

Item No. 11.1	Classification: Open	Date: 4 February 2014	Meeting Name: Planning Committee
Report title:	<p>Development Management planning applications:</p> <p>Address: MP1 within land bounded by Heygate Street to the north, Rodney Street to the east, Wansey Street to the south and Plot H3 of the Heygate masterplan to the west, London SE17</p> <p>Application for: Reserved Matters Application Reference 13-AP-3581</p> <p>Proposal: Application for the approval of reserved matters (access, scale, appearance, layout and landscaping) for Plot H6 within MPI (Masterplan First Phase) of the Heygate Masterplan submitted pursuant to Outline Planning Permission ref: 12-AP-1092. The proposals comprise the construction of a development plot ranging between 3 and 16 storeys in height (maximum building height 55.23m AOD), comprising 224 residential units, 695sqm (GEA) of flexible retail (Classes A1-A4), business (Class B1), non-residential institution (Class D1), and leisure (Class D2) uses, car parking, motorcycle parking, cycle storage, servicing, plant areas, new landscaping, and other associated work.</p> <p>Application for: Reserved Matters Application Reference 13-AP-3582</p> <p>Proposal: Application for approval of reserved matters (landscaping) for new public realm and associated works within MP1 (Masterplan First Phase) of the Heygate Masterplan, submitted pursuant to the Outline Planning Permission 12/AP/1092</p> <p>Application for: Reserved Matters Application Reference 13-AP-3583</p> <p>Proposal: Application for the approval of reserved matters (access, scale, appearance, layout and landscaping) for Plot H13 within MP1 (Masterplan First Phase) for the Heygate Masterplan, submitted pursuant to the Outline Planning Permission ref: 12/AP/1092. The proposals comprise the construction of a development plot ranging between 3 and 7 storeys in height (maximum building height 26.68m AOD), comprising 67 residential units, cycle storage, plant areas, new landscaping, and other associated works.</p> <p>Application for: Reserved Matters Application Reference 13-AP-3584</p> <p>Proposal: Application for the approval of reserved matters (access, scale, appearance, layout and landscaping) for Plot H10 within MP1 (Masterplan First Phase) of the Heygate Masterplan, submitted pursuant to the Outline Planning Permission ref: 12/AP/1092. The proposals comprise the construction of a development plot ranging between 3 and 10 storeys in height (maximum building height 37.23m AOD), comprising 69 residential units, car parking, motorcycle parking, cycle storage, servicing, plant areas, new landscaping, and other associated works.</p>		
Ward(s) or groups	East Walworth		

affected:	
From:	Head of Development Management
Application Start Date 14/10/2013	Application Expiry Date 11/2/2014

RECOMMENDATION

1. That planning permission is GRANTED for:
 - a. Reserved Matters Application Reference 13-AP-3581
 - b. Reserved Matters Application Reference 13-AP-3582
 - c. Reserved Matters Application Reference 13-AP-3583
 - d. Reserved Matters Application Reference 13-AP-3584

subject to conditions.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Site location and description

2. The MP1 development application site occupies an area of 2.05 hectares and is bound by Heygate Street to the north, Plot H12 of the Heygate Masterplan and Rodney Road to the east, Wansey Street to the south and Plot H3 of the Heygate Masterplan to the west, which fronts onto Walworth Road.
3. The site forms the southern extent of the former Heygate Estate and was previously occupied by Kingshill and Swanbourne residential blocks as well as part of the former Heygate Estate energy centre, commercial buildings and former Neighbourhood Office. The Heygate Estate is now vacant and demolition works commenced on site in October 2013 as part of the phased redevelopment of the estate.
4. The site sits entirely within the redline boundary of the Heygate Masterplan Outline Planning Permission (OPP) which was granted in March 2013. The OPP established five character areas within the Heygate Masterplan, and the site forms parts of the Walworth Road, Walworth Local, and Rodney Road Character Areas.
5. The immediate surrounding area is predominantly residential in character with residential land uses to the south and east, including the Peabody Estate, the new Trafalgar Place development currently under construction to the east, and Wansey Street and Brandon Street to the south. The future development plots of the Heygate Masterplan are immediately to the west (Plot H3) and north (Plots H7 and H11b) which will contain residential uses. The Energy Centre (Plot H12) is located to the east of the application site.

Details of proposal

6. The four MP1 Reserved Matters Applications seek approval of reserved matters (access, scale, appearance, layout, and landscaping) for development comprising Plots H6, H10 and H13 together with new public realm, parking, landscaping and other associated works pursuant to the Heygate Masterplan OPP.
7. The proposed MP1 development is the first phase of the masterplan development

comprising three development plots linked by new public realm. Each plot would consist of predominantly residential buildings arranged around a central ground level communal courtyard. Flexible retail (Classes A1-A4), business (Class B1), non-residential community (Class D1) and leisure (Class D2) uses would be provided at ground and mezzanine floors of Plot H6 fronting the new Central Shopping Street.

8. The total MP1 development proposes 360 residential units and 695sqm (GEA) of flexible non-residential uses. The table below sets out the residential units and floorspace figures for each development plot.

Land use	Plot H6	Plot H10	Plot H13	MP1 Total
Residential units – total	224	69	67	360
Residential units – Private	222	62	0	284
Residential units – Affordable	2	7	67	76
Retail (Classes A1/A2/A3/A4)	As part of 695sqm of flexible space	0	0	As part of 695sqm of flexible space
Business (Class B1)	As part of 695sqm of flexible space	0	0	As part of 695sqm of flexible space
Non-residential institutions (Class D1)	As part of 695sqm of flexible space	0	0	As part of 695sqm of flexible space
Leisure (Class D2)	As part of 695sqm of flexible space			As part of 695sqm of flexible space
Total floorspace (inclusive of plant/service areas)	23,816sqm	8,415sqm	7,102sqm	39,327sqm

9. The individual building heights within the development are summarised below.

Plot H6

Tall building (H06D) – 16 storeys (55.23m AOD)
 Mid-rise building fronting Wansey Street (H06C) – 8 storeys (29.70m AOD)
 Heygate Street mid-rise buildings (H06E/H06F) – 8 storeys (30.48m AOD)
 Townhouses fronting Wansey Street (H06A) – 3 storeys (14.80m AOD).

Plot H10

Heygate Street end block (part of H10C) – 10 storeys (37.23m AOD)
 Heygate Street mid-rise building (H10C) – 8 storeys (33.63m AOD)
 Townhouses facing Brandon Place (H10A/H10C) – 3 storeys (14.35m AOD).

Plot H13

Rodney Road mid-rise building (H13A/H13C) – 7 storeys (26.68m AOD)
 Townhouses (H13A) – 3 storeys (13.58m AOD).

10. A basement car park is proposed beneath part of Plots H6 and H10 which would be accessed from Heygate Street at the north-west corner of Plot H10. 69 car parking spaces would be provided in the basement, of which 34 spaces would be for

wheelchair users. In addition, 10 motorcycle spaces and 3 parking spaces for mobility scooters would be accommodated. A high-top disabled car parking space is also proposed within the new public realm on Park Street South (between Plots H6 and H10). 431 cycle parking spaces would be distributed within each of the development plots and public realm.

11. The proposed new public realm would include the creation of a formal boulevard along the south side of Heygate Street, a residential cul-de-sac along Wansey Street (including the reconfiguration of the existing Wansey Street CPZ car parking provision), shared surfaces between the development plots, 'play-on-the-way' and a community garden.

Revisions to MP1 proposal

12. A number of minor revisions to the application drawings have been made, as well as further clarification submitted on the daylight received to the proposed new residential units and clarification on various energy and transport matters. A list of the additional material (received 12, 13, 17, and 18 December 2013, 17 and 21 January 2014) is set out below:

- 1) Amendments to the application drawings to incorporate:

- H06A – amendment to location of window layout on the gable ends of the townhouses
- H06C/H06D – amendment to internal layouts of a number of unit types
- H06E/H06F – adjustment in the gable elevation to coordinate with kitchen layouts
- H13 – removal of brick piers in inset balconies
- H13B – amendments to elevations and incorporation of climbing plants to gable
- Minor changes to utility cupboard/coat cupboard layout in some units
- Minor changes to kitchen furniture layout in some units.

- 2) Updated accommodation schedule

- 3) Updated drawing schedule

- 4) Addendum to the daylight, sunlight, and overshadowing report to document improvements to average daylight factor (ADF) results for the new accommodation.

- 5) Note and clarification letter on transport matters concerning car parking in Wansey Street/options for servicing and waste collection for Plot H6.

- 6) Technical note on parking and kerbside bin storage, Wansey Street

- 7) Additional transport plans – Proposed Parking and Refuse Layout/AutoTrack and Visibility Splays/Heygate Street Refuse Collection H6 North and West.

- 8) Updated cycle strategy drawings – ground floor and mezzanine floors

- 9) Addendum to the energy statement to clarify the energy strategy proposals and resulting carbon emissions

13. The changes to the original drawings are considered to be non-material revisions and the other updated information relating to daylight, energy and transport was submitted for clarification purposes following discussion with officers.

Planning history

14. Application Reference: 12/AP/1092 – Granted 27 March 2013
The Heygate Estate and surrounding land bound by New Kent Road (A201) to the north, Rodney Place and Rodney Road to the east, Wansey Street to the South and Walworth Road (A215) and Elephant Road to the West, London SE17

Outline application for: Redevelopment to provide a mixed use development comprising a number of buildings ranging between 13.13m (AOD) and 104.8m (AOD) in height with capacity for between 2,300 (min) and 2,469 (max) residential units together with retail (Class A1-A5), business (Class B1), leisure and community (Class D1 and D2), Energy Centre (sui generis) uses. New landscaping, park and public realm, car parking, means of access and other associated works.
15. Application Reference: 12/AP/3203 – Granted 27 March 2013
The Heygate Estate and surrounding land bound by New Kent Road (A201) to the north, Rodney Place and Rodney Road to the east, Wansey Street to the South and Walworth Road (A215) and Elephant Road to the West, London SE17

Demolition of all existing structures and bridges and associated works.
16. Application 13/AP/2913- Recommended that no further EIA is required 7 October 2013
The Heygate Estate and surrounding land bound by New Kent Road (A201) to the north, Rodney Place and Rodney Road to the east, Wansey Street to the South and Walworth Road (A215) and Elephant Road to the West, London SE17

Screening Opinion in relation to the Reserved Matters Applications for 'Masterplan First Phase' (MP1) to comprise approximately 370 residential units and 1,000sqm of retail and community space to be submitted pursuant to Outline Permission reference 12-AP-1092 for the redevelopment of the Heygate Estate.
17. Application Reference 13/AP/2214 – Recommended that no further EIA is required 11 October 2013
The Heygate Masterplan, Elephant and Castle, London SE17

Screening Opinion to determine the need for an additional Environmental Statement to be submitted with the Detailed Phasing Plans (demolition and construction phasing) pursuant to Condition 3 of the Demolition and Outline Permissions (references 12-AP-3203 and 12-AP-1092) for the demolition and redevelopment of the Heygate Estate.
18. S106 Agreement Site-Wide Strategies and Details required
The OPP legal agreement requires various details to be submitted for approval either prior to or at the same time as reserved matters applications. A number of applications have been submitted to discharge these details and are currently under consideration. A list of the applications is provided in Appendix 4 of this report.
19. In addition, a number of site-wide strategies for the Heygate Masterplan have already been submitted to the council. A list of those submitted is provided in Appendix 4 of this report.

Planning history of adjoining sites

20. Application Reference 12/AP/2797 – Granted 15 March 2013
Land bounded by Victory Place to the North, Balfour Street to the East and Rodney Road to the South and West (known as 'Trafalgar Place')

Construction of 8 buildings ranging between 4 and 10 storeys in height (maximum building height 38.5m AOD) comprising 235 residential units, 204sqm (GEA) of retail use (Class A1-A3), car parking beneath podium level, cycle storage, servicing, plant areas, landscaping and public realm improvements.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Summary of main issues

21. The main issues to be considered in respect of the MP1 applications are:
- Conformity with the outline planning permission
 - Environmental impact assessment
 - Density and dwelling mix
 - Quality of proposed residential accommodation
 - Impact on the amenities of adjoining properties
 - Impact of adjoining uses on future occupiers of the development
 - Design issues
 - Impact on the character and setting of a listed building and/or conservation area
 - Public realm
 - Transport issues
 - Trees and landscaping
 - Flood risk
 - Wind
 - Planning obligations
 - Energy and sustainability.

Planning policy

22. The statutory development plan for the borough comprises the London Plan (2011); Southwark's Core Strategy (2011) and saved policies from the Southwark Plan (2007).
23. The application site is located within the:
- Central Activities Area (CAZ)
 - Elephant and Castle Opportunity Area
 - Elephant and Castle Major Town Centre
 - Air Quality Management Area
 - Public Transport Accessibility Rating 6b.

The site also forms part of designated Proposal Site 39P 'Elephant and Castle Core Area' which identifies a large central area of land for comprehensive redevelopment. The Elephant and Castle lies in the background of the townscape view looking from the Serpentine Bridge in Hyde Park to Westminster (Townscape View No. 23A.1 of the London View Management Framework 2011).

24. There are no listed buildings located within the MP1 application site but there are a number of Grade II listed buildings within proximity of the site, including:
- Southwark Municipal Offices and attached railings, Walworth Road
 - Southwark Central Library and Cuming Museum, Walworth Road
 - 140, 142, 150, 152 Walworth Road
 - The Walworth Clinic, 157-163 Walworth Road.

The southern edge of the MP1 boundary (along the Wansey Street boundary) is within the Larcom Street Conservation Area which has its northern boundary along the middle of Wansey Street highway.

25. The policies most relevant to the determination of the MP1 applications are listed below.

Core Strategy 2011

Strategic Policy 1 – Sustainable development
Strategic Policy 2 – Sustainable transport
Strategic Policy 3 – Shopping, leisure and entertainment
Strategic Policy 4 – Places to learn and enjoy
Strategic Policy 5 – Providing new homes
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

Southwark Plan 2007 (July) - saved policies

Policy 1.1 – Access to employment opportunities
Policy 1.7 – Development within town and local centres
Policy 2.2 – Provision of new community facilities
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 3.20 – Tall buildings
Policy 3.28 – Biodiversity
Policy 4.2 – Quality of residential accommodation
Policy 4.3 – Mix of dwellings
Policy 4.5 – Wheelchair accessible 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 and the mobility impaired
Policy 5.8 – Other parking

London Plan 2011 consolidated with Revised Early Minor Alterations 2013

Policy 2.11 – Central Activities Zone: Strategic functions
Policy 2.13 – Opportunity areas and intensification areas
Policy 2.15 – Town centres
Policy 2.18 – Green infrastructure and the network of open and green spaces
Policy 3.1 – Ensuring equal life chances for all
Policy 3.2 – Improving health and addressing health inequalities
Policy 3.5 – Quality and design of housing developments
Policy 3.6 – Children and young people's play and informal recreation facilities
Policy 3.7 – Large residential developments
Policy 3.8 – Housing choice
Policy 3.9 – Mixed and balanced communities
Policy 3.17 – Health and social care facilities

Policy 4.7 – Retail and town centre development
Policy 4.8 – Supporting a successful and diverse retail sector
Policy 4.9 – Small shops
Policy 4.12 – Improving opportunities for all
Policy 5.2 – Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
Policy 5.3 – Sustainable design and construction
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 5.14 – Water quality and wastewater infrastructure
Policy 5.15 – Water use and supplies
Policy 5.17 – Waste capacity
Policy 6.9 – Cycling
Policy 6.10 – Walking
Policy 6.13 – Parking
Policy 7.1 – Building London’s neighbourhoods and communities
Policy 7.2 – An inclusive environment
Policy 7.3 – Designing out crime
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 7.12 – Implementing the London View Management Framework
Policy 7.13 – Safety, security and resilience to emergency
Policy 7.14 – Improving air quality
Policy 7.15 – Reducing noise and enhancing soundscapes
Policy 7.19 – Biodiversity and access to nature
Policy 7.21 – Trees and woodlands

Regional Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) and Guidance

Providing for Children and Young People’s Play and Informal Recreation (2012)
Sustainable Design and Construction (2006)
The Mayor’s Energy Strategy (2010)
The Mayor’s Transport Strategy (2010)
The Mayor’s Economic Development Strategy (2010)
Housing (2012)
Planning for Equality & Diversity in London (2007)
The Mayor’s Climate Change Mitigation and Energy Strategy (2011)

Southwark Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD)

Sustainability Assessment (2009)
Design and Access Statements (2007)
Residential Design Standards (2011)
Sustainable Transport (2008)
Sustainable Design and Construction (2009)
Elephant and Castle SPD/Opportunity Area Planning Framework (OAPF) 2012

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

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

26. On 19 March 2013, the council's cabinet considered the issue of compliance of Southwark's planning policies with the NPPF, as required by NPPF paragraph 215. All policies and proposals were reviewed and the council satisfied itself that the policies and proposals in use were in conformity with the NPPF. The resolution was that with the exception of Southwark Plan policy 1.8 (location of retail outside town centres); all Southwark planning policies would be saved. Therefore, due weight should continue to be given to relevant policies in existing plans in accordance to their degree of consistency with the NPPF.

Principle of development

27. Outline planning permission (OPP) has been granted for the redevelopment of the Heygate Estate ("Heygate Masterplan") with matters of access, scale, appearance, layout, and landscaping reserved for future approval. Accordingly, the principle of a high density mixed use development on the site has already been established through the Heygate Masterplan OPP.
28. 360 residential dwellings are proposed in the first masterplan phase, of which 76 units would be affordable. The new homes will make an important contribution towards delivering the established quantum of housing (between 2,300 and 2,469 residential units) on the wider Heygate Masterplan as well as housing targets for the Elephant and Castle Opportunity Area.
29. The proposed flexible non-residential floorspace (Classes A1-A4, B1, D1 and D2) at the ground and mezzanine floors of Plot H6 (Cores C and D) are appropriate town centre uses and comply with the range of uses approved for Plot H6 on the OPP. The 695sqm floorspace could be used as one of a combination of these uses. The number of individual non-residential units and details of shop fronts and entrances will be provided prior to above grade works on Plot H6 as required by Condition 51 of the OPP.
30. The council's regeneration north team have confirmed their strong support for the MP1 proposal, particularly noting the significant benefits that the scheme would offer in terms of public realm improvements, the creation of much needed local employment opportunities (both during construction and in the completed development), and the design and place making benefits.

