

Item No. 6.1	Classification: Open	Date: 1 July 2014	Meeting Name: Planning Committee
Report title:	Development Management planning application: Application 13/AP/3815 for: Full Planning Permission Address: OCTAVIA HOUSE, 235-241 UNION STREET, LONDON SE1 0LR Proposal: Redevelopment of 235-241 Union Street (Octavia House), including garages and substation to the rear and adjoining Network Rail land to provide a 14 storey building (max. building height 44.2m AOD) for the London Centre of Contemporary Music at basement, ground, first, second, third and fourth floors (Use Class D1), a ground floor cafe (Class A3), and 55 residential units (Class C3) across the fifth to fourteenth floors including associated cycle parking, one on-site car parking space; re-provision of eight garages and landscaped public realm.		
Ward(s) or groups affected:	Cathedrals		
From:	Head of Development Management		
Application Start Date 14/11/2013		Application Expiry Date 13/02/2014	
Earliest Decision Date 12/01/2014		PPA Date 30/08/2014	

RECOMMENDATION

1. That members resolve to grant planning permission subject to a satisfactory legal agreement, planning conditions and referral to the Mayor of London (GLA).
2. In the event that the legal agreement is not entered into by 29 August 2014, that members authorise the Head of Development Management to refuse planning permission, if appropriate, for the reasons set out in paragraph 190 of this report.

BACKGROUND

Site location and description

3. The application site, measuring 0.09ha, is on the south side Union Street and bounded by railway arches to east near the junction with Great Suffolk Street, Nelson Square to the south and west and Union Street to the north.
4. The site is occupied by a three storey building known as Octavia House. The building is currently vacant but until recently was occupied by the London Centre for Contemporary Music (LCCM) within the basement and ground floor. The upper floors were occupied by an Artists Studio Company who let out floor space for use as creative studios (Class B1). To the rear of the site are eight single storey garages and land in ownership by Network Rail adjoining the railway viaduct.

5. The surrounding context has a mixed use character consisting of various commercial buildings and residential buildings, some of which are large scale in nature. The south side of Union Street varies in scale with the Nelson Square residential buildings being the most dominant. To the west lies the Lord Nelson Public House a single/two storey building which adjoins Rowland Hill House which is a part seven storey part nine storey block of residential flats. The block is one of four similar sized blocks arranged around a central open space, Nelson Square Gardens, to the south-west of the site.
6. To the north of the site there is an eight storey hotel (Travel Lodge) and north west, the Palestra office development which is 12 storeys or 56 metres in height. Union Street has a number of cultural buildings, including Jerwood Space to the east and is one of the main access routes to the Tate Gallery from Southwark tube station which is identified by the distinctive orange coloured lamp posts and the Legible London sign posts.
7. In terms of policy designations, the site is within the Central Activities Zone, Bankside and Borough District Town Centre, Bankside Borough and London Bridge Opportunity area and an Air Quality Management Area. Southwark Underground is located about 170m to the west of the site and Waterloo East and Waterloo terminus railway station a distance of approximately 550m away.

Details of proposal

8. Full planning permission is sought to erect a 14 storey building for the London Centre of Contemporary Music at basement, ground, first, second, third and fourth floors (Use Class D1), a ground floor cafe (Class A3), and 55 residential units (Class C3) across the fifth to fourteenth floors including associated cycle parking, one on-site car parking space; re-provision of eight garages and landscaped public realm.

London Centre for Contemporary Music (LCCM)

9. The LCCM is an independent education institution for popular music. It attracts talented student musicians who intend to enter the music industry and focuses on equipping graduates with the necessary skills to sustain careers in this field. The LCCM is reported to be one of two comparable facilities' in the World of which the other is the Berkeley College of Music in Boston, Massachusetts that offers curriculum in music and liberal arts. This development will provide LCCM with more floorspace allowing the institution to increase its student population from 240 to 500 students and full-time staff from 12 to 25 and up to 12 extra freelance and part time staff.
10. The development will provide the LCCM with a basement plus four floors above that will be built to a shell and core specification. The facilities will include:
 - A multi-functional venue in the basement that can be used as a performance space, two performance rooms for live band rehearsals
 - A further five rehearsal rooms
 - 14 practice booths for drum, guitar, saxophone, bass and vocal practice
 - Three recording studios
 - Eight classrooms for general teaching including instrument practice
 - Three computer rooms
 - A study room
 - Four audio-visual rooms
 - Two piano rooms
 - A library
 - Office space for management, education and admissions staff
 - An assessment room
 - A private meeting room

- A tutors room, maintenance room and communications rooms
 - A filming studio
11. In addition to the LCCM, it is also proposed that the National Jazz Youth Orchestra (NYJO) will relocate to the new building. The NYJO is one of Britain's longest-running ensembles for young people under 25 playing big-band jazz. The orchestra offers aspiring young musicians the opportunity to rehearse, write and gain experience in live performance. NYJO is currently based in Westminster.
 12. The main access to the LCCM will be on Union Street via a double height glazed entrance and ground floor cafe. The basement and upper floors within the building are accessed via either one of two lifts within this part of the building or an internal staircase.
 13. Secure parking for 30 cycles will be provided on-site at ground floor level which is accessed via garages to the rear of the site off Nelson Square. Refuse and recycling storage will also be provided at ground floor level.

