

Item No:	Classification:	Date:	Meeting Name:
	Open	4 February 2014	Planning Committee
Report title:		Addendum Late observations, consultation responses, and further information.	
Ward(s) or groups affected:		East Walworth, Chaucer	
From:		Head of Development Management	

PURPOSE

- 1 To advise Members of observations, consultation responses and further information received in respect of the following planning applications on the main agenda. These were received after the preparation of the report and the matters raised may not therefore have been taken in to account in reaching the recommendation stated.

RECOMMENDATION

- 2 That Members note and consider the late observations, consultation responses and information received in respect this item in reaching their decision.

FACTORS FOR CONSIDERATION

- 3 Late observations, consultation responses, information and revisions have been received in respect of the following planning applications on the main agenda:
 - 3.1 **ITEM 11.1 – MP1 APPLICATION REFERENCES 13-AP-3581, 13-AP-3582, 13-AP-3583, 13-AP-3584**
 - 3.2 **Additional neighbour consultation responses**

36 Wansey Street

Support the applications for the following reasons:

a) Extensive consultation process with local residents

The consultation process has been extensive and has provided more than ample opportunities for residents and stakeholders to put forward their point(s) of view. Feedback has been listened to, considered, and where possible, acted upon.

b) Retention of existing trees over and above those promised by outline consent
Lend Lease have made a significant effort to retain as many mature trees as possible. Welcome the effort made as it retains amenity to the development area and appreciate the additional planning effort required to accommodate this.

c) Design of new terraced houses along Wansey Street

The quality of architecture of the proposed new terraced housing along Wansey Street responds to the design of existing terraced housing. Through close

consultation with residents of the street, design features such as the height, characteristics, and materials have been discussed, deliberated and where possible changed so as to be as sympathetic to the original architecture. The resulting design emphasises the quiet residential nature of Wansey Street.

d) New bin stores (incorporating planting) to improve the existing refuse problem on Wansey Street

Designs for new bin stores that incorporate greenery and planting space have been developed in consultation with residents. The implementation of these designs will improve the visual aspect of the street, the development and the Larcom Street Conservation Area.

e) Car parking design along Wansey Street

Moving the originally proposed parking bays further north (towards the existing tree line) will allow the existing width of the road to be maintained, thereby retaining the existing proportions of the street.

f) Improved connections through the site

The connections through the site will be improved, with new North to South roads, other connecting roads, and new foot and cycle paths. This will bring a significant improvement to the existing site, allowing a more permeable space, and designing in safety through fewer barriers and blind spots, and with more overlooked spaces.

g) Extensive tree and landscaping proposals

The design incorporates greenery, landscaping, and other sustainable environmental features which will make the overall site a softer environment to live in and pass through.

h) Inclusion of larger homes (to encourage a more static local community)

Larger homes will allow a more static community base to be developed; this is important as the site will have a significant number of units that will appeal to more transient occupiers. Want the new development to have life and vibrancy, where the sense of community can be felt.

i) Height of H13 has been reduced to maximise daylight to surrounding buildings

A key concern of residents was the loss of daylight once the proposed taller buildings were built. Through consultation, the height of H13 was reduced demonstrating that where possible, the developer has listened and acted upon elements of the design that would reduce the existing amenity of local people.

56 Comus House, Congreve Street

Support the applications for the following reasons:

- The quality of the architecture and the way the design responds to Larcom Street Conservation Area in terms of height, features, and materials proposed.
- The quality of the landscaping, including ground level courtyards, and the extensive tree and landscaping proposed.
- The improved connections through the site which are a significant improvement on the barrier formed by the existing estate.
- The inclusion of a big percentage of larger family homes that will encourage a more static local community.

Very happy with the way that the design has been amended during the consultation process to reflect the views of local resident, including:

- emphasise the quiet residential nature of Wansey Street
- interventions to improve the existing refuse problem on Wansey Street
- the retention of additional existing mature trees than was promised at the outline application
- Plot H13 buildings have been reduced in height to maximise daylighting to surrounding buildings.