Conformity with outline permission

31. Condition 17 of the OPP requires evidence to be submitted with each reserved matters application showing how the proposed plot development complies with the site wide development controls (i.e. parameter plans/development specification/design strategy document) approved at the outline stage as well as subsequently approved site wide strategies and plot specific strategies. As noted in paragraphs 18 and 19 of this report, the OPP S106 agreement requires a number of site-wide and plot specific strategies to be submitted for approval prior to the first reserved matters application. A reconciliation statement has been submitted to demonstrate compliance.
32. The table below provides a summary of the key design controls defined by the OPP and an assessment of the MP1 proposal.

Key data	OPP requirements	OPP Reference	MP1 assessment
Plot extent	Plot extents within maximum and minimum parameters at ground/mezzanine and upper floors	Parameter Plans – P03; P04 [plot extent is inclusive of balconies, private ground floor amenity space and retail overspill space]	The extents of Plots H6, H10, and H13 sit within the defined parameter plot extents
% occupancy of plot	Total area of built footprint + balcony zones will be a maximum of 72% of the maximum plot extent at upper levels	DSD Consolidated Version) p.119; P04	H6 = 47% H10 = 48% H13 = 44%
% occupancy of tall building	Maximum floorplate area = 85% of maximum parameter plan Maximum volumetric occupancy = 85% of maximum parameter volume	DSD (Consolidated Version) p.293	Plot H6 – tall building occupies 70% of the maximum floorplate area for the tall building plot component Plot H6 – tall building occupies 76% of the maximum parameter envelope for the tall building plot component
Building envelopes	Plot extents within minimum and maximum AOD heights at ground/mezzanine and upper floors	Parameter Plans – P08; P09	All building heights are within the defined minimum and maximum parameter range
Development GEA	Development floorspace (GEAsqm) set by a minimum and maximum quantum per plot	Revised Development Specification, p.13-14, Table 4.2 H6 = 15,564 – 24,976sqm H10 = 6,537 – 10,354sqm H13 = 5,878 – 9,491sqm	H6 = 23,816sqm H10 = 8,415sqm H13 = 7,102sqm

33. As demonstrated above, the MP1 proposals clearly conform to the principal design controls established by the OPP.

Reconciliation

34. The reconciliation statement also provides a reconciliation of the MP1 proposals with future phases of the Heygate Masterplan and outlines indicatively how the detailed MP1 phase could affect the cumulative delivery of site-wide key parameters and principles set by the OPP. It is important to monitor the delivery of principal obligations

throughout the life of the phases to ensure that the obligations established at the outline stage can be delivered. It is noted that the information contained in the Reconciliation Statement is illustrative only as the detailed design of subsequent phases will be subject to formal approval. The principal obligations identified in Condition 17 where information is required at each reserved matters application relate to the delivery of:

- number and mix of residential units
 - affordable housing quantum and mix
 - land use floorspace
 - parking (including car, motorcycle, and cycle)
 - public realm, highways, and utilities.
35. The statement assumes the delivery of 2,469 maximum homes and maximum quantum of floorspace by land use on the masterplan site and shows how the MP1 proposals can be reconciled with possible development scenarios for the later phases. In this way it is possible to see if there would be any implications of the MP1 proposals for later phases, for example the under-provision of 3-bed family homes on the first phase would necessitate an over-provision in a later phase to ensure site-wide compliance with OPP requirements. The statement demonstrates that the MP1 proposals do not compromise the delivery of overall targets set by the OPP and to that extent, the on-going delivery of the Heygate Masterplan.
36. The reconciliation statement satisfies the requirements of condition 17 of the OPP for the first phase of the masterplan.

Environmental impact assessment

37. An environmental statement (ES) and ES addendum accompanied the outline planning application which assessed the likely significant environmental impacts of the entire Heygate Masterplan development during construction and operational phases. Mitigation measures were identified in order to minimise adverse impacts as far as possible and these were secured either by conditions or S106 obligations as part of the OPP.
38. In August 2013 the council issued a screening opinion (reference 13-AP-2913), in accordance with Regulation 5 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011, confirming that the proposed MP1 development did not require any new or supplementary EIA work to be undertaken as part of the reserved matters application and that the findings and conclusions of the original ES and ES Addendum remain valid.
39. The original ES and ES Addendum identified the need for further testing at the Reserved Matters detailed design stage in terms daylight and sunlight, air quality and wind assessments. These assessments form part of the MP1 application submission and are considered in the relevant sections of this report.

Density and dwelling mix

- Density
40. Core Strategy Strategic Policy 5 sets a density range of between 650 – 1,100 habitable rooms per hectare (hr/ha) within the Central Activities Zone. Densities may be exceeded in opportunity areas when developments are of an exemplary standard of design. At the outline application stage an indicative site-wide density of 1,054 hr/ha was achieved based on a maximum number of 9,052 habitable rooms or 2,469 residential units.

41. The MP1 proposals would result in the following densities:

Plot H6 – 1,164 hr/ha
Plot H10 – 924 hr/ha
Plot H13 – 1,032 hr/ha
Overall MP1 Development – 589 hr/ha

42. On an individual plot basis the densities are within the range normally expected for the CAZ, albeit with a marginal exceedance on Plot H6. The density for the overall MP1 development (taking account of the areas of new public realm) is slightly below that normally expected for this area. However, the OPP parameters establish the southern end of the Heygate Masterplan (comprising the Walworth Local and Rodney Neighbourhood Character Areas) as the most appropriate location for lower density family housing, reflective of the modest scale of the adjacent residential properties and the nearby listed buildings, including the Town Hall, and the Larcom Street Conservation Area. Higher density development towards the northern end of the Heygate Masterplan will be delivered in later phases so that the overall site-wide density will be within the recommended density range for the CAZ. The proposed density levels for MP1 are therefore considered appropriate in this context.

Dwelling mix

43. The OPP commits to delivering a residential mix comprising at least 60% of units with two or more bedrooms and at least 10% of units with 3 or more bedrooms in line with the policy requirements set out in Core Strategy Strategic Policy 7 and the Elephant and Castle SPD/OAPF. No more than 5% of units would be studio flats. These policy targets are applicable to the development as a whole rather than the individual plots. The proposed dwelling mix for the individual plots and the total MP1 development is set out below.

MP1 Unit Mix				
Unit Type	Plot H6	Plot H10	Plot H13	MP1 Total
Studio	0	0	0	0 (0%)
1-bed	101 (45.1%)	18 (26.1%)	27 (40.3%)	146 (40.5%)
2-bed	95 (42.4%)	31 (44.9%)	28 (41.8%)	154 (42.8%)
3-bed	26 (11.6%)	19 (27.5%)	11 (16.4%)	56 (15.6%)
4-bed	2 (0.9%)	1 (1.5%)	1 (1.5%)	4 (1.1%)
Total	224 (100%)	69 (100%)	67 (100%)	360 (100%)

44. There is a larger concentration of one bedroom units within Plot H6 and so only 54.9% of units have two or more bedrooms which is some way below the 60% target. As noted above, the policy targets are applicable to the development as a whole. Across the MP1 development, there would be 59.5% of two plus bedroom units which is very marginally below the policy requirement. The policy is clear in that 60% is the minimum that should be achieved and future phases need to take account of this. Within the individual plots and across the entire MP1 development the number of units with three and four bedrooms significantly exceeds the minimum 10% policy requirement for larger family units (being 60 units or 16.7% across the site) which is particularly welcome in this first masterplan phase.
45. The scheme would also deliver a range of residential unit typologies in the form of 56 (or 16%) larger 3 and 4 bedroom townhouses and duplexes at ground and first floors that have their own front door from the street which will enhance the provision of active frontages. The remaining units (or 84%) would be in the form of 1 to 3 bedroom apartments distributed throughout the upper floors of the blocks. The scheme will contribute towards delivering a range of housing choices in the Elephant and Castle, including the provision of larger family accommodation.

46. 35 wheelchair accessible units (or 10% calculated by habitable room) are proposed comprising 27 market wheelchair units (26 x 1-bed and 1 x 3-bed) and 8 affordable rent wheelchair units (2 x 2-bed and 6 x 3-bed). The market wheelchair units are distributed throughout the upper floors of Plot H6 tall building (Core D) with easy access to two lifts. The rented wheelchair units comprise ground floor duplex units located in Plots H10 and H13 with front doors off the street. In accordance with the OPP S106 agreement, the rented affordable wheelchair units would be fully accessible and designed to meet the South East London Housing Partnership Wheelchair Housing Design Guide. The market wheelchair units would be designed to a base specification and capable of adaptation to meet the needs of future purchasers. All the units have been designed to meet Lifetimes Homes standards.

Affordable housing

47. The masterplan planning permission set out the basis on which affordable housing is to be delivered for the entire site. The development was approved in outline on the basis that a minimum of 25% affordable housing would be provided. In terms of units, this would be a minimum of 533 units and up to 570 units depending on the final number of dwellings provided. The masterplan allows for a range between 2,300 and 2,469 dwellings in total. The overall mix will comply with the Core Strategy and there will be a minimum of 15% 3 bed units within the affordable housing tenure and these will be all social rented.
48. The S106 legal agreement sets out how the affordable housing should be provided on a phased basis. Although the final overall provision is set at 25% the agreement allows for varying levels to be provided in different phases. However there are key 'milestones' set at 400 unit intervals to ensure that a minimum proportion of affordable housing is provided at these intervals. The minimum to be achieved at 400 and 800 units is 20%. By 1,200 units a minimum of 25% affordable housing is required to be delivered and the same requirement is in place at 1,600 and 2,000 units. This is to ensure a relatively even delivery and provision of affordable housing across the development area.
49. Obligations are also imposed in relation to the tenure split which will be a 50:50 split of rented and intermediate but with an absolute maximum of 50% intermediate. All these matters were considered at outline/masterplan stage and the proposals now under consideration in these reserved matters applications fulfil these obligations for the 1st phase of the masterplan – MP1. Hence the matter of the quantum and tenure split of the affordable housing provision is not a matter for consideration in these applications.
50. The phase under consideration, comprising 3 plots – H6, H10 & H13, provides a total of 360 units of which 76 will be affordable. The majority of these are provided within H13, which is all affordable accommodation, with 67 units. The remaining 9 affordable units are located within H6 and H10. The breakdown of affordable units is: 21 rented units most of which will be 3 beds or larger and 55 shared ownership/intermediate units. The mix of affordable housing will be 27 x 1 bed, 28 x 2 bed, 16 x 3 bed and 1 x 4 bed units.
51. Calculated on the basis of habitable rooms overall the provision of affordable housing equates to 25%. At this point in the redevelopment the requirement set out in the legal agreement is for a minimum of 20%. One reason why the level is already at 25% is due to the change in phasing which brings forward the plots south of Heygate Street where there is a high proportion of larger units and where there is a relatively high level of social rented family units due to the scale and character of this part of the site.
52. Whilst the number of units has yet to reach the first milestone of 400 units, having met 25% on 360 units the development will be on target to meet the initial 20% obligation

at the first milestone of 400 units.

53. Local resident objections have been received concerning the presentation of the affordable housing information contained in the documents in that it is obscure and confusing. Section 4.2 of the Design and Access Statement (pg 90) provides an Accommodation Schedule Summary which details the unit numbers, size, and tenure. To clarify, the MP1 development would provide 76 affordable units: 55 of these would be shared ownership and 21 would be rented accommodation. The rented accommodation comprises 4 affordable rent units (one and two beds) and 17 social rent (three and four beds) units. (The rent levels are stipulated in the legal agreement so that 3 bed units and larger will be social rent and 1 & 2 bed units will be affordable rent at no greater than 50% market rent.) Officers consider that the application documents contain the information required to enable assessment but it is agreed that the information could be presented in a more accessible format. This is noted for future reserved matters application submissions.
54. Residents also requested a statement detailing the action the applicant has taken to secure public funds to reduce affordable rent levels. Section 8 of Schedule 3 of the legal agreement does not place an obligation on the developer to secure public funds, and nor would this be feasible. This section requires that, in the event that public funds are secured, the developer should look to improve the affordability criteria of the housing. The developer has not secured public funding for this phase and so there is no action to be taken in this regard on this particular phase.
55. Residents further query whether there is any mechanism for monitoring the figures and assumptions of the 2012 viability assessment against actual delivery, or any mechanism for updating these figures and assumptions. The figures and assumptions set out in the viability assessment were accepted at outline stage. In the event that a further viability report is required to be submitted (if the developer has not substantially commenced the first building within two years of approval of the first reserved matters application), then a comparison would be made between updated information and the original 2012 assessment.

Quality of residential accommodation

56. Development which exceeds maximum densities and/or includes a tall building is expected to demonstrate an exemplary standard of design.
57. The council's Residential Design Standards SPD advises that for a development to be considered as being of an exemplary standard of design, applicants will be expected to demonstrate that their proposed scheme exceeds the residential design standards and includes features such as:
 - significantly exceed minimum floorspace;
 - provide for bulk storage;
 - include a predominance of dual aspect units
 - have natural light and ventilation in kitchens and bathrooms
 - exceed amenity space standards
 - meets good daylight and sunlight standards.

Internal space standards

58. The SPD defines the minimum standards required for internal accommodation, including overall unit as well as individual room sizes. The following table shows the range of proposed unit sizes as compared to the SPD standards.

Unit size (bedroom/person)	SPD Minimum Unit Area (sqm)	Proposed Unit Range (sqm)
Flats		
1-bed (2 person)	50	50-59.3
2-bed (3 person)	61	61-90.2
2-bed (4 person)	70	
2-bed (average)	66	
3-bed (4 person)	74	100.9-120.6
3-bed (5 person)	86	
3-bed (6 person)	95	
3-bed (average)	85	
2 storey houses/duplex		
2-bed (4 person)	83	99.1-117.4
3-bed (4 person)	87	116.1-143.8
3-bed (5 person)	96	
3-bed (6 person)*	99	
3-bed (average)	92	
4-bed (5 person)	100	129.3
4-bed (6 person)	107	
4-bed (average)	104	
3 storey houses		
3-bed (5 person)	102	109-114.3
3-bed (6 person)*	105	
4-bed (5 person)	106	133.3-153.3
4-bed (6 person)	113	
4-bed (7 person)	123	
4-bed (average)	110	

* = The residential design standards SPD does not have a minimum size specified for these unit types. The size targets have been calculated by adding or removing 3sqm to the SPD target for unit types with the same number of bedrooms. All these units are much larger than the SPD average for that unit type.

59. All the residential units either meet or exceed minimum unit sizes as well as the minimum standards for individual rooms within the dwellings. The larger family accommodation is particularly generous in size, including the affordable dwellings, and this is a particular beneficial feature of the MP1 development. All units are provided with sufficient bulk storage. It is preferred for the family 3 and 4 bedroom units to have kitchens separate from living areas to allow for a separation of activities. The affordable family accommodation have separate kitchen/diners and most of the market units have large open plan living areas that will allow some separation.
60. The residential units are predominantly dual aspect with 65% having either a dual or triple aspect. There are 18 north facing single aspect units (or 5% of the total) of which 12 one bedroom market flats are in Plot H10 and 6 one/two bedroom affordable units are in Plot H13. North facing single aspect units should be minimised as far as possible, and where they are unavoidable should be mitigated with larger size units and/or private amenity spaces. The 12 x one-bed market units within Plot H10 meet minimum internal space standards and have some of the smallest balconies within the scheme; however, the northern facade of Plot H10 (fronting Heygate Street) extends along the maximum parameter extent of that plot and therefore to provide projecting balconies and/or bay windows to improve residential amenity would mean setting the block further back within the plot. This would compromise the quality and size of the internal communal courtyard and potentially result in an overlooking issue with the new townhouses opposite. The six affordable single aspect units in Plot H13 are more

generously sized and have larger projecting bay balconies.

61. Overall, in terms of unit size the scheme will deliver a high standard of internal accommodation with the vast majority of dwellings having well in excess of minimum space standards.

Daylight and sunlight

62. An assessment of the likely significant impacts of the Heygate Masterplan development on daylight and sunlight to neighbouring properties as well as likely light levels within the completed development was provided in the ES and ES Addendum at the outline stage. This recommended further assessment at the detailed design stage when the precise location and scale of individual buildings within the plots and the gaps between buildings were known. A daylight, sunlight and overshadowing assessment has been prepared which assesses the proposed MP1 development in accordance with the BRE Guidance 'Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A Guide to Good Practice' (2011).
63. In terms of daylight levels within the completed development, the assessment uses the vertical sky component (VSC) test where the BRE considers that a VSC of 27% would achieve a good level of daylight. When the internal layout and room use in a dwelling is known then a more detailed calculation is the average daylight factor (ADF) which assesses the quality and distribution of light within a room served by a window and takes account of the VSC. The BRE recommend the following minimum ADF values: 2% for kitchens, 1.5% for living rooms and 1% for bedrooms.
64. The report advises that as the potential for daylight improves at the higher levels of a building then the tests have been applied at the lowest floor levels. The test is repeated at each floor level until the required target is met as it is assumed that the target would then be met on all floors above. The table below sets out the number of windows tested within each plot and the number of windows predicted to achieve at least 27% VSC level.