Residential accommodation

14. All of the proposed new dwellings will be provided between floor 5 up through to floor fourteen. An assessment of the quality of accommodation and level of private amenity space is provided later in this report. An overview of the tenure of accommodation is provided below.

	Private (Units)	Affordable Rent (Units)	Shared Ownership (Units)	Social rent (Units)	Total (Units)
1 bedroom	8	2	2	0	12 (22%)
2 bedroom	22	4	4	0	30 (54%)
3 bedroom	11	0	1	1	13 (24%)
Total	41	6	7	1	55 (100%)

15. Separate entrances will be provided to access the private and affordable residential accommodation, both of which will be on Union Street. These dwellings will be served by a total of three lifts and a central escape staircase.
16. Private amenity space is provided for all units in the form of winter gardens. The winter gardens are enclosed terraces which join onto the apartments living and primary bedroom areas. Each winter garden has a full height openable perforated screen which provides natural ventilation.
17. Secure parking for 70 bicycles will be provided within the basement mezzanine for the residential units. The parking in this space will be shared between the occupiers and visitors of both the market and affordable residential units and bike storage areas will be monitored by CCTV. Refuse and recycling storage will be provided at ground floor level adjacent to the LCCM refuse and recycling storage space. One wheelchair accessible parking space will be provided as well as the re-provision of eight garages.

Amendments

18. Alterations have been made to submitted documents since submission. The main changes that have resulted are revisions to the internal layout of the proposed wheelchair accessible accommodation.

Planning history

19. 14/AP/1013 – Prior approval for demolition of existing three storey building (plus basement) including garages to the rear to facilitate redevelopment of the site. This was granted on 7 February 2014.
20. 11-AP-3506 - Renewal of planning permission reference: 09-AP-0489 dated 2 July 2009 for: Redevelopment of the site to create a part four, part six, part seven and part nine storey building (being predominantly nine storey) containing nine residential units (comprised of three x two bed, five x three bed and one x four bed units) and 2440sqm of commercial floor space of which 286sqm is in retail or financial or professional services uses (Class A1/A2) and 2154sqm is in office use (Class B1)'. This was granted on 9 July 2012.
21. 09/AP/0489 – Redevelopment of the site to create a part four, part six, part seven, part nine storey building containing nine residential units and 2,440sqm of commercial floorspace. (28sqm retail (Class A1) and 2154sqm office (Class B1) This was granted on 2 July 2009.

Planning history of adjoining sites

Palestra building

22. 9901497 - Redevelopment to provide new office building on basement, ground and 11 upper floors and part open area ground floor area and 295sq.m of retail space; associated landscaping; basement parking; servicing and two accesses onto Gambia Street at 197 Blackfriars Road. This was granted on 27 July 2001.

Travelodge

23. 05-AP-0673 - Erection of a eight storey building for hotel use with retail or restaurant (classes A1/A3) use on the ground floor at 202-206 Union Street and adjoining vacant land. This was granted on 2 October 2006.

54-58 Great Suffolk Street

24. 12-AP-3706 Planning permission granted for Change of use of land to the rear of 54-58 Great Suffolk Street from land ancillary to the railway arch units (within B class) to private amenity space associated with the proposed residential development of 54-58 Great Suffolk Street (pursuant to permission LBS Reg 11/AP/3600 dated 29/12/2011 for Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment with a four storey (plus basement) to provide seven residential units (1 x one bed, 5 x two bed and 1 x 3 bed apartments) and 139sqm of office floorspace at basement level). This was granted on 1 February 2013.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Summary of main issues

25. The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:
 - Principle of development, including land uses
 - Density
 - Design matters
 - Housing mix and quality of accommodation
 - Affordable Housing
 - Existing and future residential amenity
 - Transport impacts
 - Planning obligations (S.106 undertaking or agreement)

- Mayoral Community Infrastructure levy
- Sustainable development implications
- Flood risk
- Other matters

Planning policy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

26. The NPPF came into effect on 27 March 2012 and is a material planning consideration. The document is applicable in its entirety, but the most relevant sections are:

Section 1 - Building a strong competitive economy

Section 4 - Promoting sustainable development

Section 6 - Delivering a wide choice of good quality homes

Section 7 - Requiring good design

Section 10 - Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

The Development Plan

27. The development plan for the borough comprises the London Plan July 2011 consolidated with revised early minor alterations October 2013, the Southwark Core Strategy 2011 and Saved Policies from the Southwark Plan 2007.