Flat 6, Garland Court, Wansey Street

Object for the following reasons:

a) Cutting Wansey Street short of Garland Court

To accommodate pedestrianisation of the public square and the new shopping area, the plans set out to shorten Wansey Street (at the Walworth Road end), so that it no longer runs the full length of Garland Court. There are three blocks that make up Garland Court and the actual street will end in front of the middle block.

b) Parking on Wansey Street

The existing parking bays will no longer be conveniently positioned opposite Garland Court.

c) Concerns / impact on amenity

It is not clear what the distance of the re-positioned parking spaces will be from Garland Court. Understand that up to 15 permit holder parking places will be allocated to the new development. The nearest parking spaces (but still at a distance) to Garland Court will be three bays for 'Shared Use' (also used for pay and display users) and a 'Car Club' bay, limiting and further disadvantaging Garland Court residents from parking close to their homes.

Residents of the new Town Houses will choose to park at a convenient place outside their respective homes. The impact of this will be to restrict both parking space and choice for Garland Court residents, who will have no immediate permit holder parking outside of Garland Court and be forced to find parking much further along the street.

The impact of the pedestrianised area stretching to the outside of Garland Court means loading or unloading will also be a problem for service vehicles as well as private vehicles of Garland Court residents.

The impact on Garland Court residents does not fit with the comment in the Office's report (para 178): that *"The reconfiguration of Wansey Street will necessitate the redistribution of existing parking but all re-provided spaces will remain conveniently located for all existing residents...."*

d) Parking Survey

Parking patterns in Wansey Street have changed significantly since the fire at the Old Town Hall. Prior to the fire, parking in the street particularly at weekends was problematic for residents especially for Garland Court. The survey was conducted on two single days would not truly reflect the parking position which existed prior to the fire, which we anticipate will return and become the norm in time.

Email – no address given

Although not submitted as a formal representation, a number of queries were raised to officers concerning resident parking on Wansey Street.

1. Will the re-provided parking spaces remain conveniently located for Garland Court residents?
2. Parking at weekends and on weekday evenings will become congested. Parking is currently restricted on weekdays between 8:30 – 6:30pm. Has any thought been given to extending resident parking restrictions?

Officer comment – The submitted car parking layout shows that the nearest proposed reprovided parking spaces would be approximately 20m away from the Garland Court end block (closest to Walworth Road). It is acknowledged that residents of the Garland Court end block would not have access to a permit parking space outside the front door but they would have access to spaces within Wansey Street which is considered convenient.

The nearest three bays to Garland Court are shown as shared pay and display /permit bays. The car parking layout plan submitted demonstrates that there is capacity for the proposed number of bays (both new and reprovided bays). However, the designation of the bays will be subject to an amendment to the Traffic Management Order which requires formal consultation.

The parking layout shows that at least five additional permit parking spaces could be accommodated, over and above the reprovision of the existing parking. The Reserved Matters Applications seek approval for the physical layout of Wansey Street, including car parking spaces. As noted in paragraph 161 of the officer report, a separate application to vary the S106 will determine the actual number of CPZ permits available to new residents.

The council recognises that parking needs change over time and therefore the existing Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ) are reviewed on a periodic basis and changes made where necessary. Such a review may include the days or hours of operation.

3.3 Amendments to the officer report

The following is a list of corrections and/or points of clarification arising from the report.