VSC results – completed development			
Development Plot	Windows tested	VSC 27% target met	Percentage
H6	101	71	70%
H10	33	26	79%
H13	44	18	41%
Total MP1	178	115	64.6%

65. Of the remaining 63 windows tested (or 35.4%) which fall below target VSC, all achieve at least 21% VSC and therefore the reported target shortfalls are relatively minor. Further, the number of windows actually tested represents a small proportion of the overall number of windows within the MP1 development, with the remainder of those not tested having a VSC in excess of 27%. As such the overall proportion of windows within the entire MP1 development having a VSC which exceeds target levels would be much higher than that reported.
66. In terms of the ADF test, an Addendum to the Daylight and Sunlight Report was submitted during the course of the application as officers had requested clarification about a number of instances where low ADF levels had been reported for a number of rooms. The ADF has been calculated for each room type up to the storey at which compliance with BRE recommendations is achieved.
67. In total there are 59 habitable rooms (or 5% of the total number) within the MP1 development where the relevant ADF target is not met. Within Plot H6 (Cores C and D) there are 58 bedrooms which are below the 1% ADF target. In all cases the

bedrooms are within good sized units which exceed the council's minimum internal size requirements and benefit from well lit main living/dining areas. All the bedrooms affected are private market dwellings.

68. The remaining room that does not meet target ADF values concerns a living room located in an affordable rented 2 bedroom unit on Plot H13 which achieves 0.62% ADF rather than the target 1.5%. However, the unit is a ground floor duplex unit with a separate kitchen/diner which has an ADF in excess of the recommended 2%. The living room affected is located off a recessed balcony which restricts the amount of light reaching the window.
69. It should be noted that the above compliance figures do not take account of the fact that a number of kitchens within the open plan lounge/kitchen/dining areas do not achieve the 2% target. If kitchens are accommodated within an open plan area then it is preferred if the room achieves the higher 2% target. However, the BRE Guidance does advise that "...if the layout means that a small internal galley-type kitchen is inevitable, it should be directly linked to a well daylight living room." In all cases the calculations show that in every lounge/kitchen/diner, the living area is at least 1.5%. Furthermore, at least 296 out of a total 360 kitchens (or 82.2%) meet the 2% ADF target, including all separate kitchens.
70. In summary, the scheme achieves a relatively high rate of compliance with BRE recommendations and will generally have very good daylight levels for an inner urban location. There are some reported breaches from BRE targets but the recommendations are guidance only. It is often the case where there is a dense pattern of development that such standards can be difficult to achieve.

Sunlight – in the completed development

71. All relevant windows within 90 degrees of due south have been assessed for sunlight availability in accordance with the BRE guidance. The annual probable sunlight hours (APSH) test requires that a window should receive 25% of APSH during summer and least 5% of sunlight hours in the winter months between 21 September and 21 March. Overall, 63.6% of the new dwellings would meet BRE targets good practice targets for sunlight to a living room, and a further 17.6% of dwellings would receive the recommended sunlight for another habitable room (such as kitchen or bedroom). This is sufficiently close to the BRE guidelines to be considered acceptable.
72. Whilst it is evident that there are some cases where daylight and sunlight within the development do not achieve the BRE recommended daylight and sunlight levels it is recognised that BRE guidance has been drafted for use in both urban and suburban areas and therefore it needs to be applied flexibly, particularly in urban areas where the character of higher density accommodation will inevitably have different impacts to lower density suburban areas. Overall, in terms of daylight and sunlight the details submitted are considered acceptable.

Overshadowing – internal courtyards

73. In terms of overshadowing, the BRE guidance recommends that for outdoor amenity areas to be adequately sunlit throughout the year, at least half of a garden or amenity area should receive at least 2 hours of sunlight on 21 March. At the outline application stage, the ES and ES Addendum reported that under both the minimum and maximum parameter conditions, the H13 courtyard would be BRE compliant but the courtyards to Plots H6 and H10 would not meet good practice.
74. The assessment tested both the residential courtyards as well as the private gardens of 41 townhouses located in Plots H6 and H10. The results show that Plot H6 courtyard would receive 5 hours of direct sunlight, Plot H10 would receive 6 hours and Plot H13 4 hours of sunlight on 21 March. This is well in excess of recommended

targets and as such the courtyards will appear well lit all year round. This represents an improvement on that predicted at the outline stage. Of the 41 private gardens tested, 25 (or 61%) meet the BRE recommendation to be considered as well lit amenity areas. The private gardens that do not meet the target comprise the 15 townhouse gardens in Plot H6 (fronting Wansey Street) and the garden of one townhouse in Plot 10. These gardens would receive either 0 or 1 hour of direct sunlight on the 21 March and so would be in shade for much of the time, although to a lesser extent during the summer months when the gardens are most likely to be used. Despite not being well lit all year these gardens will offer large useable amenity areas for future occupiers.

Amenity space provision

75. All new residential development must provide an adequate amount of useable outdoor amenity space which can take the form of private gardens and balconies, shared terraces and roof gardens. In terms of the overall amount of amenity space required, the following would need to be provided in accordance with the Residential Design Standards SPD:

- minimum 50sqm communal amenity space per development
- units of 3 or more bedrooms - 10sqm of private amenity space
- units of 2 bedrooms or less - ideally 10sqm of private amenity space and where this is not possible the remaining amount be added to the communal amenity space total area
- balconies and terraces should be a minimum 3sqm to count towards private amenity space
- For houses, a garden of 50sqm (garden length at least 10m in length)
- 10sqm of play space per child bed space (covering a range of age groups)

76. The MP1 development would need to provide a total of 4,630sqm of outdoor amenity space (4,480sqm of private and 150sqm of communal amenity) to be policy compliant. The scheme proposes a total of 6,166sqm of amenity space for future residents comprising 2,930sqm of private amenity space and 3,236sqm of communal amenity space which significantly exceeds policy standards by 1,536sqm. 400sqm of under 5 years doorstep play will be accommodated within the three courtyards. The distribution of amenity space and child play space provision is detailed below.

Development Plot	Private amenity space on-site	Communal amenity space on-site	Number of children (yield)	Doorstep (under 5) playspace provided
H6	1,768sqm	1,701sqm	23 (of which 14 under 5 years)	150sqm
H10	665sqm	1,023sqm	22 (of which 10 under 5 years)	125sqm
H13	497sqm	512sqm	30 (of which 10 under 5 years)	125sqm
Total	2,930sqm	3,236sqm	75 (of which 34 under 5 years)	400sqm

77. The residential units have access to generously sized, useable private gardens, balconies or terraces with the three and four bedroom units having at least 10sqm private amenity space. The fact that every unit has access to private, useable amenity

space is welcome. There are 3 x three bedroom (5 person) market flats located in Plot H06 (Core C) which each have a total of 11sqm split over two smaller balconies, whereas it is preferred for the minimum 10sqm to be provided as a single space. This is so that the area is capable of being used by the entire household at any one time. These flats significantly exceed minimum internal size requirements and the occupiers will have easy access to high quality communal space in the courtyard.

78. There are 2 x two bedroom duplex affordable wheelchair accessible units in Plot H10 (Core C) and 2 x three and four bedroom duplex affordable family units in Plot H13 (Core A) where balconies are accessed off bedrooms. The SPD specifically states that access to private amenity space should not be from the bedroom. In mitigation, these units are generously proportioned and have landscaped strips (minimum 2m deep) to the front of the properties which could provide small sitting out areas if needed. Again, these units would have easy access to high quality communal amenity space. Given the very small number of units affected, and the amount of high quality communal external space provided, the few transgressions in terms of private amenity space for these family units are acceptable.
79. It is noted that the SPD requirement for 50sqm gardens for houses is not achieved in respect of the ground floor duplexes and townhouses. The applicant advises that this is unfeasible within the courtyard footprint and plot layouts established by the OPP parameters without diminishing the size and usefulness of the communal courtyards. Furthermore, the three storey townhouses along Wansey Street will have access to large roof terraces in addition to the private gardens. The shortfall in garden sizes has been commuted into an additional area within the communal amenity space and this is considered acceptable.
80. In addition to the communal landscaped residential courtyards, communal amenity provision is also proposed on part of the roof areas of H6 tall building (Core D) and H10 (Core C). Building H6D amenity roof would comprise a decked terrace with raised planters, including small fruit trees. The space will be bookable by residents and a small residents' function room would open onto the space. The exact arrangements for this space have to be finalised, but it is likely that there will be a nominal charge for use of this space to cover maintenance costs. Building H10C communal roof space would be divided into a scented/sensory flower garden, including beehives and rooftop allotments with raised garden plots.
81. In terms of outdoor amenity space, officers consider the proposal offers a variety of high quality outdoor space for residents and the fact that all residents have access to useable private amenity space is strongly supported.

Child play provision

82. The overarching approach to child play space on the Heygate Masterplan established by the OPP is to provide as much doorstep play areas (i.e. suitable for 0-5 years) as is practicably possible within each development plot. Additional doorstep play areas could be provided within the public realm in addition to local play (5-11 years) facilities. The new park would offer informal play opportunities for the over 12 years and there are formal facilities off-site within the vicinity. S106 monies were secured to be put towards providing new or enhanced facilities for the over 12s.
83. In accordance with the OPP parameters, the landscaped communal courtyards within each of the MP1 plots would accommodate under 5 years doorstep play split between formal structured play areas as well as informal playable spaces where natural play elements will be incorporated into the landscaping. As demonstrated in the above amenity space table, the quantum of under 5 years child play space provided within the development plots would exceed the required 10sqm per child for the under 5 age group. Furthermore, the courtyards would also offer informal play opportunities for the

older 5-11 years.

84. Play provision will also be provided within the new public realm. A key part of the public realm strategy is the inclusion of 'Playable Routes' or 'Play on the Way' where opportunities for informal play are integrated into the public spaces rather than providing stand alone fenced off play areas. 'Play on the Way' opportunities will be accommodated along Wansey Street, in Wansey Street Gardens, and along the south side of Heygate Street. Further local play provision adjacent to the MP1 development will be provided in future phases of the Heygate Masterplan, including in Brandon Place (sub-phase MP1a) located between Plot H10 and Plot H12 (Energy Centre), the new Walworth Square (MP2) at the junction of Walworth Road and Wansey Street, and the new park (MP3 and MP4). This would then deliver a total of 749sqm of informal and formal doorstep play opportunities for the MP1 development (inclusive of facilities within the residential courtyards of the three plots and incidental play within the public realm) which, together with the new park, easily provides for the anticipated child yield for the development.

Privacy and overlooking within the development

85. In order to prevent harmful overlooking between properties, the Residential Design Standards SPD requires developments to achieve a separation distance of 12m at the front of a building and any elevation that fronts a highway and a minimum 21m separation at the rear of buildings. The approved outline parameter plans were developed in compliance with this requirement.
86. The courtyards are 21m wide at the narrowest point to ensure no overlooking across the courtyards. Where there are gaps between the blocks, the windows have been positioned to ensure there are no direct facing main habitable or secondary windows. There is a 'pinch-point' of some 5.7m at the southern corner of Plot H13 where the rear windows of flats within Core A (facing Rodney Road) would be opposite the rear windows/terraces of the H13 townhouses (Core B). This is somewhat mitigated in that only angled views would be possible and the terraces could incorporate privacy screens.
87. The ground floor townhouses and duplexes that access directly onto the street would have an area of defensible space (between 2m and 3.7m depth) to protect privacy. Low hedges are proposed to delineate the privacy zones and will be maintained by the future Estate Management Company. Railings will be placed in front of the hedge to provide a permanent barrier.
88. In summary, officers consider that the MP1 development has been carefully designed to avoid any harmful impacts upon privacy and overlooking between residential units within the scheme.

Internal noise

89. Conditions 39 and 40 of the OPP require new residential units on the Heygate Masterplan to be designed as far as reasonably practicable to attain good standards of internal noise levels and noise tests will need to be submitted to demonstrate compliance with council's standards prior to the occupation.

Conclusion

90. The proposed MP1 development would deliver high quality residential accommodation. The generous size offered for most of the units, particularly the larger family units, as well as the amount and quality of the amenity spaces and play provision is very positive. There are some rooms which would not meet BRE recommendations for daylight and sunlight as well as some private gardens to the townhouses but in this urban context the light levels are generally good. Furthermore, the predominance of dual aspect units will help to improve the quality of the

accommodation. It is true that there are 12 single aspect north facing flats that just meet minimum standards, but these represent only 3% of the accommodation offered. Accordingly, officers consider that the standard of accommodation is sufficiently high to justify the level of development proposed, including the tall building.

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

91. Saved Policy 3.2 of the Southwark Plan states that planning permission for development will not be granted where it would cause a loss of amenity, including disturbance from noise, to present and future occupiers in the surrounding area or on the application site. Furthermore, there is a requirement in Policy 3.1 to ensure that development proposals will not cause material adverse effects on the environment and quality of life. Strategic Policy 13 of the Core Strategy requires developments to avoid amenity and environmental problems that affect how we enjoy the environment in which we live and work.

Daylight and sunlight to surrounding properties

92. The assessment uses two methods to test the impact on daylight levels to neighbouring properties. Firstly, the VSC where a target of 27% VSC is considered to be a good level of daylight. The BRE advise that acceptable levels of daylight can still be achieved if VSC levels remain within 0.8 times (or 80%) of their original value following construction of a new development. Any greater loss (i.e. loss of 20% or more) would mean there would be a noticeable reduction in the amount of daylight received. The guidance advises that bathrooms, toilets, storerooms, circulation areas and garages need not be analysed.
93. The no sky line (NSL) or daylight distribution method has also been used which assesses the proportion of the room where the sky is visible and plots the change in the NSL between the existing and proposed situation. The BRE advises that if there is a reduction of 20% in the area of sky visibility, daylight may be affected.
94. The report assesses the impact upon all those residential properties within the vicinity of the site that have the potential to be materially affected. These properties are:
- 1-15 Peabody Buildings;
 - 23-24, 37-38 Larcom Street;
 - 1-9, 10-18 Brandon Street;
 - 44A, 44B, 46B, 46, 48, 50, 52 Brandon Street;
 - 1-7 Brandon Mews; and
 - 26 (Garland Court), 28, 30, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, 42, 44, 46, 48, 50, 54, 56, 58, 60, 62, 64, 66, 68 Wansey Street.
95. The results show that of the total 495 relevant windows tested for VSC, 395 windows (or 80%) achieve the BRE recommended VSC levels with the MP1 development in place. Of the windows that don't achieve target levels, the properties most affected are:
- 1-15 Peabody Buildings
 - 23-24, 37-38 Larcom Street
 - 44A, 44B, 46, 46B, 48, 50 Brandon Street.

At least 50% of the windows tested in each of these properties would not achieve recommended VSC targets, or in the case of 44B and 46 Brandon Street none of the windows tested would meet targets.

96. Where windows do not meet recommended targets the VSC losses would be greater

than 20% (in the region of 20.6% up to 37.6%) and therefore, as advised by the BRE, a change to daylighting could be noticeable. However in the vast majority of cases, the windows affected would still achieve in excess of 20% VSC and therefore retain a level of light not significantly below the 27% recommended VSC. There are instances where the existing VSC is already considerably below the target VSC and relatively small reductions in actual VSC levels appear disproportionately high in percentage terms. In reality the change to daylight is unlikely to be significant under these circumstances.

97. In terms of the no-sky line analysis, of the relevant rooms assessed, 87% achieved the BRE recommended level with the development in place. Again the properties most affected are 23-24 and 37-38 Larcom Street and 44A and 44B Brandon Street. Where alterations to direct skylight would be experienced, in most cases the rooms would retain light to over 50% of their areas.
98. It is recognised that there are some neighbouring properties that will experience reductions to VSC and NSL levels over and above that recommended by the BRE. The main purpose of the BRE is to assist in the consideration of the relationship between new and existing development and the potential for development to retain good daylight and sunlight levels. The guidelines have been drafted for use in both suburban and urban areas and therefore need to be applied flexibly, particularly in urban areas where the character of higher density accommodation will inevitably have different impacts to lower density suburban areas. Taking all matters into consideration, including the relatively small number of windows and rooms affected, officers believe that the MP1 development will not reduce daylight to neighbouring properties to unacceptably harmful levels.

Sunlight

99. The impact of the scheme on sunlight to neighbouring properties has been assessed using the APSH test which requires at least 25% of annual probable sunlight hours during the summer and at least 5% of sunlight hours during the winter. The guidance advises that if a reduction in sunlight is 20% or less of its original value then the retained sunlight received is adequate.
100. The impacts of the scheme on sunlight have been considered with respect to the following properties where there are windows within 90 degrees of due south:
 - 23-24 Larcom Street
 - 1-9 Brandon Street
 - 44A, 44B, 46, 48, 50, 52 Brandon Street
 - 1-7 Brandon Mews
 - 48 Wansey Street
 - 26 Wansey Street – Garland Court.
101. The results show that with the MP1 development in place, the properties tested would be BRE compliant in respect of both Annual and Winter APSH levels with the exception of 46 Brandon Street where minor impacts would occur to two rooms. In respect of one room the reductions in annual and winter APSH levels are only marginally in excess of the recommended 20% change (being 22.2%). The other room already experiences low annual and no winter APSH levels in the existing situation. Accordingly, the impact on the sunlight levels of this property is not considered to be seriously harmful.
102. At the outline application stage, the impacts to daylight and sunlight to a number of neighbouring properties, including those on Wansey Street, Larcom Street and Brandon Street were identified as ranging from minor to substantial as a result of the minimum and maximum parameters for the development plots and consequently the

ES and ES Addendum recommended that further testing would be needed at the detailed design stage. The daylight and sunlight assessment now submitted also compares the impacts identified as a result of the MP1 development against the impacts identified at the outline stage. The results generally show that the MP1 development would have a similar level of impact to surrounding properties as that caused by the minimum OPP parameters. The impact on daylight and sunlight levels for the entire Heygate Masterplan was considered carefully at the outline stage where the identified impacts were considered to be within accepted tolerances. The MP1 proposal does not breach any of the accepted parameters and has been designed to ensure that impacts to the amenity of surrounding residential properties are minimised.