London Plan July 2011 consolidated with revised early minor alterations October 2013

28. Policy 2.10 – Central Activities Zone
 Policy 2.13 – Opportunity Area and Intensification Areas
 Policy 3.1 – Ensuring Equal Life Chances For All
 Policy 3.2 – Improving Health And Addressing Health Inequalities
 Policy 3.3 – Increasing Housing Supply
 Policy 3.4 – Optimising Housing Potential
 Policy 3.5 – Quality and design of housing developments
 Policy 3.6 – Children and young people’s play and informal recreation facilities
 Policy 3.8 – Housing choice
 Policy 3.9 – Mixed and balanced communities
 Policy 3.12 – Negotiating affordable housing
 Policy 3.18 – Education facilities
 Policy 5.1 – Climate change mitigation
 Policy 5.2 – Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
 Policy 5.7 – Renewable energy
 Policy 5.11 – Green roofs and development site environs
 Policy 6.4 – Enhancing London’s transport connectivity
 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

Core Strategy 2011

29. Strategic Policy 1 – Sustainable development
 Strategic Policy 2 – Sustainable transport
 Strategic Policy 4 – Places to learn and enjoy
 Strategic Policy 5 – Providing new homes
 Strategic Policy 6 – Homes for people on different incomes

Strategic Policy 7 – Family homes
Strategic Policy 10 – Jobs and Businesses
Strategic Policy 12 – Design and conservation
Strategic Policy 13 – High environmental standards

Southwark Plan 2007 (July) - saved policies

30. The Council's cabinet on 19 March 2013, as required by para 215 of the NPPF, considered the issue of compliance of Southwark Planning Policy with the National Planning Policy Framework. 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 Policy 1.8 (location of retail outside town centres) in the Southwark Plan all Southwark Plan policies are saved. Therefore due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans in accordance to their degree of consistency with the NPPF.
31. The site lies within the Borough and Bankside District Town Centre, the Central Activities Zone, the Air Quality Management Area and the Bankside, Borough and London Bridge Opportunity Area and has a public transport accessibility rating of six.

Saved Policies

32. Policy 1.1 – Access to employment opportunities;
Policy 2.2 – Provision of new community facilities;
Policy 2.3 – Enhancement of educational establishments;
Policy 2.5 – Planning obligations;
Policy 3.1 – Environmental effects;
Policy 3.2 – Protection of amenity;
Policy 3.3 – Sustainability assessment;
Policy 3.4 – Energy efficiency;
Policy 3.12 – Quality in design;
Policy 3.13 – Urban design;
Policy 3.14 – Designing out crime;
Policy 3.19 – Archaeology;
Policy 3.20 – Tall buildings
Policy 4.2 – Density of residential development;
Policy 4.2 – Quality of residential accommodation;
Policy 4.4 – Affordable housing;
Policy 5.2 – Transport Impacts;
Policy 5.3 – Walking and Cycling;
Policy 5.6 – Car parking

Supplementary Planning Documents

33. Residential Design Standards SPD 2011
Affordable Housing SPD 2008
Draft Affordable Housing SPD 2011
Sustainable Design and Construction SPD 2009
S.106 Planning Obligations SPD 2007
Draft S106 Planning Obligations SPD 2014
Draft Bankside Borough and London Bridge SPD
Blackfriars Road SPD 2014

Principle of development

34. The NPPF promotes sustainable development which means improving the built and natural environment whilst creating jobs, improving the design and function of places and providing a wide choice of good quality homes. This site is within the central activities zone, an opportunity area, a town centre and Blackfriars road area where a mix of uses and intensification is encouraged.

35. Octavia House was constructed in 1984, is clad in red brick and has a flat roof. The L-shaped building comprises a basement, ground and two upper floors. The property does not benefit from a lift and has a single stairway and so is limited in term of its accessibility for users. The building has neither architectural or historic interest and therefore redevelopment of the site provides an opportunity to provide a high quality building which optimises the use of a brownfield site in a highly accessible location.
36. The land uses proposed are considered appropriate under policies for the central activities zone, town centres and opportunities areas. The provision of the LCCM is also considered to support the objectives of the strategic cultural area, the boundary of which lies to the north of the site on Union street.