Paragraph / Section	Officer Comment
<u>Paragraph 10</u> 431 cycle parking spaces would be distributed within each of the plots and public realm	422 cycles spaces are provided for residents in the plots, with a further 22 spaces in the Public Realm (11 Sheffield stands). Total provision is therefore 444 spaces.
<u>Paragraph 16</u> Refers to Screening Opinion adopted by the council	It should be noted that the Detailed Phasing Plan to allow MP1 to form the first phase of the Masterplan was approved under 13/AP/2215 on 09/10/13.
<u>Paragraph 32</u>	Revised Development Specification p.13-

Paragraph / Section	Officer Comment																		
Sets out the key design controls that were established with the Outline Planning Permission and how MP1 proposal relates to this	14, Table 4.2 Plot H6 = 15,564 – 24,967 sqm (GEA)																		
<u>Paragraph 46</u> Makes reference to the s106 agreement and specifically the clause relating to rented affordable wheelchair units and the South East London Housing Design Guide	This should read that these units should be “designed to meet the <i>principles of the South East London Housing Guide</i> ”																		
<u>Paragraph 50</u> Sets out the affordable housing mix in terms of number of bedrooms per unit	Whilst the total number is correct, the breakdown of affordable housing by number of bedrooms in MP1 is as follows: 28 x 1 bed, 31 x 2 bed, 16 x 3 bed, 1 x 4 bed																		
<u>Paragraph 104</u> Details potential overshadowing issues at existing amenity spaces in close proximity to MP1	For clarity, it should be noted that the assessment of the potential impact on Victory Community Park showed that it would receive at least two hours of sunlight on <i>21 March</i> , and complies with the BRE recommended sunlight level for a space to appear adequately sunlit throughout the year.																		
<u>Paragraph 122</u> Refers to the block heights in Plot H6	The opening sentence should state that the Western face of block H6 rises from 8 storeys at the southern end to a 16 storey tower at the Heygate Street frontage.																		
<u>Paragraph 132</u> Details the location of ‘the Tower’	This should refer to the location of the Tower on Plot <i>H6</i> , as opposed to Plot H3																		
<u>Paragraph 133</u> Reference to the full height of blocks on Plot H6	This should be corrected to state that the full height of H6 is 16 storeys																		
<u>Paragraph 166</u> Sets out details relating to the revised parking layout and the surrounding streets.	For clarity, the breakdown of existing and proposed spaces is summarised below: <table border="1" data-bbox="774 1758 1340 2027"> <thead> <tr> <th>Parking</th> <th>Existing</th> <th>Proposed</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Permit spaces:</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Wansey St</td> <td>26</td> <td>28</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Brandon St</td> <td>5</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Content St</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>31</td> <td>33</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Parking	Existing	Proposed	Permit spaces:			• Wansey St	26	28	• Brandon St	5	5	• Content St	0	0	TOTAL	31	33
Parking	Existing	Proposed																	
Permit spaces:																			
• Wansey St	26	28																	
• Brandon St	5	5																	
• Content St	0	0																	
TOTAL	31	33																	

Paragraph / Section	Officer Comment		
	Wheelchair spaces for residents on Wansey St	3	3
	Pay and Display	3 (Outside Town Hall)	3 (Shared permit and pay & display on Wansey St)
	Wheelchair spaces (associated with Town Hall)	2	2 (To come forward with MP2)
	Short stay (Content St)	2	2
	Car Club spaces	0	2
	TOTAL	41 (31 Permit)	45 (36 Permit) (2 Car Club)
<p><u>Paragraph 254</u> Refers to the potential for the plant space in Plot H6 to become a residents' gym once the Energy Centre becomes operational.</p>	<p>It is recommended that a condition be attached to require that detailed layouts are submitted for approval in connection with any alternative use of the H06 Plant room.</p>		
<p><u>Appendix 4</u> Refers to the range of strategies that are required to be submitted by the s106 legal agreement attached to the OPP</p>	<p>A number of other additional details were required by Planning Conditions attached to the OPP. The Detailed Phasing Plan, required by Condition 3 of the OPP, was agreed on 09/10/13, prior to the submission of the MP1 Reserved Matters Applications.</p>		

Affordable housing section (paragraphs 47 – 55)

In relation to the local resident objections received concerning the presentation of the affordable housing information contained in the application documents, Appendix 1 of the Addendum Report sets out the private and affordable housing mix for the MP1 development.

It is noted that this doesn't change the information previously provided within the application documents.