103. In summary, it is considered that the impacts of the MP1 proposal on the daylight and sunlight to neighbouring residential properties is acceptable and is unlikely to result in material changes to the levels currently experienced to such an extent that planning permission should be refused. As noted, the impacts are within the parameters considered acceptable at the outline stage.

Overshadowing

104. The ES and ES Addendum for the OPP tested sunlight availability to 12 existing amenity areas in the vicinity of the Heygate Masterplan site. The only one close enough to MP1 development to be affected is Victory Community Park and Playground and therefore the impact of MP1 on this space has been assessed. The results show that with the completion of MP1, 100% of the park and playground achieves at least 2 hours of sunlight and complies with the BRE recommended sunlight level for a space to appear adequately sunlit throughout the year.

Outlook and privacy

105. It was recognised at the outline application stage that the closest existing residential properties to the development would be those along Wansey Street. In order to protect the privacy and amenity of existing occupiers, Condition 12 of the OPP requires a minimum distance of 15m between new and existing building faces (excluding balcony projection) to be maintained along Wansey Street and that a minimum distance of 10m to be maintained between the maximum parameter extent of Plot H10 and the application boundary to the south of Wansey Street. There would be about 21m separation between the new townhouses on Plot H16 and the existing properties opposite, and about 18m separation from the Plot H10 to those opposite. As such, the proposal does not give rise to any impacts upon the privacy of adjoining existing residents.

Impacts during construction

106. The ES and ES Addendum submitted with the outline application considered that the principal impacts on air quality would be from dust generating activities and vehicle emissions from construction traffic during the construction phases. Naturally, those living closest to the development site (as well as future occupiers of the site as earlier phases are completed) would be the most likely to experience nuisance at different times and magnitude over the estimated 13-year construction programme for the entire Heygate Masterplan development.
107. The air quality assessment submitted in support of the MP1 applications confirms that if mitigation measures were not in place then the risk of dust effects would be high, particularly when earthworks occur in the vicinity of residential properties with those closest being the existing properties to the south in Wansey Street. In mitigation, the OPP legal agreement secures the submission of a construction environmental management plan (CEMP) for each phase of the Heygate Masterplan development, including MP1. Furthermore, Condition 20 of the OPP requires dust monitoring to be undertaken before works on each construction phase commences and monitoring

throughout the works to ensure the agreed targets are met. Further, the MP1 air quality report recommends a number of measures that should be included within a CEMP for MP1, including a stakeholder communications plan to ensure community engagement before and during MP1 works.

108. Similarly, at the outline application stage it was recognised that noise and vibration during construction would potentially have a substantial adverse impact for sensitive receptors closest to the site boundaries. Mitigation measures were therefore secured through the S106 requirement for the CEMP and noise and vibration monitoring in accordance with conditions 21 and 22.
109. The measures secured by the OPP to minimise construction impacts are considered robust and should ensure that potential adverse effects are reduced as far as possible. It is considered that no further mitigation or measures are required in respect of the MP1 development.

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

110. The existing uses surrounding the MP1 development are predominantly residential in character and therefore compatible with the proposal. In this location the major factors affecting future occupiers would be air pollution and acoustic impacts.

Air quality – in the completed development

111. The site is within an air quality management area (AQMA) as existing air quality is currently poor with the principal source of pollution being from road traffic. The air quality chapter contained in the ES and ES Addendum for the outline application considered that further work would need to be undertaken at the reserved matters detailed design stage to minimise the potential impacts of emissions from road traffic and from the heating plant in the energy centre (Plot H12). An air quality assessment accompanies the MP1 applications.

Temporary boiler plant

112. Two temporary gas boilers are proposed on the ground floor of Plot H6 tall building (Core D) as the Energy Centre is not required to become first operational until prior to the occupation of the 605th unit of the Heygate Masterplan and Trafalgar Place Developments or until there is sufficient thermal demand (3GWh). The temporary boilers would discharge through adjacent flues at a height of 55.23m AOD on the H6 tall building. The boilers would be ultra-low NOx (nitrogen oxides) boilers with emissions at 26mg/kWh in order to minimise impacts on air quality.
113. The assessment found that at ground level the boilers would have a negligible or slight adverse effect on proposed residential receptors within 50m of the tall building. The receptors most likely to be affected would be those on the future Plot H3 located to the west of Plot H6 and fronting Walworth Road. The impact of the boilers on the actual facade of the tall building would be low below 50m but would increase as the height of the flue is reached so that maximum impacts occur at the full height of the building at 55m AOD. Consequently, access to the uppermost roof area of the H6 tall building is proposed to be restricted to occasional use for maintenance and a green roof is would be provided on this element of the plot. All air intakes on the tall building are located below 53m AOD and therefore this access restriction would not apply to the proposed amenity roof terraces. Concentrations at the windows of the upper floors below 50m were found to be acceptable.
114. It should be noted that the test results are based on both boilers operating continuously at full load and represents a worst case scenario. Nevertheless, the testing undertaken demonstrates that the impacts are acceptable at all heights and

that no mitigation is required in relation to the use of sealed windows, location of air intakes for ventilation systems etc with the exception of restricting access to the uppermost roof area. In any event the boilers are a temporary solution until the Energy Centre becomes operational, and Condition 45 of the OPP secures the submission and approval of boiler plant management plans (whether temporary or permanent CHP or boiler equipment) prior to occupation of that development plot to ensure impacts on air quality are minimised. The impacts of a site-wide Energy Centre will be considered in a future reserved matters application.

Traffic impacts

115. The traffic impacts of the completed development itself on air quality were found to be of negligible significance, although it is acknowledged that in combination with existing pollution sources, pollution levels are likely to remain high for some time. Mitigation measures to limit air quality impacts of road traffic associated with the development have been secured in the OPP, including financial contributions to public transport improvements, new cycle routes, cycle hire, car club schemes and travel plans.
116. For completeness, the Air Quality Assessment has also considered the cumulative potential operations impacts resulting from the effects of increased vehicular emissions on the local road network and emissions from the temporary boiler plant. These could have impacts on both existing residential receptors and on future properties on the development, and in the case of traffic, subsequent phases of the Heygate Masterplan. Again, mitigation measures have been secured in the OPP to encourage sustainable transport choices and details of boiler room management plans. In general, the development is predicted to have a negligible impact on local air quality and no significant worsening of existing exceedance of air quality objectives are predicted as a result of the development.
117. The Environmental Protection Team has confirmed that the Air Quality Assessment is comprehensive and well reasoned. The conclusions are sound and the proposed mitigation is sufficient.

Noise impacts – in the completed development

118. A number of conditions were secured on the OPP to ensure that future residents of the Heygate Masterplan development, including MP1, have an adequate level of amenity. Conditions 39 to 43 require specific noise standards (both internal and external) to be achieved in residential dwellings and that adequate measures are in place in terms of soundproofing and protection from plant noise. It is considered that these measures are robust and will secure an adequate level of amenity for future occupiers. No further mitigation or measures are required for the MP1 development in respect of noise.

Design issues

Masterplan layout

119. Whilst this is prescribed by the approved parameter plans, the variance between the maximum and minimum parameters of the outline approval allows a degree of flexibility to designers in response to the local context.
120. The main adjustments to the illustrative scheme – within the defined parameters – include:
 1. Plot H6 has been angled towards the south-west corner and extends to its maximum parameter. This has been done to preserve a number of large trees in the courtyard and Wansey Street, to reflect the hierarchy of the streets in this area and encourage permeability to the north from the Walworth Square, along the new retail street to the new park and the Elephant & Castle Mainline station beyond. This

change highlights the proposed angled block and enables Wansey Street – which is due to be closed to vehicular access from the Walworth Road in this location – to remain open for local pedestrian access, preserving its residential character.

2. Plot H10 has been straightened out to introduce a new alignment to the extended Wansey Street. This has been done to maximise the internal courtyard garden in this plot which is relatively narrow in outline and in order to adhere to the separation distances set out in the adopted Residential Design Standards. This adjustment introduces a bend in Wansey street and reinforces its residential character and brings into view the terrace of houses proposed along its northern edge both on plots H6 and H10. At the same time this subtle but effective change places the northern edge of Plot H13 on axis making it a focus of this local view.

3. The plot H13 perimeter block has been moved to the northern-most maximum parameter. This has been done to preserve a number of large trees on the site and maintain a high level of separation across Content Street to the south.

121. Plots H6 and H10 are designed as a perimeter blocks with buildings on three sides encircling a landscaped communal courtyard at grade. To the south on Wansey street the proposal takes the form of a terrace of 3-storey houses to complement the residential setting of the street. To the north on Heygate Street the proposal includes two 8-storey mansion block style apartment blocks with maisonettes at their bases. Between H6 and H10 is a new access route which gives the plots an urban character and offers views into the landscaped courtyard.
122. On the western face of H6 the block rises from 7 storeys at the southern end to a 15-storey tower at the Heygate Street frontage. On the eastern side of H10 the mansion block on Heygate Street is bookended with the more modest scale of a terrace of houses facing Rodney Road. The separate components of each plot are articulated with gaps which offer views into the landscaped courtyards and ensure that these spaces will become the focus of the development.
123. Parking is accommodated in a basement located under the terrace of houses and accessed from Heygate Street. This results in courtyards that are generous and well proportioned with mature planting. All the blocks can be accessed from the street and the basement car parking is via the landscaped courtyards which allows all the residents to enjoy these landscaped spaces.

Scale, massing and architectural design

Plots H6 & H10

124. *Terrace of houses*
The proposed terrace of houses on Wansey Street is modest and well designed and reflects the proportions and bay-design of the Victorian properties in the Conservation Area across the way. This is a sound approach and complements the historic setting appropriately. Brick and stone are the chosen materials.
125. The detailed design is informed by the Wansey Street typology and includes an integrated and appropriate defensible space at the front of every house as well as a bay window feature which introduces a modern interpretation of the Victorian properties in the conservation area across the way. All the buildings are designed in the round with flank walls to the terrace designed with windows and Juliette balconies to offer interest and natural surveillance to the pedestrian routes.
126. *Mid-height blocks*
To the north the mansion blocks on H6 and H10 have been designed individually. The H6 mansion block is highly articulated and stepped to break up its mass into bays which reflect the plot-widths of a typical London Street. In contrast, on H10 the

mansion block has been designed as a singular form rising at the eastern corner to terminate Heygate Street with two roof-top villas.

127. Here too brick and stone are proposed as the main cladding materials with contrasting colours of string courses, cornices and window surrounds used to emphasise the proportions of the openings as well as the base middle and tops of each building. The buildings benefit from active frontages with front doors and lobby entrances accessed directly off the street. The blocks are designed with in-set balconies on the street frontages.
128. To the rear, facing onto the courtyard, the blocks become less formal in their expression with oversailing balconies opening out onto the landscaped courtyards. The mansion blocks hold great potential in design terms. Their contrasting forms will give Heygate Street a confident character and an appropriate townscape without becoming overly dominant or relentless. The design distributes the height of buildings appropriately and rises at either end of the two sites to 'bookend' the street and give each group of buildings its urban setting.
129. In their architectural detailing the flanks of the H6 mansion blocks are well designed with openings especially at the lower levels and at the set-backs on Heygate Street to establish natural surveillance of public routes and thoroughfares. Entrances to lobbies are prominent and generous especially from Heygate Street and the landscaped courtyards. Plant, cycle storage and servicing frontage at the base of the building has been minimised and concentrated at the northern end of H6 and accessed mainly from the courtyard.
130. The scheme includes two roof-top villas at the eastern end of H10. These are simple geometric forms that catch the eye and are intended to lead the viewer round onto Heygate Street from Rodney Road. The detailed design for these rooftop villas is less well developed and could benefit from further finessing and delineation and could be reserved by condition.
131. *The Tower*
The tower is located as described in the outline permission, at the northern-most end of the Walworth Square on plot H3 and at the southern end of the retail street. As such it has a role to play to encourage permeability on the retail street to give Walworth Square a sense of enclosure and as a focus of views along Heygate Street and Walworth Road.
132. The tower rises from the angled form of the mid-height block on the western edge of H6. This block is designed with a double-height base and steps up from 8-storeys in height at Wansey Street to its full height of 15 storeys at Heygate Street. The western face of H6 is expressed as a single form that is folded at the middle and stepped at the northern corner where it turns to rise in a cruciform shape as the main body of the tower.
133. At the top of the tower the accommodation is set in on two sides to create two very generous roof-top terraces which are enclosed by colonnades to give the tower a recessive and layered appearance. The tower is to be clad in brick with stone banding to break up its mass and reflect its stepped geometric form. The tower design has developed well and the building has taken on a character of its own. Its design is elegant and highly articulated and holds great potential which should be evident in the local and wider views.
134. The tower has a well defined base, middle and top and has a stepped design which recedes as it reaches the top. The cruciform plan is effective in reducing the bulk of the tower. With careful detailing and a robust selection of cladding materials, including

the presentation of a mock-up, the architectonic qualities of the tower will be embedded in the constructed scheme and should be conditioned. At the top, the tower design includes two expansive terraces, one of which is open to residents. This is a feature of the design which could give the top lighter, more lattice-like appearance and needs further refinement. The detailed design of the top three storeys of the tower should therefore be reserved by condition to retain the elegant lattice-like appearance that is required.

135. The tower is well articulated, simple in form and a well proportioned composition. It differentiates itself sufficiently from the main blocks and is complemented by the significant public realm surrounding it as well as the large public space that will follow to the west on plot H3. The design has exceptional qualities which lie in its rigorous architectural proportions, high quality materials, elegant narrow proportions and recessive form. The cumulative views demonstrate that the tower will complement the emerging character of the Heygate which includes a number of tall buildings. In conclusion, due to the exceptional quality of design, the significant contribution to the public realm and its contribution to the emerging skyline, the tower complies with saved Policy 3.20 of the Southwark Plan (2007).

H13

136. Plot H13 has taken its design cue from the neighbouring Peabody buildings and designed as two seven-storey mansion blocks arranged along Rodney Road. At the base the design has maisonettes with front doors leading off the street and the upper floors are set back and divided into bays with traditional bay windows. On Content Street the scheme includes a modest terrace of houses which reflect the residential properties across the way. In addition, the courtyard offers a visual amenity to Brandon Street and retains the existing mature trees.
137. This part of the development is highly articulated. Broken down into three blocks, and separated by gaps on this narrow triangular site, the architectural design takes on the bay-design of the Peabody buildings to the south. As a consequence the architects have chosen to use a more restrained palette of materials, contrasting a mid-grey brown brick with a white brick window surrounds and stone banding. This palette of materials works well. The restrained aesthetic and materials palette works well for the main part of Plot H13.
138. Height and scale has been concentrated at the northern end where the set-back design and upper storey bay features give way to a sheer 7-storey block at the junction of Brandon and Wansey Streets. This block has to play an important role in terminating Wansey Street and facing onto two public spaces, the community garden on Wansey Street – included in this application - and the public space at the energy centre site which will follow in due course.
139. In terms of Secured by Design matters, the Metropolitan Police are satisfied with the MP1 proposal and that the development plots have been designed to optimise natural surveillance over the street and provide defensible space at ground level. The police have requested that the applicant achieves full Secured by Design accreditation on completion of the development and this is already secured by Condition 47 of the OPP.

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

140. The applicant has provided a number of relevant views to aid the assessment of the impact on heritage and in particular the impact of the tower. At the centre of the conservation area is the Grade II Listed St John's Church. The accurate rendered view submitted with application has been deliberately selected to illustrate the impact of the development from Larcom Street at the church and demonstrates that there is

limited visibility in this location. The top few floors of the brick and stone tower are visible in this view. The verticality of the design and the proposed materials complement the character and appearance of the conservation area in the view. Added to that the recessive and lattice-like qualities of its top two floors ensure that it is not a harmful intrusion into this historic setting.

141. The significance of the Grade II listed group of civic buildings on the Walworth Road which includes Walworth Town Hall, Newington Library and The Larcom Street Clinic are in their architectural splendour, their varied and intricate silhouette and their stone and masonry cladding. The Town Hall is one of the most dominant features of the group.
142. In relation to the Town hall group the views of the development from the Walworth Road are important and were considered at the outline permission as well as at the detailed design stage. They demonstrate that the tower, set-back one block from the Walworth Road and the Wansey Street frontages and fronting onto Heygate Street, coupled with its predominantly stone and brick appearance and recessive top, will not be overly dominant, it will appear layered behind the Wansey Street buildings and will complement the architectural and historic significance of this historic group.
143. English Heritage has confirmed that they do not wish to offer any comment on the MP1 applications.

Public realm

144. The MP1 development proposal provides 1.13 hectares of new public realm that is defined by a hierarchy of different types of streets and spaces that connect with the existing wider area to the south and east and improve permeability to the north. The key areas of public realm are summarised below.
145. Central Shopping Street/Walworth Square
This street forms the first section of a new retail-led street that will run north-south parallel to Walworth Road and connect to the new Park. This street will form a shared space where furniture and landscaping/tree planting would be arranged to create pedestrian zones at either side of the street with informal cycle access through the centre. Vehicular access would be limited for servicing purposes. The southern end of the Central Shopping Street (located to the front of Garland Court) would connect to the new Walworth Square positioned at the junction with Walworth Road. The square itself is outside of the MP1 redline boundary and the detailed design will come forward in a subsequent masterplan phase. The landscaping at this southern end of the shopping street comprises new paving and planting which is to be designed to safeguard the amenities of Garland Court residents.
146. Wansey Street/Brandon Street/Content Street (including Wansey Street Garden)
Wansey Street is currently a residential cul-de-sac with access from Walworth Road. It is proposed to alter the access and create a vehicular link that will connect through to Brandon Street to the east. The existing vehicular access at the Walworth Road junction would be limited/restricted in connection with the new Walworth Square. This route will provide a new connection between Walworth Road and development to the east of MP1, including Victory Primary School. Additional tree planting and 'play-on-the-way' is proposed as well as Wansey Street Garden which will provide a landscaped informal amenity space with extended meadow area and woodland planting. A reconfigured car parking layout is also proposed to cater for existing permit holder parking as well as additional on-street permit parking for new residents of the development. A vehicular turning head is proposed towards the western end of the street. The reconfigured layout will also accommodate new refuse stores on build-outs between parking spaces which can accommodate 2 Eurobins per store to replace the

refuse bins for the existing properties on the south side of the street. This will significantly enhance the existing refuse arrangements which are proving visually detrimental as well as causing an obstruction to residents.

