 1 in a 100 or greater annual probability of fluvial flooding, or a 1 in 200 greater annual probability of flooding from the sea in any given year.

- 51 A series of mitigating measures would be proposed, so that there is an impact of **negligible** significance. Such measures include damp proof membranes to prevent exposure to groundwater to potential contamination, implementing water efficient fixtures and fittings and incorporating sustainable urban drainage systems to reduce surface water flood risk.

Ground conditions

- 52 The impact of the scheme has been assessed with regard to the impact on the condition of soils and groundwater. Testing will be carried out to test for any significant areas of soil contamination, and identify soil for disposal from the site. The removal/remediation of any contaminated soil would result in residual impacts of **minor to moderate beneficial** significance.

Buried heritage

- 53 The desk based archaeological assessment identifies the potential impacts on buried archaeological resources. The site lies within the Borough, Bermondsey and Riverside Archaeological Priority Zone, arising from the high potential of the area to contain

remains dating from the prehistoric period onwards. The assessment submitted has shown that remains may survive under the existing Ludgate House site and adjacent areas. Archaeological deposits under Sampson House have already been destroyed by the excavation of the basements at Sampson House.

- 54 The new basement area under Ludgate House could impact on any surviving remains, and accordingly, archaeological investigation would need to be secured by condition. A mitigation strategy would also need to be secured for preservation by recording; this can also be done by condition.
- 55 The re-modelling of basements under Sampson House is not anticipated to have an impact on any archaeological remains as these have already been destroyed by the development of the existing Sampson House.
- 56 The successful implementation of the mitigation strategy would reduce any residual adverse impacts to **negligible** significance.

Ecology

- 57 An ecological impact assessment was carried out and comprises the collection of ecological data and surveys to assess the site's ecological importance. A bat scoping and inspection survey on trees and structures was also undertaken to identify potential roosting locations and signs to indicate the presence of bats. No bats or signs of bats were noted during the survey. An arboricultural survey was also undertaken.
- 58 The site does not fall within the boundaries of any designated statutory or non statutory sites. There are no records of protected or notable species recorded within the site, however a range of protected and notable species have been recorded within 2kn, including bats and birds (Black Redstart, Herring Gull, Song Thrush). No mammal signs were recorded on the site.
- 59 The proposal does result in the loss of six trees in total, including two mature London Plane that are protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). The loss of these trees is considered to have a residual impact of **minor adverse** significance in the short term and **negligible** significance in the long term.
- 60 Once the development has been completed, new landscaping would be laid, including new amenity areas, new planting (both native and non native) and green roofs would be planted. The proposed landscape strategy would have a residual impact of **minor beneficial** significance on local biodiversity.
- 61 The new 49 storey tower would result in some overshadowing of a section of the River Thames, however, the shadow would be transient and it is considered that the residual impact is of **negligible** significance.

Electronic interference

- 62 An assessment has been carried out to consider the potential impacts to digital and satellite television reception associated with the proposed development. Consideration has also been given to radio reception, telephone signals, wireless networks and emergency service communications.
- 63 The proposed new buildings can cause disruption to terrestrial TV and satellite TV reception, because of the signals could be blocked by the new buildings. In terms of

mitigation, the heights of existing aerials may need to be raised and/or subscription to a non satellite service. Existing satellite dishes that would be affected would also need to be re-sited.

- 64 Radio signals however can bend around new buildings and therefore there would be no significant risk to radio reception.
- 65 The reception of mobile telephone signals, wireless networks and emergency service communications would be unaffected as no aerials can be found in the area.
- 66 Following the incorporation of mitigating measures, residual impacts to TV reception would be of negligible significance.

Townscape, Conservation and Visual Impact Assessment

- 67 The likely long-term significant impacts of the completed development on the settings of the Westminster World Heritage Site (WHS), St Paul's Cathedral, and conservation areas and local townscape character areas have been assessed. The ES concludes that the likely impact on the Westminster WHS would be negligible, its impact on river views and St Paul's Cathedral as moderate to major beneficial, the impact on the St. James's Park footbridge view is neutral. The report, at paragraphs 173-177 contains a more detailed assessment of the impact on these views.

Cumulative impact development

- 68 The ES has addressed the potential cumulative impacts of the proposed development in relation to other developments that may have an additional impact on the surrounding area within 1kn and have a gross external area of more than 10,000sqm. Examples of schemes considered include 1 Blackfriars Road, 20 Blackfriars Road, Kings Reach Tower, Tate Modern and Neo Bankside. Schemes outside of the borough have also been taken into account including the Shell Centre and Elizabeth House in Lambeth.
- 69 On completion of the proposed development, there is the potential for beneficial combined cumulative impacts relating to:
- the provision of a substantial amount of new housing;
 - the provision of new retail, office and leisure floorspace;
 - the provision of new areas of public open space and landscaped areas;
 - increased opportunities for biodiversity enhancement;
 - benefits to groundwater given the extent to which contaminated land would be remediated.
- 70 Potential for combined adverse impacts arising from the proposed development with other schemes may be experienced in terms of daylight/sunlight. Some adverse impacts may be encountered for a low percentage of residential properties.

Neighbour consultee map