Trees and landscaping (paragraphs 185 – 196)

The applicant has advised that some discrepancies on the numbers of retained and proposed trees were reported in the application documents. Paragraph 187 of the officer report should read:

“The MP1 development would provide a total of 139 trees across the site. This includes 40 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 Landscaping Strategies). 53 new trees to be planted within the residential plot courtyards and 46 new trees in the public realm.”

3.4 Amendments to the recommendation

A summary of the substantive changes to the draft decision notices is set out below.

<p>Plot H06 - Application Reference 13-AP-3581</p>	
<p>Condition 4 – Landscaping</p>	<p>Amend trigger for submission of details:</p> <p><i>“Before any of the landscape works hereby approved have commenced above grade....”</i></p> <p>Include details of the play equipment in the list of information to be submitted.</p>
<p>Add new Condition 5 to allow for the temporary plant room to change to an alternative use once the Energy Centre is operational.</p>	<p><u>Detailed Drawings – Plot H06D Plant Room</u></p> <p><i>Before any alternative use of the plant room located in H06D hereby approved, detailed drawings of layouts and any changes to external elevations shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with any such approval given.</i></p> <p><u>Reason</u></p> <p><i>In order that the Local Planning Authority be satisfied as to the design and details in accordance with saved policies 3.12 Quality in design and 313 Urban design of the Southwark</i></p>

	<i>Plan and SP12 Design and conservation of the Core Strategy 2011.</i>
Plots H10 and H13 - Application References 13-AP-3583 and 13-AP-3584	
Condition 2 and 4 - Landscaping	Amend trigger for submission of details: <i>“Before any of the landscape works hereby approved have commenced above grade....”</i> Include details of the play equipment in the list of information to be submitted.
Public Realm – Application Reference 13-AP-3582	
Informative 15	Include reference that the required details will be submitted pursuant to Condition 4 (landscaping).

3.5 ITEM 11.5, 6 AND 7 - 127-134 BOROUGH HIGH STREET SE1

3.6 To advise Members of pre-application advice, Conservation Advisory Group Comments, Section 106 issues and additional conditions.

3.7 Pre-application advice

In order to understand the evolution of the current proposals now before the planning committee, further planning history is set out below which details the pre-application proposals submitted over the last 2-3 years and officers’ and DRP views on those proposals.

3.8 Pre-application 11-EQ-0205 submitted on 4/11/2011 was for the general demolition of the scaffolded buildings (129-143 Borough High Street) with the re-building of their frontages, apart from Zenith House at No.133-5 where a wholly contemporary building was proposed. The proposed use on site included a hotel, retail and proposed gymnasium.

In design and conservation terms this proposal was not considered to be responsive to the urban grain and scale of the conservation area. It was also advised that the applicant was not to consider the Wolfson Building to the rear as setting a precedent as it was not considered to be a positive contributor to the local townscape.

Concern was raised in relation to the scale of the new block Nos. 137-139 Borough High Street as it exceeded other heights in the streetscape with its

prominent gable which was incongruous in scale, form and design and which was likely to un-balance the whole proposal.

Whilst the proposal involved a re-building of the frontages to 129 – 131 and 141 – 143, the new frontage to 137 – 139 was considered to sit uneasily in the streetscape.

- 3.9 Pre-application 12-EQ-0269 submitted on 25/01/2012 was for the retention of the listed building at 127 Borough High Street and the erection of two new buildings linked at first floor level to replace 129 to 143 Borough High Street comprising of a six storey with basement building with set backs from Borough High Street at fourth and fifth floor levels. Spur Inn Yard and Nags Head Yard will be retained and utilised for public realm issues, servicing and cycle storage. The proposed land uses for the site are a 100 bedroom hotel, three retail units and a two bedroom maisonette.