Loss of floor space in B Class use

37. The lawful use of the existing building is for office space (Class B1) which this scheme does not seek to re-provide. In accordance with Strategic Policy 10 and saved policy 1.4 that the net loss of floorspace with a Class B1 use will not be permitted unless:
 - a) The applicant can demonstrate convincing attempts to dispose of the premises; either for continued B Class use, or for mixed uses, involving B Class, including redevelopment, over a period of 24 months, have been successful; or
 - b) the site or buildings would be unsuitable for re-use or redevelopment for B Class use or mixed uses including B Class use, having regard to physical or environmental constraints; or
 - c) The site is located within a town or local centre, in which case in accordance with saved policy 1.7, suitable Class A or other town centre uses will be permitted in place of Class B uses. Where an increase in floorspace is proposed, the additional floor space may be used for suitable mixed or residential use.
38. As the site is within a Town Centre, and seeks to provide a mix of town centre uses the loss of B class floor space would be acceptable in accordance with the saved policy 1.4. The surrounding area is currently being transformed by a series of new developments and this site has been identified as having the potential to positively support the vision for Blackfriars Road. This scheme will support those land use objectives by contributing towards the delivery of new homes and supporting the achievement of educational potential through the LCCM. In terms of land use, the principle of the scheme can be supported and would be in accordance with objectives for the central activities zone, the core strategy and the Blackfriars road SPD (2014). It will add the vitality of the wider strategic cultural area by bringing this vacant site back into productive use and enhancing arts-orientated education provision.

Density

39. Core Strategy Strategic Policy 5 sets out a density range of 650-1100 habitable rooms per hectare (hr/ha) within the Central Activities Zone. Densities may be exceeded in opportunity areas where developments are of an exemplary standard of design. Officers have calculated the density of the scheme to be 3023 hr/ha based on the methodology set out in Southwark's Residential Design Standards SPD (2011). As such, the density of the scheme will exceed the prescribed range for new development in this part of the borough by a significant margin.
40. Density provides a numerical measure of the intensity of development and an indication of whether the scale of development is likely to be appropriate in different parts of the borough. A density above the expected range would not, in itself, necessarily lead to a conclusion that a scheme should be judged unacceptable. However, it would indicate that the impacts of a scheme, on the character of a local

area, neighbouring properties and quality of the accommodation being provided, should be carefully examined. In cases where such impacts are found to be acceptable, it is not considered that density alone should be of overriding concern sufficient to warrant refusal of planning permission. Where a development exceeds the prescribed density range it is required to achieve a high standard of architectural design in accordance with the Residential Design Standards Document SPD. This is discussed further under the design and quality of accommodation section of this report.

Affordable Housing

41. London Plan Policy 3.8 requires new developments to offer a range of housing choices and the provision of affordable family housing. London Plan Policy 3.12 requires the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing to be provided when negotiating on individual private residential and mixed schemes. It stipulates that negotiations should take account of their individual circumstances including development viability, the availability of public subsidy, the implications of phased development including provisions for re-appraising the viability of schemes prior to implementation.
42. Strategic Policy 6 requires the provision of 665 affordable homes in the Bankside, Borough and London Bridge Opportunity Area between 2011 and 2026. On a development of ten or more units a minimum of 35% is required to contribute towards affordable provision or as much as is financially viable. The tenure of affordable housing in this area is required to be split between social rented (70 per cent) and intermediate (30 per cent) in accordance with saved policy 4.4 of the Southwark Plan.
43. The draft Affordable Housing SPD 2011 outlines a sequential approach to make sure as much affordable housing as possible is achieved. The sequential approach is set out below:
 - All housing, including affordable housing should be located on the development site.
 - In exceptional circumstances we may allow the affordable housing to be provided off-site. In these circumstances we require that affordable housing is provided on another site or sites in the local area of the proposed development.
 - In exceptional circumstances we may allow a pooled contribution in lieu of on-site or off-site affordable housing. In these circumstances we require a payment towards providing affordable housing instead of the affordable housing being built as part of the proposed development.
44. The SPD also states that where the council allows either an off-site or pooled contribution provision, at least as much affordable housing must be provided as would have been provided if the minimum 35 per cent affordable housing policy requirement were achieved on-site. The SPD sets out that a minimum of £100,000 of pooled contribution per habitable room of affordable housing will be required.
45. This scheme will deliver 55 units of which 14 will be 'affordable'. The affordable units comprise one target rent unit (one x three bed) six affordable rented units (two x one-bed and four x two-bed) and seven shared ownership units (one x three bed, two x one-bed and four x two-bed). This equates to 24 per cent affordable housing when measured by habitable rooms and 25 per cent as a proportion of the new dwellings units. The Affordable Housing SPD requires that, in calculating affordable housing, all rooms in a development which measure more than 27.5sqm be counted as two habitable rooms.
46. The affordable rented accommodation will be capped at 40 per cent of market rents

which will be secured by legal agreement and will not exceed the maximum local housing allowance. The council's Housing Strategy team has confirmed that this is an acceptable level of affordability for Southwark residents. Similarly the proposed shared ownership units will be offered in accordance with affordability thresholds set out in the draft Affordable Housing SPD which will also be secured by a legal agreement. These thresholds can be supported as they reflect local needs and circumstances in accordance with Southwark Council policies.