147. Heygate Street/Rodney Road

An urban boulevard would be created along Heygate Street by the retention of large mature trees, new tree planting, street furniture and defensible space for the new residential units fronting these streets. A new bus stop and pedestrian footways are also proposed along Heygate Street.

148. Park Street South

This new route will connect Wansey Street to the eastern end of the new park. It bisects the residential courtyards of Plots H6 and H10 and informal tree planting is proposed to complement the landscaping in the courtyards. The vehicular entrance to the basement car park beneath Plots H6 and H10 is at the Heygate end of this street. A high-top disabled parking space would be provided on-street. The remaining part of the street is designed as a shared space for pedestrians and cyclists.

149. The proposed public realm layout is highly permeable to both pedestrians and cyclists and where routes are proposed to be shared with vehicles then the vehicular access will be restricted. This will significantly improve connectivity through the site as well as integrate the development with the surrounding area. To this extent the public realm proposal fully accords with the parameters and principles established by the OPP.

150. The submitted drawings show that the scheme has the potential to create a high quality publically accessible environment which will be of benefit to the wider community as well as future occupiers of the development. There are, however, some transport and landscaping issues concerning the detailed design of the public realm that will be need to addressed and these are discussed in the relevant sections of this report.

Traffic issues

151. Strategic Policy 2 of the Core Strategy sets out that through development, the council will encourage walking, cycling and the use of public transport. The application site is located in a high PTAL (Transport for London Public Transport Accessibility Level) area of 6b, and therefore benefits from excellent links to public transport. A Transport Assessment and Framework Travel Plan were submitted as part of the OPP which assessed the likely transport impacts of the Heygate Masterplan and mitigation measures were secured either by condition or legal agreement.

Access arrangements

152. In accordance with the OPP parameters, the MP1 development would provide a new vehicular link to Brandon Street from the east side of Wansey Street. Vehicular access to Wansey Street from Walworth Road will be restricted (cycle access and emergency vehicles only) in connection with the provision of the new Walworth Square at the junction of Walworth Road which will form part of a later phase of the wider Heygate Masterplan development.

153. Vehicular access to the basement car park below Plots H6 and H10 would via an inclined entry ramp at the north-western corner of Plot H10. The ramp would operate on a signal controlled alternate single lane basis with priority given to vehicles entering to ensure that vehicles do not queue either on the adjacent new shared space, 'Park Street South', or out onto Heygate Street. Vehicle tracking diagrams have been submitted to demonstrate the adequacy of this arrangement and highways officers are satisfied with this although detailed drawings of the basement ramp (including length and gradient) will need to be secured by condition.

Pedestrian and cycle movements

154. The key cycle and pedestrian routes have already been established at the outline application stage. Pedestrian and cycle access to the MP1 development would be from a number of locations including Walworth Road, Wansey Street, Heygate Street, Rodney Road, and Brandon Street. New pedestrian and cycle routes (unsigned) through the MP1 development are also proposed to the west of Plot H6 on the new Central Shopping Street and between Plots H6 and H10 on Park Street South. Existing pedestrian and cycle routes will also be improved along Wansey Street, Heygate Street, Brandon Street, and Content Street. As such, there will be a number of desired movements around and within the MP1 development site with new highways created and new connections to existing destinations. The development will also create new destinations that will be accessible and beneficial to the wider community. The development will provide greater pedestrian and cycle permeability than existing and provide desirable origins as well as convenient through connections for a variety of users. The improved connectivity that the MP1 development will bring is particularly welcome.
155. Shared spaces, including the Central Shopping Street and Park Street South, are proposed between the development plots which will be subject to vehicular restrictions. However, these restrictions are not currently proposed to include cyclists and therefore all routes and spaces will need to be designed to ensure there is no conflict between all users. Although the council supports carefully designed shared spaces, shared surfaces are not supported unless a delineated space for pedestrians is provided. This is particularly important for more vulnerable pedestrians, including those with vision or mobility impairments requiring physical clues to aid navigation. This can be provided through segregated pedestrian routes using street furniture or low vertical alignment. A landscaping condition is recommended which will require further details of the hard and soft treatment of the new shared routes, including delineated pedestrian pathways, subject to the council's standards.
156. Highways officers note that there is a potential conflict from Walworth Square to Wansey Street as both emergency vehicles and cycle access need to be provided and will require to be delineated from the pedestrian access. Although Walworth Square sits outside the remit of the MP1 phase the design of the western end of Wansey Street should not preclude the detailed design of Walworth Square to the required standards. A condition will be required to cover all public realm detailed design to ensure that it is in line with Southwark's standards and conforms to Road Safety Audits Stages 1, 2, and 3.
157. The OPP requires provision of two signed and/or way marked direct cycle routes through the estate, one of which will run north-south between Brandon Street and Heygate Street. This is shown indicatively in the OPP through an area of new public realm ('Brandon Place') to be provided between Plots H10 and H12 (Energy Centre). Brandon Place and associated sign posted cycle route do not form part of the MP1 development and will come forward in a subsequent phase.
158. Car parking
The OPP allows for a total of 616 car parking spaces (including a maximum of 62 on-street spaces) to be provided on the Heygate Masterplan development. The Masterplan site is located within a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) and therefore the legal agreement (Paragraph 13.2 of Schedule 3) currently stipulates that new residents of the development (with the exception of blue badge holders) will not be allowed to apply for on-street parking permits.
159. A basement car park is proposed beneath part of Plots H6 and H10 containing 69 car parking spaces, of which 34 spaces are accessible for wheelchair users. In addition,

10 motor bike parking spaces and 3 mobility scooter parking spaces are proposed in the basement. The inclusion of motor cycle parking is somewhat of a concern as officers consider the reasons for seeking car-free development in the CAZ apply equally to motorcycles which generally have poor environmental performance. At the outline stage officers recommended that the number of motorcycle spaces should be minimised at the reserved matters stage. To this extent the number of motor cycle spaces is not excessive when considering the total number of residential units within MP1 and on balance this aspect of the scheme is acceptable.

160. The applicant commits to providing a minimum of 20% of the basement car parking spaces to be equipped with electric vehicle charging points with a further 20% with passive provision. Whilst greater provision would be welcome and encouraged, this level accords with London Plan standards. Condition 55 of the OPP and Paragraph 14.5 of Schedule 3 of the legal agreement requires details of the car parking layout and management for each development plot, including the number and monitoring of demand for electric charging points. It is hoped that a greater level of provision exceeding London Plan standards can be provided in subsequent phases of the Heygate Masterplan.
161. At street level, it is proposed to reconfigure the existing Wansey Street car parking provision to create additional CPZ parking bays for use by future occupiers of the new town houses fronting onto Wansey Street and Content Street as well as the wider community. This would necessitate a variation to the legal agreement to allow a definitive number of new residents to apply for parking permits in the CPZ. A separate application for a Deed of Variation is currently being considered (application reference 13-AP-3602). The justification for the change is that there is insufficient space within the plot boundaries to provide street level parking outside the townhouses and the basement parking would be less convenient. Officers accept the principle of allowing additional permit parking for new residents of the larger family townhouses on the basis that there would be no net loss of existing parking spaces on the street, and that the number of new permit bays is counted against the Heygate Masterplan site-wide total of 616 parking spaces allowed by the OPP.
162. 21 new CPZ parking spaces were originally proposed to be provided along Wansey Street in addition to re-providing the existing CPZ parking spaces. During the course of the application discussions have been ongoing as to whether this level of additional parking could be satisfactorily accommodated within the street and that further detail was required to demonstrate a level of additional permit parking based on existing demand and capacity. Furthermore, officers needed to be assured that the existing provision could be adequately re-provided which comprises 31 residential parking bays on Brandon Street and Wansey Street, three disabled bays on Wansey Street, two short-stay parking bays on Content Street, and three pay-and-display bays from outside the Town Hall. It has been agreed that the two disabled bays associated with the Town Hall could be re-provided in the second masterplan phase – MP2.
163. The parking layout also needed to take account of the proposed public realm enhancements, including new street tree planting, as highways officers had raised concerns that the build-outs shown for street trees did not appear to meet adoptable standards (3.5m required) which may impact on the number of parking spaces to be provided. Further detail was also required about the distance achieved between the trunk centres of proposed new street trees and building facades to determine whether these are acceptable.
164. A revised car parking plan and technical note (dated 21 January 2014) has been submitted to show an updated parking layout and demonstrates the safe re-provision of the existing bays and additional bay provision. A parking beat survey was carried out (Sunday 12 and Tuesday 14 January 2014) to assess the current demand for on-

street parking on Wansey Street, Content Street, Larcom Street and Brandon Street.

165. The revised layout parking layout (drawing 28900/005/SK22 Rev L) shows that the proposed design layout of Wansey Street could accommodate at least an additional 5 permit parking spaces over and above the existing provision of 31 permit spaces in Brandon Street and Wansey Street. The three disabled parking bays on Wansey Street and two short-stay bays on Content Street will also be re-provided in the current location. A condition is therefore recommended to require details of the Wansey Street car parking layout which allows a minimum of five additional spaces as well as re-provision of the existing parking bay and two car club bays.
166. The parking survey undertaken demonstrates that there is existing capacity on-street for 12 vehicles within the permit bays. It is therefore acknowledged that based on a minimum of five additional permit parking bays provided on-street, and with the demonstration of existing capacity, the legal agreement could be varied to allow up to 17 new parking permits for future residents of the townhouses with no adverse impact to existing local residents. Notwithstanding this, the applicant has advised that they will seek an amendment to the legal agreement to allow for an allocation of 15 CPZ permits and therefore leaving a margin of spare capacity within the street. Officers consider this acceptable in terms of existing and future demand for on-street car parking. Measures to reduce car dependence have been secured by the legal agreement.
167. The reconfigured parking layout would also provide 2 on-street car club spaces which will contribute towards the overall OPP requirement to provide 16 car club spaces on the wider Heygate Masterplan site. To clarify, total 616 car parking spaces allowed on the masterplan site does not include car club spaces. In accordance with the OPP legal agreement, 3 years car club membership for each eligible household will be provided. In addition, a high-top disabled parking space is proposed within Park Street South which is also welcome.
168. Local resident objections about the proposed additional on-street parking spaces have been received. The residents consider that the 616 parking spaces granted by the outline consent is an already generous breach of council policy on a site where 'car-free' development would normally be required. They assume that the proposed on-street spaces would be in addition to the consented 616 parking spaces and that no viability assessment is submitted to support these additional spaces. Further, that the applicant has not set out the considerations that have informed the proposed level of car parking and therefore there is no justification for any additional parking.
169. The level of car parking provision was considered very carefully at the outline application stage where the applicant's justification for 616 parking spaces based on viability, particularly in respect of the deliverability and saleability of the larger family units, was supported by the district valuer who assessed the financial appraisal on behalf of the local planning authority. The MP1 development includes a high proportion of larger 3 plus bedroom family units (16.6%) and hence officers have agreed that some additional on-street parking for the townhouses could be provided. It is important to note that the proposed on-street spaces are not additional to the maximum 616 spaces allowed by the OPP, rather they make-up part of the total site-wide quantum. As such, no further viability assessment is required to be submitted in support of these spaces.
170. The legal agreement (at Paragraph 14.1 of Schedule 3) also requires the submission of a car parking scheme prior to or at the same time as the submission of each reserved matters application which should include details of the considerations that have informed the proposed parking quantum. Accordingly a separate submission has been made alongside the MP1 reserved matters applications (reference 13-AP-

3593) which references the relevant sections of the MP1 application documentation in support. The applicant explains that a scheme of this size is partly reliant on offering a range of homes and options to potential purchasers in order to achieve the required sales rates to secure the deliverability of the regeneration of the site, which is intrinsic to the overall viability. This is especially the case for larger, family homes, the sales of which will be affected should insufficient car parking be provided on the site.

171. The reconfiguration of Wansey Street will necessitate the redistribution of existing resident permit parking along the street but all re-provided spaces will remain conveniently located for all existing residents. As noted above, the proposal will not result in the loss of existing resident permit parking. Furthermore the additional resident permit parking spaces would be available for use by existing residents as well as a specified number of new residents and the 2 car club bays would be of benefit to both existing and new residents.

172. Cycle parking

The proposal provides a total of 431 cycle parking spaces, inclusive of 11 visitor cycle stands. At least 420 cycle spaces would be needed to serve future residential occupiers of the MP1 development plots (the policy requirement being 1 space for every one or two bedroom unit and 2 cycle spaces for every unit with three or more bedrooms). The storage should be located in areas convenient for the individual units and therefore should be accessible for each individual block. The cycle stores are located at ground floor level in the case of Plots H10 and H13 and at mezzanine level in Plot H6 accessed by lift which extends down to the basement. The cycle strategy plan was updated during the course of the application and the revised distribution of residential cycle spaces between the development plots is set out below.

Development Plot	Required number of cycle spaces	Proposed number of cycle spaces
Plot H6	252	252
Plot H10	89	90
Plot H13	79	80
Total	420	422

173. The number of spaces required for each plot meets minimum policy requirements but more cycle storage would be welcome, particularly in view of the high PTAL of the site and excellent cycle links in the area.

174. The submitted drawings show an 80-20 ratio of Josta stands to Sheffield stands which is less than ideal. Although officers recognise the space saving offered by Josta stands, Sheffield stands are the council's preferred storage type, being easily accessible to all users. The Josta stacking system is not suitable for bikes that are not of a standard size (such as children's bikes) and require a degree of strength and/or dexterity that not all users will necessarily have. The inclusion of a good proportion of Sheffield stands (at least 50% accessible stands) is encouraged in developments to ensure ample choice for all cycle users.

175. 22 visitor cycle spaces (or 11 Sheffield stands) is proposed within the new public realm along Park Street South and the Central Shopping Street. This does not meet the council's requirement for at least one space for every 10 residential units which would equate to 36 visitor spaces for the MP1 residential element and 3 visitor spaces for the commercial space – totalling 39 visitor spaces to be provided. Furthermore, separate cycle storage should be provided for the commercial unit(s) but the drawings do not identify commercial cycle storage.

176. At this stage the proposed cycle parking is deficient in terms of quantum of visitor and commercial cycle parking. Conditions 53 and 54 of the OPP require details of cycle

storage for residents, non-residents and visitor parking prior to above grade works being carried out for each development plot, so that the shortfall in provision can be satisfactorily addressed through the submission of details at a later stage. That said, officers strongly advise that the proportion of accessible Sheffield stands should be maximised in future phases of the Heygate Masterplan and such a high proportion of Josta stands as that currently proposed (being 80%) is to be avoided.

Servicing and refuse collection

177. The OPP requires that prior to the overall implementation of the Heygate Masterplan development, a Site Wide Servicing Management Strategy be submitted for approval (Paragraph 30.3 of Schedule 3 of the legal agreement) detailing the arrangements for the entire site. In addition, a Service Management Plan is required prior to implementation of each development plot which provides further details of the servicing and waste proposed for that plot (Paragraph 30.3 of the agreement). Conditions 57 and 58 of the OPP require details of the actual refuse stores for both residential and commercial uses. These conditions provide the mechanism for the final approval of the servicing strategy for the reserved matters applications.
178. Servicing (including waste collection) for the development is proposed to take place from Heygate Street, Wansey Street and Rodney Road for the residential units and via the new Central Shopping Street for the non-residential unit(s) in Plot H6. The principle servicing strategy to enable servicing from Heygate Street for the residential units in Plots H6 and H10 (other than the townhouses facing Wansey Street and Brandon Place) would be to use the existing bus lane between Rodney Road and Walworth Road. This would necessitate a change to the hours of the operation of the bus lane to operate during peak hours only to allow servicing of the plots to take place during off-peak hours. The bus lane currently operates 7am – 7pm (Monday to Sunday) and the applicant is seeking to amend bus lane operations to 7am – 10am and 4pm – 7pm (Monday to Sunday) to give a servicing window of 6 hours outside the network peaks. A single yellow line waiting restriction between 10 am and 4pm would also be introduced to within the bus lane to restrict parking whilst the bus lane is open to general traffic. This strategy was detailed in the transport assessment submitted at outline stage but is subject to formal approval from the council and TfL.
179. Modelling has been carried out to demonstrate how Heygate Street would operate if the proposal to reduce the bus lane hours to peak only were implemented. The model demonstrates that queue lengths will not be significantly increased and that the junction with Walworth Road would operate effectively in this scenario without causing a significant increase to bus journey times. For this reason officers would support the proposed reduction in hours of the bus lane. Notwithstanding this, TfL have advised that much more information would be needed before they could support the council in approving any changes to the bus lane operating hours or waiting and loading restrictions on Heygate Street to facilitate servicing of Plots H6 and H10 (including numbers and types of service vehicle movements, lengths and times of stay and proposals to manage on-street parking). This information will need to be provided as part of the final approval of a detailed Service Management Plan.
180. Communal bin stores are proposed within each development plot for residents of the flats and ground floor duplex units. The townhouses facing Wansey Street would have individual bin stores located at the rear of their properties and their bins would be moved to the communal bin stores by a management team on collection days.
181. Lengthy discussions have taken place during the course of the application concerning servicing and waste collection. Although the waste collection strategy for Plots H10, H13 and the bin stores on the south side of Plot H6 is agreed, the servicing and waste collection for the Plot H6 units located at the Heygate Street (north) side of the plot (Cores D, E, and F) is proving problematic with the refuse vehicle stops proposed on

Heygate Street creating conflict with a nearby zebra crossing, traffic calming and bus cage. A Transport Note (dated 17 December) has been submitted which sets out a number of alternative options for servicing of Plot H6D, E and F, including relocating the bus stop to the east to free up kerb-side space for servicing, or servicing from the Central Shopping Street. Officers have reviewed these options and, whilst consider there is a feasible option for waste collection for Plots H6D/E/F, the only option would be to service these units from the Central Shopping Street which would involve a managed solution to bring the bins towards the street. At this stage, officers consider there is no safe highway option for refuse collection on Heygate Street. Final details will be required as part of the approval of the Service Management Plan for Plot H6. .