In terms of design and conservation issues, the scale of the buildings which had been problematic in initial designs had been amended in terms of its bulk and massing to better respond to the heritage streetscape and wider townscape. The street frontage has been broken-up into 4 elements which reflected the general plot widths of surrounding buildings and visually broke up the bulk of the proposal, yet still retaining a consistency and unified development. However, it was considered that the articulation could be enhanced further.

It was considered that the proposed scale is the absolute maximum that would be acceptable on this site. The proposal to revive the listed building was supported.

- 3.10 Design Review Panel of 11/06/2012 raised fundamental concerns over both the urban design and the architectural expression of the proposal and were not able to endorse it in its submitted form. Considered that the proposal needed to be of the highest architectural order, given the substantial demolition of several buildings within the conservation area. The Panel were unanimous that the proposal has not demonstrated the quality of architectural design required to justify the disruptive impact on the historic context.

The Panel concluded that they had concerns in relation to the proposal due to its poor quality of urban design and architectural design. They felt it failed to respect its historic context and required a design concept that reflected its importance to the conservation and its position within the wider masterplan for the hospital campus. They considered that the applicants should review their proposals from first principles and bring back a new scheme back to the DRP before they consider a planning application on this site.

- 3.11 Design Review Panel of 12/03/2014 (considering pre-application proposals which are similar to those now before the committee) took the view that the revised scheme would regenerate a key part of the street frontage to Borough High Street and create new public amenities and a diverse range of facilities and activities for the local community and King's College London students.

The proposal was considered to take on a prominent role in the conservation area and sought to retain the permeability of the yards to the rear to compliment them by bringing active uses to these important spaces which are characteristic of the area.

It was considered that the side and rear elevations lacked distinction and could be strengthened to better address the historic yards more appropriately. The Borough High Street facade would benefit from more articulation to reflect the varied and highly articulate townscape of the conservation area. It was also considered that there should be a better landscape proposal as the public realm and planting lacked conviction.

The Panel concluded that the concept was sound, of a high quality design in a sensitive historic context but raised concerns in respect to the architectural expression of the rear buildings, design and use of the spaces around the buildings. These issues have now been addressed in the subsequent proposals before the planning committee.

- 3.12 Comments were received from English Heritage 18/04/2013 to the proposals viewed by the DRP stating that they will be formally objecting to the pre-application proposal as their assessment indicates that the proposal would cause harm to the Borough High Street Conservation Area and that they were not convinced of the merits of the new scheme.

Further comments from English Heritage following a site visit and subsequent meeting dated 19/04/2013 who objected to the emerging proposals for the application site on the grounds that there had been no case submitted that justified the demolition of 129-143 Borough High Street as required under current government policy (NPPF). That the buildings made a significant positive contribution to this part of Borough High Street Conservation Area and the setting of the listed buildings at 121-127 Borough High Street.

3.13 Conservation Advisory Group Comments

The application was presented to CAAG on 13 July 2013, and the group objected to this scheme for the following reasons:

- CAAG do not accept the Heritage Statement's suggestion that these façades and front rooms cannot be restored and re-constructed where necessary. The Heritage Statement does point out that these buildings make a strong positive contribution to the conservation area, as recorded in the Borough High Street Conservation Area appraisal (2006) and echoed by English Heritage's recent objection to this scheme. These Georgian facades are of the first order and feature Coade stone detailing. The Victorian hop warehouse has attractive polychrome brick arches, with traces of Renaissance half-timbered framing to the Spur Inn Yard side elevation.
- This group of buildings is one of the most important ensembles. These buildings speak eloquently about the prosperity and commercial development of Southwark's historic core. We must do all we can to preserve these structures for future generations.
- The architectural proposal itself was weak, in no way preserving or enhancing the conservation area.
- An excessively dense hotel is proposed behind these unconvincing facades. If a hotel is needed CAAG suggest that the applicants, Kings College London, and their architects, look at the Rookery Hotel Cowcross

Street in Smithfield <http://www.rookeryhotel.com>. Are a further 100 rooms really required on our Borough High Street?

CAAG ask that the scheme is rejected and demand a conservation-led design for this important site that preserves our valuable historic townscape.