47. The applicant has stated that they cannot deliver a policy compliant level of affordable housing which at 35 per cent would equate to 68 habitable rooms. They consider that two floors (50 habitable rooms) is the maximum that this scheme can viably support on site and that the shortfall cannot be provided on the upper floors of the building. The shortfall (18 additional habitable rooms) equates to approximately another floor of the building which they consider would tip the balance and make the scheme financially unviable, due to the reduction in the number of units available for market sale.
48. The applicant has also explained that a mix of affordable and private tenures on a single floor would be problematic for management and maintenance reasons and could not be delivered as part of this scheme. For these reasons two floors of affordable housing is the maximum that can be practicably delivered on site.
49. Officers accept that it is likely to be problematic for a policy compliant mix of affordable housing to be accommodated within the upper floors of this building in terms of management and maintenance. This takes into account the requirements of Registered Providers who generally require separate entrances, separate lifts and vertical separation between private and affordable tenures. Difficulties tend to arise in the management and servicing of properties where tenures share cores, which can lead to high housing costs over and above what is considered to be affordable.
50. In these circumstances, it is accepted that a policy compliant mix of target rent and shared ownership units is unlikely to be possible on this site. Based on this analysis, the sequential test as set out under paragraph 43 has been applied.

Off-site affordable housing provision

51. The Affordable Housing SPD explains that in exceptional circumstances, affordable housing may be provided off-site. The applicant has explained that the area is undergoing extensive long term regeneration and therefore the availability of sites is limited. Sites have both already been secured and allocated for development, or construction has started as part of regeneration within the area. Officers accept that the availability of suitable sites either with planning permission or a realistic chance of gaining planning permission and being deliverable within timescales to fit in the LCCM programme is challenging and may unreasonably harm the deliverability of this scheme.
52. Based on this analysis, officers consider that there are legitimate reasons for why an in lieu payment may be acceptable to enable the timely delivery of this development to meet the needs of the LCCM. The majority of affordable housing is being delivered on site and the shortfall (18 habitable rooms) equates to approximately seven units. Under these circumstances the principle of an in lieu affordable housing contribution can, on balance, be supported.

In lieu affordable housing payment

53. The SPD advises that a minimum of £100,000 per habitable room of affordable housing not being provided on-site be secured as an in lieu affordable housing payment. The applicant has proposed £1,100,000 which equates to 11 habitable rooms in addition to the on-site affordable provision of 50 habitable rooms. This

equates to 31% affordable housing provision when combining the on-site units and in lieu payment (61 habitable rooms). Sixty eight (68) habitable rooms would be expected under the policy target of 35%. There is, therefore, a shortfall of 7 habitable rooms. Based on a minimum of £100,000 per habitable room that equates to a shortfall of £700,000.

54. However, this calculation does not fully reflect the SPD which advises that one less affordable habitable room can be provided for every affordable wheelchair accessible unit provided. Taking this into account, one habitable room can be deducted from the target; resulting in the shortfall in hab rooms required to met for the scheme to be policy compliant falling to 6 affordable habitable rooms, which equates to £600,000.

Viability

55. The applicant has submitted a viability appraisal with the application which has been assessed on behalf of the Council by the District Valuer Service (DVS). It explains that they cannot deliver more on-site affordable housing taking account of the lower revenues associated with the LCCM who have been offered a long lease and rents at levels significantly lower than would be achieved if the building were to be used for office space. The applicant has also explained that they have agreed to purchase the garages to the rear from Southwark Council which will be leased back to existing residents once the development is complete and will not be for new residents of the proposed building. These circumstances have impacted upon the viability of the scheme and the number of affordable units that can be delivered on site. Officers recognise that these commitments have also impacted on the level of in-lieu payment that the scheme can afford.
56. Following extensive negotiations, there are a number of differences between the DVS and the applicant's valuer on certain inputs in the appraisal. The key areas of disagreement are market sale values, benchmark land value, build costs and professional costs. The DVS does not agree with the final outcome of the applicant's viability assessment and concludes that the development may be capable of viably supporting a policy compliant affordable housing contribution of £1,700,000. The DVS has looked at a range of scenarios, taking account the differences on these inputs and the lower revenues associated with the LCCM. In their opinion a policy compliant contribution can be supported by this scheme.
57. The applicant disputes the DVS' conclusion. The expertise of the DVS is a significant factor in any decision where viability is a consideration. However, in determining an application for a major development, a wide range of issues and benefits must be weighted, including the benefits of bringing forward a development in a timely manner. This proposal aims to provide new accommodation for the LCCM, enabling them to remain and expand in Southwark. The developer is willing to commit to commence the scheme under a 'short-life' permission (requiring the build to begin in 18 months rather than the standard 3 year permission). The shortfall of £600,000 for affordable housing is not an insignificant sum, but may be within the bounds of financial sensitivity for a development of this scale. Despite very extensive negotiations, the applicant has not been able to improve on this final offer. In the circumstances, and very much influenced by the commitment for speedy delivery of this project including new music opportunities for Southwark residents, it is recommended that, on balance, the affordable housing offer be accepted.