182. Officers also note that there is potentially a management issue for the Central Shopping Street in terms of pedestrian and vehicular movement depending on the level of servicing vehicular activity along this street. Further detail of how this will be managed to ensure there is no conflict between users will be required when the Service Management Plan is submitted in accordance with the requirements of the OPP legal agreement. It may be that collapsible bollards will need to be installed to manage this street.
183. As part of the MP1 proposal new bin stores for existing residents would be provided in the pavement area on the south side of the street. Currently “Wheelie” bins for individual properties are being stored on the street which is unsightly and obstructs the footway. The new stores would have capacity for larger communal “Eurobins” and would be screened with tree planting. The detailed design of the bin enclosures and their location will need to be secured by condition.

184. Conclusion

A positive aspect of the scheme is the improved permeability for cyclists and pedestrians with new shared routes through the site. The level of car parking proposed at basement and street level accords with the level agreed at outline stage. The legal agreement will need to be varied to allow a number of residents to apply for parking permits but it has been demonstrated that additional permit bays can be accommodated on-street without affecting existing provision. There are matters outstanding in terms of quantum of cycle storage spaces and refuse collection for Plot H6 (Cores E and F) but officers are satisfied that there is a workable solution. Final details will be secured through the submission of a Service Management Plan for that plot.

Trees and landscaping

185. At the outline application stage, lengthy discussions took place regarding the suitability of raised residential courtyards and their ability to provide a high quality design solution. Officers accepted that the plots along New Kent Road and Walworth Road (i.e. Plots H1, H2, H3, H4, and H5) would be likely to have their amenity courtyards raised to first or second floors as large format retail stores are envisaged at ground and mezzanine floors. However where the plots would be predominantly residential, then officers considered courtyards at grade would be more appropriate.
186. A particularly positive feature of the MP1 proposal is that all the residential courtyards are at grade and car parking is now provided at basement level. This will ensure that adequate soil depths are achieved to allow for substantial planting and provide the opportunity for the courtyards to be viewed from the street, thereby interacting with the streetscape and enhancing the ‘greener’ aspect of the public realm.
187. The MP1 development would provide a total of 149 trees across the site. This includes 45 existing trees to be retained (of which there are an additional 5 London Plane trees on and adjacent to Content Street which were not identified for retention in the OPP

Tree and Landscape Strategies), 55 new trees to be planted within the residential plot courtyards and 49 new trees in the public realm.

188. The council's urban forester is satisfied that the proposed internal residential courtyard arrangements successfully retain the trees of greatest contribution to amenity. Furthermore, the courtyard layouts are of design merit and provide a wide variety of landscape amenity in terms of natural play equipment, mounded earthworks, stepping stones, reclaimed logs, timber decking and seating, with appropriate surfacing types. Generally, there is a good balance between hard surfacing and green space. Bin stores and flank walls would be screened with climbers and other planting with a welcome variety of both ornamental and native plant species of various sizes.
189. Details of how the basement car park ramp will be excavated so that mature trees to be retained are not damaged and how it is to be designed into the courtyard and adjacent public realm will be required as well as detailed planting schedules/specifications, including boundary treatment details. These matters can be adequately addressed by conditions.
190. The proposed public realm layout recognises the need to provide ample set back of elevations on Heygate Street to allow the retention of valuable large trees as well as the introduction of smaller ornamental street greening in conjunction with parking along Wansey Street. The design on Wansey Street is successful in combining competing demands for refuse storage and enhanced amenity along this boundary to the Larcom Street Conservation Area. However, whilst the proposed tree locations and sizes of trees are acceptable amendments are necessary to the proposed tree species shown in the planting schedule so that these are more appropriate in terms of ultimate size and growth habitat, especially along Wansey Street. Furthermore, the planting mix needs to be shown for tree bases and planters on the new Central Shopping Street. A landscaping condition is therefore recommended to require further details of the planting to be provided within the new public realm.
191. Green roofs are proposed on all blocks which are not been used for amenity spaces or photovoltaic panels. Condition 49 of the OPP already requires details of green roofs (including specification and maintenance plan) to be submitted for each development plot and therefore no further conditions are necessary in this respect.
192. Condition 48 of the OPP requires an Environmental Action Plan to be submitted for each development plot detailing proposed ecological mitigation measures (such as bat and bird boxes). The council's Ecology Officer has confirmed that no concerns are raised with the MP1 applications.
193. Local resident concerns have been raised that the re-phasing of the Heygate masterplan has resulted in a delay to the park area strategy and temporary park strategy and that the MP1 applications makes no mention of when the temporary park will be provided, where it will be, and what size it will be. They request that an update and timescales for the establishment of the park and temporary park is provided.
194. The Heygate Masterplan development will ultimately deliver a new park at least 0.8 hectares in size which is of significant benefit to the local community. Due to the phased nature of the development it was recognised that the park may not be completed for some time and hence the legal agreement requires a temporary park (minimum 0.4 hectares in size) to be delivered in the interim. To this effect Paragraphs 21.1 and 21.2 of the agreement requires, that unless otherwise agreed in writing with the council, a temporary park area strategy should be submitted three months prior to the submission of first reserved matters application for any of the plots that don't adjoin the new park (including Plots H6, H10, H13) and that a parks advisory group should be established at least one month prior to work commencing on the temporary

park strategy. A letter on behalf of the applicant was submitted in June 2013 requesting a delay to the submission of the temporary park strategy and establishment of the associated parks advisory group so that the timings more closely reflect the anticipated timescales for the approval and delivery of the temporary park with the MP1 development phase.

195. Following discussions with the applicant this request was agreed in writing (by letter dated 8 October) on the basis that the commitments to delivering a temporary park would not be affected and that the legal agreement allows for such a variation. The letter gave an indicative date of Q4 2016 for the construction and delivery of the Temporary Park which would be prior to the anticipated final completion of MP1 (early 2017). The following revised timeframe was agreed between the applicant and the council:

- Establishment of Park Advisory Group – Q3 2014
- Submission of Temporary Park Strategy – Q1 2015
- Submission of detailed design for Temporary Park – Q4 2015
- Construction and delivery of Temporary Park – Q4 2016.

Whilst it should be noted that these times are indicative only any potential change to this sequence would be minor because there is little scope for change bearing in mind the delivery of the temporary park has to be before the end of 2016.

196. It should be noted that the legal agreement (at Paragraph 21.5) restricts 50% occupation of Plots H2, H3, H6, H10, H11a, H11b or H13 until the temporary park has been delivered and this obligation remains unchanged. No changes are proposed to the S106 requirements concerning the delivery of the main park and in this respect a Park Area Strategy is required to be submitted for approval prior to the submission of the first reserved matters applications for any of the plots that adjoin the park (i.e. Plots H4, H5, H1, or H7).

Flood risk

197. The OPP environmental statement considered the likely impacts of the masterplan development on flood risk, groundwater levels and surface water drainage. As a consequence a number of conditions were attached to the outline consent concerning flood risk, surface water infiltration and submission of a surface water drainage scheme.

198. The Environment Agency has confirmed that they have no objection to the MP1 applications as the appropriate conditions remain to be fulfilled on the outline application.

Wind

199. At the outline application stage, the wind assessment contained in the ES and ES Addendum identified a number of locations within the completed development (including building entrances and internal courtyards) where measures may be required to improve wind conditions. It was recommended that further assessment would be required at the detailed design stage to demonstrate that the scheme is suitable for the intended uses: sitting, standing, leisure/business walking and roadway/car park. Accordingly, a Wind Assessment has been submitted.

200. The assessment found that likely wind conditions in and around the MP1 development would be suitable for their intended uses along thoroughfares and at building entrances throughout the year. The internal residential ground floor courtyards and nearly all upper floor balconies and terraces would be suitable for sitting during the

summer months. Three roof terraces within the north-west corner of Plot H6 would, without mitigation, be suitable for standing only during the summer months and mitigation in the form of planting will be required to shelter these areas. Officers consider this can be dealt with by landscaping condition.

Planning obligations (S.106 undertaking or agreement)

201. There are no new planning obligations arising from the reserved matters applications. All obligations have been secured on the outline consent for the masterplan application.
202. A Deed of Variation is required in order to allow for the specified number of occupiers of the houses on Wansey Street to be exempt from the obligation which prevents occupiers of the masterplan site from applying for parking permits. This is in recognition of the additional number of on-street parking spaces arising from these reserved matters applications.

Sustainable development implications

203. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out that planning has a key role to play in meeting the challenge of climate change, through securing radical reductions in greenhouse emissions, through providing resilience to climate change and by supporting the delivery of renewable and low carbon energy.
204. London Plan policy 5.2 stipulates that in order to make the fullest contribution to minimising carbon dioxide emissions, developments should employ the following energy hierarchy: be lean (use less energy), be clean (supply energy efficiently), be green (use renewable energy). From October 2013, the London Plan sets a minimum target for reduction in carbon dioxide emissions of 40% on 2010 Building Regulations.
205. London Plan Policy 5.6 states that development proposals should evaluate the feasibility of Combined Heat and Power (CHP) systems and where a new CHP system is appropriate also examine the opportunities to extend the system beyond the site boundary to adjacent sites.
206. London Plan Policy 5.7 states that, within the framework of the energy hierarchy, major development proposals should provide a reduction in expected carbon dioxide emissions from the use of on-site renewable energy generation, where feasible.
207. Southwark Core Strategy policy 13: High environmental standards, requires new development to meet a number of environmental targets including Code for Sustainable Homes level 4 for residential development and BREEAM "excellent" for most non-residential development. It also requires development to achieve a 44% reduction of carbon dioxide emissions over the 2006 Building Regulations (equivalent to 25% over the 2010 Building Regulations), as well as stipulating that 20% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions must be as a result of on-site renewable technologies.
208. These requirements are stressed within the Elephant and Castle Supplementary Planning Document, specifically SPD 19: 'Energy, water and waste', whilst Southwark's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD provides further guidance on how sustainable design and construction methods can be incorporated into developments.
209. A suite of documents has been prepared to demonstrate how these policies and requirements have informed the proposals for the redevelopment of the Heygate Estate. This consists of strategies submitted at the outline application stage, subsequent site-wide and plot-specific details as required by the legal agreement

attached to the outline planning permission (OPP) and further detail to underpin the MP1 reserved matters applications. The relationship between these documents is outlined below.

210. Issues covered at the outline planning permission stage

A Sustainability Strategy was submitted with the outline planning application for the Heygate Estate, which acknowledged policy requirements and detailed how sustainable design and construction techniques would be incorporated into the scheme. This was supplemented by an energy strategy (and an energy strategy addendum) that specifically addressed how carbon dioxide emissions would be reduced as the Masterplan was delivered.

211. In line with the above policies, key commitments included achieving Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 on all residential properties, a BREEAM rating of 'excellent' on commercial space over 1,000sqm and BREEAM 'very good' for any community use floorspace.

212. The approach was premised on applying the principles of the Mayor's Energy Hierarchy, as set out in the London Plan. The specific measures proposed at this point are outlined below.

213. *Be lean*

The Heygate Masterplan seeks to improve thermal performance, thereby reducing space heating requirements and improving efficiency of building service elements. Space heat requirements will be reduced through high levels of insulation and air tightness. It stated that building services initiatives such as variable speed fans and pumps, demand controlled ventilation with heat recovery benefits, smart controls, and smart meters would be considered at the detailed design stage.

214. *Be clean*

The Heygate Masterplan includes an on-site Energy Centre to supply low carbon energy to meet all the remaining heat demand and offset some of the electrical demand. The Energy Centre will comprise two Combined Heat and Power (CHP), high efficiency gas boilers and a thermal store to cope with peaks in demand. The Energy Centre will be connected to a District Heat Network to supply the homes in the development and it will be 'future proofed' so that it is capable of also supplying neighbouring sites. It was proposed that the CHP boilers are only activated once there is sufficient thermal demand, so an interim solution will be required.

215. The District Heat Network is not tied to any one technology to supply heat. So, whilst in the first instance it is proposed to use highly efficient gas-fired CHP, in the future it is proposed to introduce biomethane, which would result in much greater carbon reduction.

216. *Be green*

An initial review of available renewable technologies was carried out and solar photovoltaic panels were found to be the most compatible with the intended CHP Energy Centre solution for the site. However the level of carbon reduction as a result of incorporating PVs into the development is limited, requiring a substantial proportion of the roof area to achieve any meaningful carbon saving on the site. The applicant is therefore proposing to use biomethane as an alternative fuel source to natural gas.

217. Biomethane is created when biogas, generated through the anaerobic digestion of sewage, waste or crops, is cleaned to remove other gases, creating a gas that is approximately 98% methane. The biomethane can then be injected into the gas network and gain accreditation under the Green Gas Certification Scheme (GGCS), which is administered by the Renewable Energy Association. Biomethane is a

relatively new form of renewable energy, and therefore it is currently not recognised by Southwark's planning policies as a renewable technology. Biomethane could, theoretically, offer significant carbon savings in comparison to using gas. However, this is a fledgling technology and the details of how this might be implemented are yet to be determined. Whilst acknowledging the potential carbon savings at OPP stage, it was stressed that this would not meet the Core Strategy requirement for on-site renewable energy generation (i.e. the gas would be produced off-site and transported to the Energy Centre).

218. On balance, the overall approach regarding carbon reduction across the Masterplan site was considered to be broadly policy compliant. The introduction of CHP was particularly welcomed and the aspiration to exceed carbon reduction targets was noted. However, it was accepted that further detail regarding particular energy efficiency design measures and an assessment of the feasibility of incorporating renewable technologies during each phase of the development would be required to be submitted through the reserved matters applications. These principles were enshrined in the s106 legal agreement attached to the OPP, as set out below.
219. Developer's obligations
Section 26 of Schedule 3 of the S106 Legal Agreement for the OPP required the submission of a site-wide energy strategy and a series of plot-specific energy strategies. The site wide strategy sets out the broad principles that were agreed as part of the outline permission and forms the basis for the subsequent plot-specific strategies, which in turn will demonstrate how the Masterplan will be implemented and detailed policy requirements and standards achieved.
220. The Site Wide Energy Strategy aims to ensure that the Heygate Masterplan will achieve net zero carbon growth; emitting no more carbon than the previous Heygate Estate and the 1,107 flats it contained. In addition to addressing development plan policies, it sets out the ambition to put the Heygate Masterplan and the Council at the forefront of innovative energy solutions for London.
221. As highlighted in the OPP and detailed above, the Site Wide Energy Strategy is based on applying the principles of the energy hierarchy: Be Lean, Be Clean, Be Green. It states that carbon emissions will be reduced by 42% based on 2010 Building Regulations across the masterplan area, but highlights that carbon savings would increase significantly if biomethane can be introduced at a later stage. In the absence of this, there is a commitment to fully explore the feasibility of introducing a range of renewable technologies within each masterplan phase.
222. MP1
The legal agreement stipulates that a plot-specific energy strategy must be submitted with every phase of development. The strategy must demonstrate how carbon reductions will be achieved within the phase, contributing to broader savings that are envisaged across the site as a whole. It must detail any temporary energy solutions to be implemented prior to CHP being introduced to the site and the range of renewable technologies that have been assessed. The specific requirements are set out in section 26.7 of the legal agreement.
223. The MP1 plot-specific strategy submitted in July 2013 contained a number of gaps because modelling was still being undertaken, so a supplementary MP1 Energy Statement has been prepared to reflect the latest data on forecasted energy performance for Plots H6, H10 and H13.
224. As with previous strategies, the MP1 Energy Statement reflects the Energy hierarchy to demonstrate how a range of measures will cumulatively contribute towards carbon reduction.

225. *Be lean*

The proposed energy efficiency measures for new dwellings include:

- Highly insulated building fabric with low air permeability setting 'fabric first' as the principal priority;
- The construction approach is considering a cross laminated timber (CLT) technique for the town houses and upper levels of the midrise apartments;
- Glazing with better than average U-value, G-value and daylight transmittance;
- Whole House Mechanical Ventilation (WHMV) with heat recovery; and
- Low energy lighting.

226. CLT is an engineered timber product with good structural properties and low environmental impact. Through the detailed design stages of the project, it is proposed that the design team will develop the potential of using CLT construction and within a more holistic approach to carbon emission reduction, evaluate the embodied carbon in the approach as an overall contribution to the sustainable merits of the development.

227. Section 8.5, Table 6 of the energy statement shows that the energy efficiency measures achieve an improvement of 8.6 % over the baseline.

228. *Be clean*

The principle of the proposed heating and cooling systems for the development have been considered in accordance with Policy 5.9 of the London Plan and accepted through the Heygate Masterplan Outline Planning Application Energy Strategy. The Energy Centre is set to be delivered as part of phase MP1a and the Heygate Heating Network on a phased basis. Once the CHP network is operational, Table 7 sets out that, combined with the above efficiency measures, a carbon saving of 35.1% beyond the baseline will be achieved.

229. The legal agreement sets out that the first CHP boiler will only become operational after the occupation of 605 units or when thermal demand reaches 3GWh. Therefore, the Heygate Masterplan OPP permitted temporary energy solutions to be implemented for each plot that is completed in advance this. The use of a temporary boiler plant for an interim period before connection to the site-wide Heygate Heating Network is compliant with advice in the council's Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (2009) and consistent with the Heygate Masterplan OPP.