3.14 Section 106 contributions

The toolkit for the Section 106 contributions is attached as Appendix 2.

However, since the report was written the administrative charge has been changed as no administrative fee on payments in lieu is charged. The payment is now £9,901.74.

The works in lieu to the Spur's Inn and Nag Inn Yard to the equivalent value of at least £75,750.

3.15 Viability Issues

127 Borough High Street is listed and is being retained as part of the proposed scheme. The remainder of the buildings on site are not protected specifically, although they do fall within the conservation area.

The existing buildings are very modest and are in need of extensive refurbishment. As reported in the principal report floor to ceiling heights are limited in some of the properties which makes retention and alteration problematic in terms of design and expensive relative to a new build scheme. The restricted nature of a retained scheme limits the available floor space which can be used to generate value. In addition the conversion costs are disproportionately much higher which adversely affects the viability when compared to the proposed new build scheme.

The applicant has submitted a viability report to support their argument that the refurbishment and retention of the existing buildings is not viable and that the proposed scheme's scale and massing is necessary in order to generate a return in line with market expectations.

The inputs submitted have been examined and are considered to be in line with market levels and expectations.

The applicant's conclusion that the retention of the existing buildings (other than the listed 127 Borough High Street) on either of the residential led or commercial led bases is unviable is considered reasonable.

Moreover, the scale and massing of the proposed scheme is considered necessary in order to generate a return inline with market expectations.

To conclude, on the basis of a review of the applicant's submitted report in the limited time available it is considered reasonable to agree with the conclusion of their viability adviser's report that it is not viable to retain the existing buildings (other than the listed building at 127 Borough High Street) as part of the redevelopment of this site.

3.16 Additional Conditions

That the committee impose the following 5 additional conditions in respect to the planning application (13-AP-1714):

(13) Details of the shop-fronts for the approved retail units shall be submitted to this Local Planning Authority and approved in writing; the development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with any such approval given.

Reason:

In order to ensure that the design and details in keeping with the appearance of the conservation area and the setting of 127 Borough High Street in accordance with The National Planning Policy Framework 2012, Strategic Policy 12 - Design and Conservation of The Core Strategy 2011 and Saved Policies: 3.12 Quality in Design, 3.13 Urban Design, 3.16 Conservation Areas and 3.17 Listed Buildings; of The Southwark Plan 2007.

(14) The development hereby permitted, in relation to the hotel, shall be designed to ensure that the following internal noise levels are not exceeded within the proposed hotel bedrooms, 30dB LAeq, T and 45dB LAFmax due to environmental noise between 23:00 and 07:00. The bedrooms shall be designed to include the provision of background ventilation without the need for occupiers to open windows.

Reason

To ensure that the occupiers and users of the development do not suffer a loss of amenity by reason of excess noise from environmental and transportation sources in accordance with strategic policy 13 'High environmental standards' of the Core Strategy (2011) saved policies 3.2 'Protection of amenity' and 4.2 'Quality of residential accommodation' of the Southwark Plan (2007), and the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

(15) No developer, owner, employee, or visitor to any part of the development hereby permitted, with the exception of disabled persons, shall seek, or will be allowed, to obtain a parking permit within the controlled parking zone in Southwark in which the application site is situated.

Reason

To ensure compliance with Strategic Policy 2 - Sustainable Transport of the Core Strategy 2011 and saved policy 5.2 Transport Impacts of the Southwark Plan 2007.

(16) Prior to the commencement of the authorised use, an acoustic report detailing the rated noise level from any plant, together with any associated ducting (which shall be 10 dB(A) or more below the lowest relevant measured LA90 (15min) at the nearest noise sensitive premises, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The method of assessment is to be carried in accordance with BS4142:1997 'Rating industrial noise affecting mixed residential and industrial areas'. The plant and equipment shall be installed and constructed in accordance with any such approval given and shall be permanently maintained thereafter and the development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with any such approval given.