Summary

58. Based on the analysis above, the principle of mixed use development is strongly supported and is consistent with strategic and local planning policies for the Central Activities Zone, Town Centres and the Bankside, Borough and London Bridge Area. The shortfall in affordable housing is a key policy consideration, but it is considered that the shortfall is not so substantial that it would outweigh the positive aspects of the

proposal.

Environmental impact assessment

59. An EIA is mandatory for development described under Schedule 1 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011. The proposed scheme does not fall under any of the categories of projects listed under Schedule 1 of the Act and so there is no mandatory requirement for an EIA.
60. Notwithstanding this there is a need to assess whether it would fall under the list of projects listed under Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011, and if so to determine if the scheme is likely to have significant environmental effects.
61. Schedule 2 lists a range of projects and relevant thresholds that must be considered when screening a project for EIA. Taking account of the provisions set out in the Schedule it is considered that the scheme is capable of being considered a 10 (b) 'urban development project' as the scheme proposes the demolition of buildings, construction works and the change of land use of existing buildings in an urban area. The relevant threshold applicable for these projects is for the development area to exceed 0.5 hectares.
62. The site, measuring 0.09ha, falls below this threshold and so is likely to not have significant environmental effects. Notwithstanding this, consideration has been given to Schedule 3 of the EIA regulations and taking account of the nature of the development, the environmental sensitivity of the location.
63. As the scheme is for a tall building, a town and visual assessment was provided to assess the impact of the proposed building on the London skyline which in accordance with the London Views Management Framework has a number of protected views. The conclusions of the assessment is that the development will not adversely impact protected views and will have impacts which cannot reasonably be considered to be of more than local importance. For this reason an EIA is not required for this development. A more detailed analysis of the developments design is detailed in the following section.

Design issues

64. Strategic policy 12 of the Core strategy 'Design and conservation' states that 'Development will achieve the highest possible standards of design for buildings and public spaces to help create attractive and distinctive places which are safe, easy to get around and a pleasure to be in'. Saved policy 3.12 of the Southwark Plan asserts that developments 'should achieve a high quality of both architectural and urban design, enhancing the quality of the built environment in order to create attractive, high amenity environments people will choose to live in, work in and visit' and saved policy 3.13 requires the principles of good urban design to be taken into account in all developments. This includes height, scale and massing of buildings, consideration of the local context, its character and townscape as well as the local views and resultant streetscape.
65. The proposal is for a basement plus 14 storey development rising to 44.2m (AOD). As such it is considered a 'tall building' in terms of planning policy and should comply with saved policy 3.20 which states that any building over 30 metres tall (or 25 metres in the Thames Policy Area) should:
 - I. Make a positive contribution to the landscape; and

- II. Be located at a point of landmark significance; and
- II. Be of the highest architectural standard; and
- V. Relate well to its surroundings, particularly at street level; and
- V. Contribute positively to the London skyline as a whole consolidating a cluster within that skyline or providing key focus within views.

66. Several written representations have expressed concern that the height, form, scale and massing of the proposed development will be overbearing and will not relate well to the site and its surroundings. They note that the building is much higher than a previous scheme consented at this site in 2009 and which remains extant following a renewal of the planning permission in 2012. The Conservation Areas Advisory Group have also expressed concern regarding the building's height.
67. This section of the report assesses the design focusing on the quality of the scheme and its relationship to surrounding properties. It also takes account of comments made by the Design Review Panel (DRP) who commented on a version of the scheme that was revised prior to submission. Those comments are detailed in the appendix, but in summary the Panel concluded that the site could accommodate a tall building subject to the design of the building being of a high standard.