230. The energy statement sets out that a series of highly efficient gas boilers will be installed on a temporary basis to serve Plots H6, H10 and H13. The plant will be sited in the ground floor of plot H6 and will deliver the heat demands for MP1 through a local heat network. Once the Energy Centre becomes operational it is anticipated that this space will become a residents' gym.

231. The temporary solution of boiler plant does not include the provision of combined heat and power plant and therefore the carbon emission performance of MP1 illustrated in the energy statement is based upon the connection to the site wide Heygate Heating Network, and efficiencies stipulated therein.

232. For illustrative purposes, section 9.2.2 also includes a table that indicates the short term carbon emission performance of MP1 whilst operating with the temporary boiler plant.

233. *Be green*

The Heygate Masterplan Site Wide Energy Strategy sets out a medium-term objective to achieve 'zero carbon'. Capital investment in low and zero carbon technologies are therefore focused on the Energy Centre and district heating system (and the provision of biomethane), rather than local (on-plot) provision. Achieving these savings is

premised on the use of biomethane, as detailed above. Whilst it is acknowledged that this could lead to significant carbon savings, it has not yet been demonstrated that this is feasible and, regardless of this, we would still not consider its use to be an example of an on-site renewable technology.

234. Whilst this could be possible for future phases, the MP1 energy statement does not rely on the provision of biomethane gas. Instead it assesses the feasibility of introducing a range of on-site renewable technologies, based on those listed in the London Plan. Options such as biomass heating, cooling and electricity and energy from waste have been discounted for MP1 as they would require a site wide approach. Photovoltaic panels (PV), solar water heating and wind are outlined as being reasonable options and it is concluded that roof-mounted photovoltaic arrays are the most suitable technology.
235. It is stated that the availability of roof space and the capital cost limit the extent of PVs that can be introduced on-site. Taking these factors into account, it is proposed that 230 square meters of PV panels can be efficiently located as part of MP1. The incorporation of PVs would achieve a further 3.24% reduction in annual CO2 emissions (10,445 kg).
236. Overall reduction in CO2 emissions
When the energy centre is delivered and the first CHP is switched on the overall energy efficiency measures, heating and cooling systems and renewable energy technologies will achieve a 37.2% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions compared to the baseline (as set out in section 11, table 11 of the energy statement). Based on the approved phasing plan, this could be as early as 2018.
237. The proposed interim solution involving the use of temporary boilers will result in a reduction in CO2 emissions of 15.4%, below the mandatory 25% reduction required to achieve Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4. However, the Code for Sustainable Homes technical guide notes that for large, phased developments, assessments can be based on the projected carbon reduction over the Masterplan as a whole, so this should not prove to be a barrier in meeting the policy requirement.
238. Conclusion
In isolation, MP1 appears to fall short of policy requirements and the aspirations set out in material submitted at outline stage. In particular, the interim solution only reduces carbon emissions by around 15%. However, a number of principles were agreed at the outline stage that have dictated the approach to energy and reducing carbon emissions and so MP1 needs to be viewed in the context of the wider masterplan.
239. Based on the current phasing plan, construction of MP1 is due to complete in early 2017 and the CHP could be switched on shortly afterwards in 2018/19. At this point, the reduction in carbon emissions would equate to 37.2%, enabling the scheme to achieve Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4.
240. A 37.2% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions is below the current London Plan policy, which required a 40% reduction as of October 2013. However the forecast achievement for the development as a whole is 42% as set out in the OPP and it is noted that this figure is for the completion for the Masterplan by 2025 and not necessarily for each individual phase.
241. Paragraph 11.1.7 of the Energy Statement acknowledges that the development does not comply with Southwark's Core Strategy policy 13 requirement for a 20% reduction in CO2 emissions from on-site renewable technologies. Several renewable technologies have been discounted as incompatible with the proposed Heygate Heat

Network; moreover the use of PV panels is limited by the presence of green/brown roofs, residential gardens and other design considerations, which reduce available roof space. Officers are satisfied that, as required, a range of renewable options have been explored.

242. On balance, officers are satisfied that despite the small proportion of carbon savings that is attributable to on-site renewable technology, the 37.2% savings that are forecast for MP1 make a valuable contribution towards the carbon dioxide savings that will be made across the wider site.
243. As a result, the energy strategy for MP1 can be supported; however, it should be noted that more extensive reductions in carbon dioxide emissions will be required in subsequent Masterplan phases to compensate for the shortfall at this point. This could be achieved through continued innovations that lead to construction methods and technologies becoming more energy efficient over the development period, or potentially through the introduction of biomethane gas (or an alternative) to be used in conjunction with the CHP boilers at a later stage.
244. Further assessments will be required for subsequent Masterplan phases to explore the feasibility of using renewable technologies to meet policy requirements, whilst the carbon reductions for the development as a whole will be monitored through the submission of a revised site-wide energy strategy one month prior to the final phase of implementation.

Conclusion on planning issues

245. The MP1 applications seek the approval of reserved matters pursuant to an outline permission granted in March 2013 for the redevelopment of the wider Heygate Masterplan development. MP1 is the first phase of the Heygate redevelopment and therefore represents an important milestone for the regeneration of the estate and wider Elephant and Castle area. The OPP established a series of parameters and principles for future reserved matters applications. It has been demonstrated that the MP1 proposals conform to the principal design controls established by the OPP and that the proposals do not compromise the delivery of overall targets set by the OPP.
246. The MP1 development would deliver high quality residential accommodation with generous internal room/unit sizes and dual aspect for the majority of units. Daylight and sunlight levels are generally very good considering the urban context. All dwellings would have useable private amenity space which is particularly welcome and residents will have easy access to high quality landscaped communal amenity space. A range of play provision would be provided within the development plots as well as in the public realm. The impact on local residential amenities, including daylight and sunlight impacts to neighbouring properties, has been considered very carefully. Whilst it is recognised there will be some minor impacts to daylight and sunlight, particularly for properties on Brandon Street and Larcom Street, the proposals are unlikely to result in light reductions to such an extent that planning permission should be refused. Furthermore, the impacts are within the parameters that were considered acceptable at the outline stage.
247. The development would be of high quality architectural design with a highly articulate urban form and create a complementary relationship with the nearby heritage assets that surround the site. The development would significantly improve the public realm and provide a total of 149 trees, including retaining more existing trees than envisaged at outline stage which is especially welcome. In terms of car parking, a total of 616 car parking spaces across the site were allowed by the OPP. The proposed basement and additional on-street spaces for a definitive number of new residents for the family townhouses would make up part of this site-wide quantum and therefore there is no

conflict with what was established at the outline stage. The proposed additional parking bays to be accommodated on Wansey Street will not impact on existing permit parking provision and it has been demonstrated that there is capacity on the street. There are some final details to be agreed in terms of cycle parking and refuse collection for Plot H6 (Cores D, E, and F) but these matters will be finalised though conditions.

248. It is acknowledged that in isolation the MP1 development falls short of policy requirements in terms of carbon savings. However, this is a temporary situation and when the CHP is switched on then the reduction in carbon savings would enable the scheme to achieve Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4. Ultimately the scheme when completed is forecast to deliver in excess of current London Plan policy targets and to this extent the scheme should be supported.
249. Having regard to all the policies considered and any other material planning considerations it is recommended that planning permission is granted for the four MP1 reserved matters applications, subject to conditions.

Community impact statement

250. 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 and the impacts are set out above. In addition, the applicant has undertaken their own consultation prior to lodging the application. This consultation is described in a statement of community involvement (SCI) which accompanies the applications.
251. The SCI advises that formal consultation on the wider Heygate Masterplan has been taking place since May 2011. A consultation hub was set up at 182-184 Walworth Road to host feedback sessions, liaison group meetings, community outreach and as a drop-in information centre. There is also a web site which provides information on the masterplan project which can be used to view previous consultations, presentations and so on.
252. Consultation on the MP1 development commenced in May 2013 which has included a range of events and meetings, workshops and walk-and-talk events. Discussions have also taken place with neighbouring properties and key community stakeholders. The Public Consultation Events include:
- Public Exhibition – June 2013
 - Walk and Talk Event – June 2013
 - Public Exhibition – July 2013
 - Residents Drop-in – July 2013
 - Public Exhibition – October 2013 (post application submission).
253. A SCI Addendum has also been submitted which documents the exhibition and feedback received at the October exhibition. Comments made at the exhibition included:
- Architectural style and form and use of brick complemented
 - Queries over type of likely retail
 - Public realm in front of Garland Court
 - Vehicular access to Wansey Street
 - Amount and location of affordable housing
 - Aspects related to the wider Heygate Masterplan, including phasing.

Consultations

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

Consultation replies

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

256. Summary of neighbour consultation responses

Two responses have been received in objection to the MP1 Reserved Matters applications. The issues raised are listed below.

- Delay to the Park Area Strategy and Temporary Park Strategy as required by the S106 legal agreement
- Whether the temporary boilers will increase CO2 emissions
- Wish to know the proportion of energy demand that will be met on-site by renewables, once the permanent energy solution is in place
- No justification (including viability assessment) for additional 21 on-street parking spaces
- Presentation of affordable housing information is unclear and confusing – an Affordable Housing Statement should be provided
- Whether there are mechanisms for monitoring the figures and assumptions of the viability assessment (May 2012) against actual delivery or mechanisms for updating/revising these figures.

Human rights implications

257. 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.

258. These applications have the legitimate aim of providing details of reserved matters (access, scale, appearance, layout and landscaping) pursuant to Outline Planning Permission reference 12-AP-1092 granted on 27 March 2013 for the redevelopment of the Heygate Estate. 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.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Site history file: TP/H1064A Application file: 12/AP/1092 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: 020-7525-5349 Council website: www.southwark.gov.uk

APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	Consultation undertaken
Appendix 2	Consultation responses received
Appendix 3	Consultation maps
Appendix 4	Site wide strategies required by s106 legal agreement
Appendix 5	Images
Appendix 6	Recommendation for Reserved matters (app ref 13-AP-3581)
Appendix 7	Recommendation for Reserved matters (app ref 13-AP-3582)
Appendix 8	Recommendation for Reserved matters (app ref 13-AP-3583)
Appendix 9	Recommendation for Reserved matters (app ref 13-AP-3584)

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Gary Rice, Head of Development Management	
Report Author	Helen Goulden, Development management	
Version	Final	
Dated	22 January 2014	
Key Decision	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS/DIRECTORATES/CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments sought	Comments included
Strategic director of finance & corporate services	No	No
Strategic director of environment and leisure	No	No
Strategic director of housing and community services	No	No
Director of regeneration	No	No
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team		23 January 2014

Consultation undertaken

Site notice date: 15 November 2013

Site notices erected at the junction of Brandon Street and Content Street, Wansey Street, Larcom Street and Walworth Road.

Press notice date: 7 November 2013

Case officer site visit date: Numerous visits since March 2012

Neighbour consultation letters sent: 18 November 2013

Internal services consulted:

Environmental Protection Team, Transport Planning Team, Public Realm, Urban Forester, Elephant and Castle Project Team, Design and Conservation Team, Planning Policy, Ecology Officer, Archaeology Officer, Local Economy Team, Waste Management, Housing Regeneration Team

Statutory and non-statutory organisations consulted:

Greater London Authority, Transport for London, Metropolitan Police, English Heritage, London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority, Environment Agency, EDF Energy

Neighbours and local groups consulted:

All properties within circa 100m radius of each application red line boundary as well as local residents groups were consulted on the four applications. A list of properties are provided on the application case files.

Re-consultation:

Consultation responses received

Internal services

Elephant and Castle Regeneration North Team – Applications 13/AP/3581, 13/AP/3582, 13/AP/3583, 13/AP/3584

Support the reserved matters applications for the first phase of the consented Heygate Masterplan for the following reasons:

Stakeholder Engagement

Detailed proposals have evolved following continued extensive public consultation and engagement particularly with key groups including residents of Wansey Street and Garland Court. The proposals respond effectively to concerns raised throughout the engagement process particularly through the proposed on-street parking solution, the “pulling back” of the proposed building line from the site boundary on Wansey Street and also the reduction in height of the tallest element in Plot H6.

Public Realm Benefits

Offer significant benefits and improvements to the local urban environment particularly on the southern edge of Heygate Street and Wansey Street demonstrating Lend Lease’s commitment in delivering the regeneration vision described in the outline consent. The southern footway of Heygate Street will be transformed with the introduction of new footways, improvement planting and pedestrian crossings replacing the 4m high brick wall and raised footway that is to be removed as part of the Heygate demolition works. Wansey Street will be enhanced with widened footways, enhanced tree planting and landscaping particularly at the western end of Wansey Street that is to be stopped up ahead of the creation of the Walworth Town Square, to be delivered as part of MP2. New north south pedestrian routes connecting Wansey Street and Heygate Street are to be created between Plots H6 and H10. Spaces will be landscaped with high quality materials and planting and pedestrians moving the space will be able to view into the street level communal amenity spaces/courtyards that have been facilitated by the repositioning of approved car parking provision to basements.

Economic and Section 106 Benefits

Key economic benefits are the creation of at least 20 apprentice opportunities, 38 short courses, and 44 sustained jobs for local residents. Lend Lease are aspiring to exceed the overall targets established in the outline consent through targeting sustained jobs of at least a minimum of 6 months of employment. On completion of the development a further economic benefit will be the creation of 917sqm of non-residential floorspace creating further job opportunities. This is supported by the Regeneration North Team as the creation of non-residential ground floor uses on Plot H6 mark the first stage of the creating of the secondary retail street.

Design and Place Making Benefits

The proposals replace the inward looking Heygate Estate on the north side of Wansey Street with family housing in the form of townhouses. The Regeneration Team support the reformation of Wansey Street as a residential street that reinstates historical pedestrian links between Wansey Street and Brandon Street and on to Rodney Road which was lost when the Heygate was developed. The scheme is of high quality architecturally with the use of brick and stone on the Wansey Street fronting buildings consistent with the existing local context and the Larcom Street Conservation Area.

The Regeneration Team therefore strongly supports the submitted applications. Regeneration momentum has now been established at the Elephant and Castle with the on-going demolition of the Heygate Estate and the construction of the new leisure

centre, One the Elephant and Trafalgar Place developments. Lend Lease's high quality proposals for the scheme and commitment to a swift commencement on site will continue this momentum and should be endorsed.

Ecology Officer – Applications 13/AP/3581, 13/AP/3582, 13/AP/3583, 13/AP/3584

Have no concerns or comments at the moment. It would be useful to know the total area of each roof type. Will comment when details are submitted for Conditions 48 and 49.

Archaeology Officer – Applications 13/AP/3581, 13/AP3582, 13/AP/3583, 13/AP/3584

The approach detailed in the conditions for the outline consent – building recording – completed and a watching brief over groundworks is sound for the details of these buildings. The change in impact to include basements is detailed in the outline consent and the application of a programme of archaeological observation and recording to the development works is commenced, as detailed in the conditions.

Urban Forester – Applications 13/AP/3581, 13/AP/3582, 13/AP/3583, 13/AP/3584

Plot H13

The internal courtyard arrangement to this block successfully retains the trees of greatest contribution to amenity within private and communal amenity space. Unlike other blocks the more articulated H13 provides the opportunity to see into the courtyard from the roadside frontage on Brandon Street via the boundary fence. The layout provides a wide variety amenity including natural play equipment, mounted earthworks, stepping stones, reclaimed logs, timber decking and seating with appropriate surfacing types. Bin stores and flank walls are screened with climbers and other planting with a welcome variety of ornamental and native plant species of various sizes. Green roofs and terraces with tree planting are proposed where these can successfully be integrated with solar panels. A discrepancy exists with 13-AP-3582 regarding the number of trees proposed for retention or new planting on Content Street. Likewise, planting schedule and other specifications including fence details can be captured within suitable conditions.

Plots H6

The internal courtyard arrangement to H6 block proposes a landscape scheme for private and communal amenity space which is of design merit and provides the opportunity to see into the courtyard from a gate where this block fronts onto Park Street South. The overall balance between hard surfacing and green space is well balanced with a wide variety of amenity including natural play equipment, mounded earthworks, stepping stones, reclaimed logs, timber decking and seating, with appropriate surfacing types. Bin stores and flank walls are screened with climbers and other planting, with a welcome variety of both ornamental and native plant species of various sizes. Green roofs are proposed where these can successfully be integrated with solar panels. Details are required of how the proposed basement will be excavated so that the liner of mature Plane trees will not be damaged. Likewise, planting schedule and other specifications including fence details can be captured within suitable conditions.

Plot H10

The internal courtyard arrangement to H10 proposes a landscape scheme for private and communal amenity space which is of design merit, however there is little opportunity to see into the courtyard from this block fronts onto Park Street South due to the car ramp. The overall balance between hard surfacing and green space is well balanced with a wide variety of amenity including natural play equipment, mounded earthworks, stepping stones, reclaimed logs, timber decking and seating, with appropriate surfacing types. Bin stores and flank walls are screened with climbers and other planting, with a welcome variety of both ornamental and native plant species of various sizes. Green roofs and terraces with tree planting are proposed where these can successfully be integrated with solar panels. Details of how the ramp is to be designed into the courtyard are required especially given its relation to the adjacent access road and coverage as

seen from above. Planting schedule and other specifications including fence details can be captured within suitable conditions.