Reason

To ensure that occupiers of neighbouring premises do not suffer a loss of amenity by reason of noise nuisance or the local environment from noise creep due to plant and machinery in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework 2012, .Strategic Policy 13 High Environmental Standards of the Core Strategy 2011 and Saved Policy 3.2 Protection of Amenity of the Southwark Plan (2007).

(17) Prior to the commencement of use, full particulars and details of a scheme for the ventilation of the kitchen to an appropriate outlet level, including details of sound attenuation for any necessary plant and the standard of dilution expected, has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and the development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with any approval given.

Reason

In order to ensure that that the ventilation ducting and ancillary equipment will not result in odour, fume or noise nuisance and will not detract from the appearance of the building in the interests of amenity in accordance with The National Planning Policy Framework 2012, Strategic Policy 13 - High Environmental Standards of The Core Strategy 2011 and Saved Policy 3.2 Protection of Amenity of The Southwark Plan 2007.

REASON FOR LATENESS

- 4. The comments reported above have all been received since the agenda was printed. They all relate to an item on the agenda and Members should be aware of the objections and comments made.

REASON FOR URGENCY

- 5. Applications are required by statute to be considered as speedily as possible. The application has been publicised as being on the agenda for consideration at this meeting of the sub-committee and applicants and objectors have been invited to attend the meeting to make their views known. Deferral would delay the processing of the applications/enforcements and would inconvenience all those who attend the meeting

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Individual files	Chief Executive's Department 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH	Planning enquiries telephone: 020 7525 5403
Appendix 1 MP1 Affordable Housing Summary	Appended	

Appendix 2	Appended	
S106 Toolkit		

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Gary Rice, Head of Development Management	
Report Author	Helen Goulden, Team Leader; Michele Sterry, Team Leader	
Version	Final	
Dated	4 February 2014	
Key Decision	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments Included
Strategic Director of finance and 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		4 February 2014

APPENDIX 1

MP1 Affordable Housing Proposals

The following tables set out the private and affordable housing mix within the MP1 Development:

MP1 UNIT MIX				
Unit Type	Number of Units	Market Homes	Affordable Homes	Percentage of Total
Studio (1 persons)	0	0	0	0%
1-bed (2 persons)	146	118	28	40.5%
2-bed (3-4 persons)	154	123	31	42.8%
3-bed (5-6 person)	56	40	16	15.6%
4-bed (6-7 persons)	4	3	1	1.1%
Total	360	284	76	100%

MP1 AFFORDABLE HOUSING MIX				
Unit Type	Social Rented	Affordable Rented	Shared Ownership / Intermediate	Total Affordable Units
Studio (1 persons)	-	-	-	-
1-bed (2 persons)	-	-	28	28
2-bed (3-4 persons)	-	4	27	31
3-bed (5-6 person)	16	-	-	16
4-bed (6-7 persons)	1	-	-	1
Total	17	4	55	76

Affordable Housing Rents

The following principles were established within the Outline Planning Permission (OPP) and approved Affordable Housing Strategy:

- The Overall Development shall provide 25% Affordable Housing (calculated on the basis of habitable rooms) and that no more than 50% of the said Affordable Housing shall comprise Shared Ownership Units
- Social Rent Levels for 3 and 4 bedroom homes, in line with borough housing priorities
- Affordable Rents on 1 and 2 bedroom homes at 50% of market rent, which is:
 - A lower level than is set by the GLA 2011-15 Affordable Housing Programme; and
 - A lower level than is being forecast in a number of London boroughs.
- 50% of Shared Ownership Units (based on habitable rooms) are to be provided to residents on incomes at or below the Soutwark Shared Ownership Affordability Threshold;
- 50% of Shared Ownership Units (based on habitable rooms) are to be provided to residents on incomes at or below the GLA Affordability Threshold

When applied to the MP1 proposals this equates to the following:

AFFORDABLE HOUSING & RENTS TABLE BASED ON STEAD STREET EXAMPLE

Availability of Public Sector Funding

The OPP Section 106 Legal Agreement includes clauses in Schedule 3, Paragraph 8 relating to public sector funding. The Section 106 states the following at paragraph 8.1:

"In the event that the Developer secures Public Funds, the Developer shall confirm to the Council in writing at the same time as submitting an application for Reserved Matters the availability of such Public Funds that are to be used in the Plots that are subject to the Reserved Matters application for the purposes of improving the affordability criteria of the Affordable Housing so as to increase the affordability of the Affordable Housing on the following basis and possible in the following sequence:

- *Reducing the Affordable Rent Levels for 1 and 2 bedroom Dwellings; and then*
- *Increasing the proportion of Shared Ownership at Soutwark Shared Ownership Affordability Thresholds.*

Schedule 3, Paragraph 8.1 of the Section 106 does not place an obligation on the Developer to secure public funds. It simply states that in the event public funds are secured these should be confirmed in writing to the Council and used to improve, in the first instance, the affordability criteria. Lend Lease has not secured any public funds and so did not need to submit anything as part of the MP1 reserved matters applications to address this obligation.

APPENDIX 2

ADDRESS / TP FILE REF			
DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT			
PLANNING OBLIGATION	SUMMARY OF COUNCIL REQUIREMENT	APPLICANT CONTRIBUTION (£)	OFFICER VERIFICATION
AFFORDABLE HOUSING	On site provision for 15 units or more. (Zero = on site)	0	
EDUCATION	£11,156 per school place	0	
EMPLOYMENT IN THE DEVELOPMENT	To provide training and support into employment through a WPC for one person costs £2667	12,532	
EMPLOYMENT DURING CONSTRUCTION	Contribution to workplace co-ordinator programme, including training and network support £76463 per annum	75,116	
EMPLOYMENT DURING CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT FEE	Contribution to the management and co-ordination of the construction workplace co-ordinator programme	5,887	
PUBLIC OPEN SPACE, CHILDRENS' PLAY EQUIPMENT, AND SPORTS DEVELOPMENT	£71 per person for open space (and additional £71 per person in areas of park deficiency)	15,994	
	£80 per child for children's play equipment	0	
	£349 per person for sports development	0	
TRANSPORT STRATEGIC	£223 per person	38,276	
TRANSPORT SITE SPECIFIC	Costed on a site-by-site basis. Eg zebra crossing £30,000	50,500	
TRANSPORT FOR LONDON	Costed on a site-by-site basis	0	
CROSSRAIL CHARGE	Based on indicative sums	0	
PUBLIC REALM	Costed on a site-by-site basis. For example street lighting £2100 per column	75,750	
ARCHAEOLOGY	Site up to 1000sqm would cost £2400	0	
HEALTH	£961 per unit	0	
COMMUNITY FACILITIES	£73 per person	0	
OTHER, INCLUDING	Costed on a site-by-site basis. For example contribution to	0	

ADDRESS / TP FILE REF			
DESCRIPTION OF DEVELOPMENT			
PLANNING OBLIGATION	SUMMARY OF COUNCIL REQUIREMENT	APPLICANT CONTRIBUTION (£)	OFFICER VERIFICATION
TOURISM CONSERVATION CHILDCARE COMMUNITY SAFETY	CCTV system, the capital cost of providing a new childcare facility, refurbishment of adjacent listed building, or tourism and wayfinding initiatives		
ADMIN CHARGE	2% of the first £3 million of monetary contributions to be provided thereunder and 1% of monetary contributions to be provided thereafter	11,506	
MAYORAL COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL)	£35 per sqm for all forms of development except charity and social housing projects	To be Calculated	
TOTAL			
APPROX. COST RESIDENTIAL PER UNIT*		N/A	
APPROX. COST COMMERCIAL PER SQM*		N/A	

*Please note average costs per units are approximated based on the average minimum unit size thresholds set out in the Residential Design Standards SPD