Landmark significance

68. The Blackfriars Road SPD supports tall buildings in locations, where they are of an appropriate scale and height. Generally heights are expected to be taller along the Blackfriars Road but buildings will be encouraged where they are appropriate and positively help to regenerate and transform the area. London Plan Policy 7.7 and Core Strategy Strategic Policy 12 encourages tall buildings in areas with good access to public transport, within the Central Activities Zone and in Opportunity Areas, provided due regard has been given to the impact on heritage assets and the wider context.
69. The site is located on an important local thoroughfare near the junction of Blackfriars Road and Union Street and in close proximity to Southwark Tube Station. Its immediate context is dominated by the intersection of railway viaducts around the junction of Union Street and Great Suffolk Street to the east. This part of Union Street varies in scale taking account the Lord Nelson Pub (2 storey), Rowland Hill House which is the northern most block of the Nelson Square estate (part 7, part 9 storey), the Travelodge (8 storey) and the 56 metre height of the Palestra building at the junction with Blackfriars Road.
70. Union Street has a number of cultural buildings and is one of the main access routes to the Tate Gallery from Southwark tube station. A notable aspect of the locality is that following completion of the Tate extension (TM2), a new entrance will be located at the northern end of the Great Suffolk Street, the axis of which is immediately adjacent to the site. The importance of this route from the tube to the Tate is in part denoted by the distinctive orange coloured and the Legible London signage posts.
71. A point of landmark significance is defined in the Southwark Plan as: "*where a number of important routes converge, where there is a concentration of activity and which is or will be the focus of views from several directions.*" The applicant has highlighted that Union Street is an important thoroughfare and where a number of pedestrian routes between the Tate and the Tube Station converge. The proposal could appear in the southerly axial view along Great Suffolk Street from the new southern entrance to Tate and is equally prominent in the view from the Tube station. Whilst the proposed building does not directly front onto Blackfriars Road, renderings of strategic and local views provided with the submission demonstrate that the building will signal the regeneration of the area and will help improve the legibility of the area by directing visitors to and from the Tate. It will also provide a presence for LCCM and encourage permeability southwards along Great Suffolk Street.

72. It is considered that a landmark feature at this location can improve the legibility of this part of the borough and its cultural identity without being overly dominant. The proposed height of the building (44m) is considered to appropriately mediate between the heights of buildings on Nelson Square and the 56m height of Palestra.
73. The GLA have provided a stage one report on the scheme and note that it has reduced in height following comments from Council officers. They consider that proposed building will be subservient in scale to Palestra and would not appear overly dominant within the immediate streetscape and are supportive of the buildings scale, height and massing in the local context.
74. Based on the analysis, it is considered that the site and development will meet the 'landmark significance test' and on balance, will be in accordance with saved Policy 3.20

Contribution to the landscape and relationship to surroundings

75. This part of Southwark is characterised by busy arterial and pedestrian routes which form one of the many approaches to the culturally significant Southbank and Tate Modern Gallery.
76. In terms of its contribution to the street scene, the proposed building introduces an angled cut into the strong geometric form of the upper storeys. The cut creates a dramatic entrance and 15 metre high window into the daily operation of the music school. The proposed internal arrangement will enable activities within the college to animate the street for passersby walking past this elevation. This corner would be visible when exiting Southwark Tube station and provide a significant presence to the music college under the cantilevered structure. The angled cut is also considered to reflect the local desire-line across the site from Nelson Square to the south to the viaduct which leads north to the Tate.
77. Through a reconfiguration of the garages including a biodiverse roof, and landscaping around the site the scheme would improve the approach to Applegarth House and La Gare from Union Street. The public footway into Applegarth has also been widened considerably which is considered a public benefit and an improvement visually from the existing situation.
78. A landscaped area is provided to the front of the building that is proportionally large, having regard to the building footprint, and capable of positively contributing towards the streetscene and improving permeability around the site. The design of this area positively reflects comments made at pre-application stage by the Design Review Panel who supported the proposition of a covered open area in front of a well articulated, animated entrance to the LCCM.
79. The area of landscaping and configuration of the building are considered to make a positive contribution to the landscape and relate well to its surroundings. For this reason the scheme is considered to comply with parts i) and iv) of saved policy 3.20.

Architectural standard

80. Buildings of this stature are required to demonstrate their contribution to the appearance of the wider area. The highest architectural standard is called for and requires an elegance of proportion, innovation in design, materials and a demonstrable exceptional quality of accommodation.
81. The proposed development is characterised by two parts: the four-storey plus basement accommodation that will be occupied by the LCCM and the floors above which extend to the fourteenth floor providing residential accommodation. The

architectural approach provides visual differentiation between the two massing elements through the use of contrasting materials and design. This is considered to positively respond to the comments from the Design Review Panel who previously encouraged the applicant to improve the street presence and visibility of LCCM.

82. The white glazed bricks of the LCCM provide a clear visual contrast with the upper floors of the building which has a more lightweight appearance. This is achieved through the use of ceramic clad fins and glazing to the residential element. The main entrance to the LCCM has a full height glazed wall fronting Union Street which adds interest and positively contributes to the streetscene. This approach to design is welcome and can be supported.
83. On the upper floors the building has a simple refined form providing residential accommodation fronted by winter gardens. The quality of this accommodation is assessed later in this report and has been considered to provide standard of accommodation that will be in accordance with policy and can be supported. Above this the roof has been designed as a seamless three-dimensional feature with the ribbed design returning over the top.
84. The roof, soffit and the oversail of the residential element of the building will play an important role in the execution of the building. Similarly, the quality of landscaping to the front on Union Street as well as the areas to the rear of the building encompassing the garage court and the approach to Nelson Square and La Gare are important and can significantly improve the relationship of the site to the surrounding urban environment. The approach to the design of these areas can be supported but it is recommended that design details are reserved by condition.
85. Based on the analysis above, the building is considered to meet the highest standard of architectural design as required by criteria iii) of the saved policy 3.20.