Public realm

The proposed public realm layout recognises the need to provide ample set back of elevations on Heygate street and to allow the retention of valuable large trees and the introduction of smaller ornamental street greening in conjunction with parking on Wansey St. The design on Wansey Street is successful in combining competing demands for refuse storage and enhanced amenity at this boundary to the conservation area. An additional large tree has been retained further to previous tree strategy proposals so that the turning head does not now conflict with planters at the western end. Overall the landscape plan is of design merit with innovative re-use of timber, generous space for various planting mixes and internal courtyards at grade. These internal spaces provide a more diverse mix of planting in terms of species and variety of sizes thereby further enhancing amenity interest and communal use. A landscape condition is required to capture the following outstanding issues:

- Details of the underground car park ramp need to be confirmed
- Proposed tree locations and sizes are acceptable; however amendments are necessary in relation to species so that these are more appropriate in terms of ultimate size and growth habitat, especially where proposed on Wansey Street. in relation to species

Drawing OX5055-1-111

T1 - no change

T2 - amend to Quercus Koster or similar fastigiated species

T3 - amend to Pyrus Chanticleer or other smaller shade tolerant species (only on south side of Wansey Street)

T3 - on north side Wansey Street no change

T4 - amend to match existing line of Planes (Platanus orientalis to provide additional foliage interest and drought tolerance)

T5 - no change

T6 - no change

T7 - amend to Prunus laurocerasus magnolifolia to match retained existing

T8 - no change

T9 - no change

T10 - no change

T11 - no change

T12 - no change

- Planting mix needs to be shown for tree bases and planters on Central Shopping Street and east of block H10.

Drawing OX5055-1-110

- TG1 - details of tree surround resin bound gravel
- Cross sections of all landscape planters, beds and tree pits, including planting specifications
- Maintenance details

Transport Team and Public Realm – Applications 13/AP/3581, 13/AP/3582, 13/AP/3583, 13/AP/3584

Comments are incorporated into the main body of the report.

Environmental Protection Team – Applications 13/AP/3581, 13/AP/3583, 13/AP/3584

The Air Quality Assessment is comprehensive and well reasoned. Its conclusions are

sound and the mitigation proposed sufficient.

Waste Management

No response to consultation received.

Design and Conservation Team

Comments are incorporated into the main body of the report.

Design Review Panel (DRP)

The MP1 proposal was presented to DRP on 9 July 2013. The Panel endorsed the approach to the site and felt assured that the project would be a success. However, they raised a number of questions in relation to the arrangement and detailed design of accommodation, the design of the roofs, the energy centre and the area around it, the practical implications of the car parking and the facade treatment of the blocks which they encouraged the designers to address in developing their proposals prior to submitting a planning application.

The site includes a tall building at the western end of plot H6 as envisaged by the approved outline permission. This is a substantial building and as such, it needs to be of exceptional architectural design. The Panel raised a question over the proximity of the tall building relative to the neighbouring block on Heygate Street and questioned the narrow gap that is proposed. This occurs at a number of locations across the three sites – including plot H13 – which raised concerns about overlooking and privacy at this close proximity. The Panel acknowledged that these could be resolved by design and by providing a second aspect for the affected units but felt the gaps appeared narrow given the scale of the buildings. They encouraged the architects to re-appraise the design in relation to proximity and to revise the detailed design of the affected units to avoid issues of overlooking and privacy.

The Panel generally endorsed the distribution of mass around the site and the arrangement of blocks however; they felt the blocks appeared truncated with little articulation at roof level. The roofs are an important feature of buildings in the area and given the substantial scale of the proposed development, could be better designed with more articulation, and even limited setback accommodation on the roofs to give these large blocks a more varied silhouette and a greater interest when viewed from the street. Added to this, the applicants are proposing roof-top communal uses and spaces which will require access and enclosure which is currently not shown. The Panel encouraged the architects to develop the design of these spaces further and to view the roof tops as the fifth elevation of the development which will be viewed from the surrounding buildings and the other tall buildings envisaged for the Heygate.

Car parking is an issue in city centre sites. The Panel welcomed the approach to provide basement parking and communal courtyards at grade. They felt this ensured that the courtyards are more likely to be enjoyed and could benefit from mature landscaping. However, they highlighted that the control and the distribution of parking spaces as well as the distance between the allocated car parking spaces and the residential units could be an issue that needs careful consideration. The Panel was encouraged to see this as a design opportunity to integrate access to the residential units within the landscaped courtyards.

The Panel was encouraged by the sketch design for the energy centre and felt this was a good opportunity especially when it is considered in the context of the prominent junction of Rodney Road, Heygate Street and Rodney Place. They were not able to comment in detail due to the limited information presented to them. They encouraged the designers to consider this as an 'object' building or a pavilion in the public space which should maximise the active frontages on all its sides and not just an isolated cafe. The Panel challenged the architects for the energy centre to develop their detailed

design further and to consider the building in the round together with the public space as well as the wider routes and links across the area – including crossings, and cycle lanes.

The Panel raised a significant question over the concentration of single-aspect north-facing units especially in the large block on H10. They questioned the implications of the single-core design of this block and felt that, due to its size; this arrangement would result in long internal corridors and poor quality accommodation and should be avoided especially in a flag-ship development such as this. They challenged the designers to include a second core into the building like others in the same scheme to ensure that the development is able to deliver more dual aspect units and to avoid single-aspect north facing units.

Public realm is an important aspect of this proposal and will be crucial to the quality of the completed scheme. Whilst the Panel acknowledged the efforts of Gillespies in the public realm and Churchman in the communal gardens, they felt the public realm lacked context and needed further development to give it a sense of place and a purpose. They encouraged the designers to develop their landscape proposals in detail and overlay their designs with the local links and routes to give a sense of how the public realm contribute to the area and will be a place to be enjoyed.

Finally, the Panel welcomed the use of the Cross Laminated Timber (CLT) technology. However, they noted that the proposed technology would have implications on the proposed facing materials, the 'inner' and 'outer' faces and the reveals especially around windows and balconies which were not described in detail in the presentation. These questions over the architectural expression of the development is particularly relevant to the tall building where the technology was still in its infancy. The Panel encouraged the designers to develop the design of the facades in detail, to give the buildings a masonry face to reflect the character of the area, and use technology appropriately to give the design depth and interest.

In conclusion, the Panel endorsed the massing and arrangement of the four blocks in the Phase 1 scheme including the sequence of public spaces and the associated energy centre. However, they questioned certain aspects of the design and encouraged the architects to develop the scheme to improve the proximity between blocks and avoid the single-aspect north-facing units, resolve the access to and from the car parking, the detailed design of the cladding and the roofscapes and to develop the design of the energy centre and the public realm.

Statutory and non-statutory organisations

Metropolitan Police – Applications 13/AP/3581, 13/AP/3583, 13/AP/3584

Confirm that they have been consulted by the Architects about this proposal and that local crime risks have been taken into consideration and it has been designed to optimise natural surveillance over the street and provide defensible space at ground level. Support the application in principle and have no additional comments regarding the design and layout at this time. Request a condition to require the applicant to achieve full Secured by Design Accreditation on Completion. This will ensure that the detailed elements such as doors, windows and lighting achieves the minimum standards of the scheme and that I will have continued involvement throughout the build phase so that crime opportunities are reduced once the building is completed.

Environment Agency – Applications 13/AP/3581, 13/AP/3582, 13/AP/3583, 13/AP3584

Note that there are a number of outstanding pre-commencement conditions for Plot H6, Plot H10, Plot H13, and public realm (Condition 8/24/28/29/30/31/32) concerning flood risk, surface water drainage, and land contamination. No objection to the approval of reserved matters for these applications providing that the submitted details do not prevent the aforementioned pre-commencement conditions from being fulfilled.

Transport for London – Applications 13/AP/3581, 13/AP/3582, 13/AP/3583, 13/AP/3584

TfL's primary interests related to MP1 are:

- Servicing (and parking) on Heygate Street and the potential impacts on the bus lane/bus operations
- Cycle routes
- Cycle hire provision
- Bus standing

Understand that details in relation to service management plan (SMP), refuse storage, and construction environmental management plan CEMP) are not provided as part of these applications as these details don't need to be submitted until prior to implementation of a phase/a plot or prior to occupation (as required by the outline consent and legal agreement). Understand that TfL will be consulted on the SMP and CEMP at the appropriate time.

A technical note in the application (KN2-TN005 – Appendix J of the D&A Statement) outlines the potential impact of servicing on Heygate Street on bus services. Trust this is for 'information only' rather than 'for approval'. For TfL to support the Council in approving any changes to the bus lanes operating hours or waiting and loading restrictions on Heygate Street, much more information will need to be provided, such as numbers and types of servicing vehicle movements, lengths and times of stay and proposals to manage on-street parking. Would expect this level of information to be provided when the draft SMP is submitted.

Plan PBA /28900/005/SK29 (Cycling and Pedestrian Routes) has inconsistencies with Plan 4 in the Masterplan outline permission legal agreement. In the former, no cycle route is shown across Walworth Square, but it is in the latter. Also, the former describes 'Nervous Cyclists Cycle Routes', the latter 'Signed Quiet Routes available to cyclists'. As Plan 4 accurately reflects changes agreed by the applicant to address the requirements of the Deputy Mayor for Cycling, it is expected that all approved material for MP1 to be consistent with and to facilitate /deliver where appropriate the cycle routes identified in Plan 4.

Bus stand matter - TfL's concern is that the MP1 proposals may not allow in their design for future use by buses to access a bus stand on Rodney Road. TfL's view is that this location is the favoured and potentially only suitable on-site location for a bus stand in operational terms (given the approved masterplan). If access to a stand is not via the Heygate development (i.e. MP1 estate roads) then the alternative is a route through existing unsuitable streets to which residents would object and which has a significantly greater dead mileage and operational risks. Clearly this issue is something for the future, however TfL wish to make it clear in this formal response to MP1 that approval and subsequent implementation of MP1 may constrain, if not foreclose, the option of an on-site bus stand. This concern is not being presented as an objection to the approval of these applications but instead a clarification and confirmation of TfL's potential future position.

English Heritage – Applications 13/AP/3581, 13/AP/3583, 13/AP3584

Do not wish to offer any comments on this occasion. This application should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance, and on the basis of your specialist conservation advice.

Greater London Authority – Applications 13/AP/3581, 13/AP3582, 13/AP/3583, 13/AP/3584

No response to consultation received.

London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority – Applications 13/AP/3581, 13/AP3583, 13/AP/3584

No response to consultation received.

EDF Energy – Applications 13/AP/3581, 13/AP/3583, 13/AP/3584

No response to consultation received.

Neighbours and local groups

Balfour Street Resident

Strongly object to the proposal to vary the OPP to allow 21 on-street parking spaces for new estate residents. Applicant was already granted a huge and currently unjustified number of car parking spaces by the OPP. This approval was contrary to Southwark's policies which require a car-free development, and ignored the central London location and PTAL Rating of 6a/6b. Officer report states that all proposed properties will be excluded from eligibility for on-street parking permits to protect the amenity of existing residents. Proposed variation is contrary to the OPP. The applicant has made no effort to justify why these 21 extra spaces would be needed. There are far more useful things that can be done with the land which 21 spaces would occupy (e.g. short stay spaces for shoppers). If the 21 spaces already exist, it would cause considerable inconvenience to existing permit holders to have extra people competing for those spaces.

Strongly object that the applicant has not complied with the terms of the OPP: they have not provided the information to support why they think 616 (+21) parking spaces are necessary to enable them to sell flats in central London. A large percentage of parking spaces for the recently built flats in Steedman Street, Crompton Street, Printworks and South Central are rented out/sold by the owners because they did not want their parking space. believe this area needs to be re-visited and the permission to grant over 616 spaces must be revoked.

Strongly object that the re-phasing of the regeneration seems to mean that the already closed Elephant Road park has been forgotten and this application makes no mention of when the temporary park will be provided, where it will be, and what size it will be. A commitment with timescales for the establishment of the park and temporary park is needed before approval can be given for this application.

Object that the affordable housing information has been provided in an unnecessarily confusing way and that the council should demand to see the information in a clearer format. This would allow proper judgement of what affordable housing the applicant intends to provide, whether it complies with the OPP, and that it does not further breach London Plan/Southwark Council policies any more than allowed by the already lenient permission.

Elephant Amenity Network Group – Applications 13/AP/3581, 13/AP/3582, 13/AP/3583, 13/AP/3584

Our comments also relate to the S106 obligations 27 March 2013 entailed by the outline masterplan and demolition planning permissions 12/AP/1092 and 12/AP/3203.

1. *Park area strategy and temporary park strategy* – Understand that these strategies are now delayed, contrary to the S106 agreement, because of the rephrasing of the development. There is no reference to these delays in the Planning Statement. Given the significant increase in density of population this application will bring, and that park provision in the area is already below Southwark's own standard, an update and timescales for the establishment of the park and temporary park is needed before approval can be given.

2. *Energy Strategy* - Understand that the energy centre proposed under the Energy Strategy, supplied further to the S106 agreement, and originally part of MP1 will now be delayed to be included in sub-phase MP1a. Note that the temporary boiler under Plot H6

will not be a CHP boiler and wish to know whether this will increase CO2 emissions. Note the proposal for an array of photo voltaic cells. Wish to know the proportion of energy demand that will be met by on-site renewables, once the permanent energy solution is in place. (Understand that planning permissions do not require 20% on-site renewable energy, despite being Southwark's policy).

3. (i) *Car parking* – Object to the proposal to vary the outline masterplan S106 and allow 21 on-street parking spaces for new residents. The applicant was granted 616 parking spaces (including 62 on-street spaces within the estate) by the outline permission, contrary to saved policy 5.6 of the Southwark Plan which requires a car-free development; we assume that the 21 new spaces will be in addition to these.

(ii) The applicant argued in the masterplan application that the spaces should be allowed because the viability assessment supported the case for car parking and that spaces improved 'saleability' (Officer report para 226). The report continues that the applicant will 'set out the considerations that have informed the proposed amount of car parking for the plot(s) including deliverability and saleability of the scheme' in Reserved Matters applications. Object that the applicant has not done this, but merely re-states that it will 'assist deliverability and saleability'.

(iii) Further object that the application has no viability assessment to support the additional 21 on-street parking spaces. If 616 spaces satisfied the District Valuer regarding the viability of the scheme there is no justification for increasing that amount and no evidence has been presented to show that the viability of the scheme requires more.

(iv) Among the assurances given to the planning committee, persuading it to allow car parking was one that 'the amenity of existing residents would be protected by excluding all properties within the proposed estate...from eligibility for on-street parking permits (para 230). Object that the proposal is contrary to this assurance and that it requires that the car parking spaces of present Wansey Street residents be moved.

(v) Further object that the extra pressure on space created by an additional 21 on-street parking spaces makes the satisfactory accommodation of other elements of the development that much harder to achieve.

(vi) Note that the officers report for the outline application states that on-street car parking should be limited to 'ensure pedestrian and cycle friendly environments' (para 227) and we can see no justification for extending an already generous breach of council policy.

4 (i) *Affordable housing* – The presentation of the amount of affordable housing by the applicant is needlessly obscure, moving between unit numbers and percentages. Our understanding is that the proposal will deliver – 360 units in total, of which 76 will be affordable; 55 of these to be intermediate and of the remaining 21, 17 will be social rented and 4 affordable rent.

(ii) Assume that the social rented units will be 3/4 beds and the affordable rent units will be 1/2 units, but it is not clear from the Planning Statement nor the Affordable Housing Strategy (July 2013) what the unit mix and size of the affordable housing will be. Note that an Affordable Housing Statement is not required for reserved matters applications; nonetheless we believe the significance of the application and the importance of providing affordable housing requires one and note that the authority can ask for one (LPA DOC23 – Application for approval of reserved matters following outline, Local planning application requirements).

(iii) The applicant should provide an Affordable Housing Statement to include:

- a table of each tenure by unit number
- a table of unit mix by bedroom/person size
- a table of rents for the social and affordable rented units
- the length of tenures to be offered for social rent and affordable rent tenancies
- statement on what action the applicant has taken pursuant to Section 8 of Schedule 3 of the agreement to secure public funds to reduce affordable rent levels, in the first instance.

5. *Viability* – Note that no viability assessment accompanies the application in accordance with Section 7 of Schedule 3 of the agreement. Understand that no more viability assessment will be required, unless public funding is secured for affordable housing. If this is correct, we wish to know whether there is any mechanism for monitoring the figures and assumptions of the viability assessment of May 2012 against actual delivery or any mechanism for updating or revising the figures and assumptions.

Consultation Maps

Application Reference 13-AP-3581



Application Reference 13-AP-3582



Application Reference 13-AP-3583



Application Reference 13-AP-3584



APPENDIX 4

Site wide strategies required by s106 legal agreement

Application Number	Issue	Relevant s106 section	Date determined
13/AP/1986	Details of the Site Wide Energy Strategy	26.1	Pending
13/AP/2192	Details of the Site Wide Public Realm Strategy	22.1	Agreed 14/10/13
13/AP/2216	Details of a Detailed Phasing Plan	7	Agreed 25/10/13
13/AP/2368	Details of a Demolition Environmental Management Plan	3.1	Agreed 25/10/13
13/AP/2390	Details of Affordable Housing Strategy	5.3.1	Agreed 14/10/13
13/AP/2581	Details of Plot Specific Energy Strategy	26.6	Pending
13/AP/3538	Details of Site Wide Employment and Training Strategy	9.1	Pending
13/AP/3539	Details of Wheelchair Accessible Dwellings Strategy	29.1	Pending
13/AP/3541	Details of Children's Play Provision Strategy	23.1	Pending
13/AP/3542	Details of Affordable Retail Unit Strategy	27.3	Pending
13/AP/3590	Details of Employment and Training Scheme	9.2	Pending
13/AP/3591	Details of Apprenticeship Posts	10.1	Pending
13/AP/3592	Details of Car Club Scheme	12.1	Pending
13/AP/3593	Details of Car Parking Scheme	14.1	Pending
13/AP/3595	Details of Cycle Hire Scheme	18.1	Pending
13/AP/3596	Details of Reserved Matters Public Realm Scheme	22.5	Pending
13/AP/3597	Details of the Reserved Matters Play provision	23.4	Pending
13/AP/3598	Details of the Plot Community Space Contributions	25.1	Pending
13/AP/3599	Details of the Plot Health Contributions	24.1	Pending
13/AP/3600	Details of the Reserved Matters Affordable Retail Unit Strategy	27.3	Pending
13/AP/3601	Details of the accommodation schedule for Wheelchair Accessible Dwellings	29.2	Pending