Contributing to the London skyline as a whole consolidating cluster within that skyline or providing key focus within views.

86. The scheme has been tested in local and strategic views as set out in the London View Management Framework (LVMF), 2012. Officers are satisfied that the key views provided are accurate visual representations and take account of the nearby sensitive local receptors including the Kings Bench, Union Street and Valentine Place Conservation Areas in accordance with the requirements of the LVMF.
87. The nearest tall building to this site is Palestra which is located across Union Street to the north west of the site. This building is characterised by its block-like form and its distinctive cantilevered top. This proposal echoes the geometric character of its neighbour but takes on a modern masonry-clad aesthetic which will distinguish it in views. The building is considered to compliment that of Palestra albeit being more modest in scale and it will not have a significant impact on the London skyline, given the substantial scale of its neighbours. It will be most prominent in local views from the elevated railway line, Great Suffolk street, Nelson Square Gardens and from Southwark tube station. Notwithstanding this it is not considered that this scheme will adversely impact upon the setting of nearby heritage assets.
88. In conclusion, officers consider the proposal is a well considered and refined building which combines an educational institution and substantial residential accommodation successfully. It is also considered to be a design of distinctive quality, suitable for its purpose and setting. Whilst the building will undoubtedly be prominent by virtue of the scale of the development these impacts need to be considered against the character of the Central Activities Zone where larger scale development is expected to optimise the use of land in accessible locations. It will provide an appropriate marker between Southwark station and the Tate Modern along Great Suffolk street and, subject to its

detailed design and landscaping being reserved by condition, it will have an exceptional high standard of architectural design.

Dwelling mix and quality of accommodation

89. London Plan Policy 3.8 requires new developments to offer a range of housing choices in terms of the mix of housing sizes and types. Strategic Policy 7 of the Core Strategy requires major developments in this area to provide at least 60 per cent of units with 2 or more bedrooms and 10% of units to have three, four or five bedrooms. No more than five per cent of units should be studio flats.

Unit type	Private	Affordable Rent	Shared ownership	Social rent	Total
1 bed	8	2	2	0	12 (22%)
2 bed	22	4	4	0	30 (54%)
3 bed	11	0	1	1	13 (24%)
Total	41	6	7	1	55 (100%)

90. The scheme will provide a mix of units comprising a high proportion of 2 bed (54 per cent) and three bed (24 per cent) dwellings which equates to 78 per cent of the units being delivered on site. As such the scheme will exceed minimum targets set out in Strategic Policy 7 for both two and three bed dwellings in this area.
91. Saved policy 4.2 'Quality of residential accommodation' states that planning permission will be granted for residential development, where it achieves good quality living conditions including outdoor amenity space. An assessment of internal space standards is provided below.

Unit size (bedroom/person)	SPD minimum unit area f (sqm)	Proposed unit size range (sqm)
1 bed (2 persons)	50	50 – 65
2 bed (3 persons)	61	63 – 95
2 bed (4 persons)	70	
2 bed (average)	66	
3 bed (4 persons)	74	101 – 144
3 bed (5 persons)	86	
3 bed (6 persons)	95	
3 bed (average)	85	

92. All of the units will either meet or exceed minimum space standards within the London Plan as well as Southwark minimum space standards, including standards for individual rooms within dwellings. The dwellings have also been designed to meet lifetime home standards, and secure by design principles will be incorporated into the development. Policy compliant storage and utility space would also be provided within each new dwelling. The large affordable family units (three bed plus) will also have a self-contained kitchens in accordance with residential design guidance.
93. The majority of residential units will be dual aspect (58 per cent) and in accordance with policy, each dwelling will have private amenity space in the form of a winter garden and a good standard of internal living accommodation.

Privacy and overlooking within the development

94. The proposed dwellings are arranged around a central core and will not create overlooking issues between the new residential dwellings.

Outdoor amenity space and child play space

95 The Residential Design Standards SPD advises that new residential development should provide an adequate amount of useable outdoor amenity space which can take the form of private gardens, balconies, shared terraces and roof gardens. The standards applied to new development are set out below:

- Minimum of 50sqm communal amenity space per development
- Units of three or more bedrooms – ten square metres of private amenity space
- Units of two bedrooms or less - ideally ten square metres of private amenity space and where this is not possible the remaining amount be added to the communal amenity space total area
- Balconies and terrace should be a minimum of three square metres to count towards private amenity space
- Ten square metres of play space per child bed space (covering a range of age groups).

Unit size	SPD private amenity space standard (sqm)	Proposed outdoor amenity size range (sqm)
1 bed	10	5 – 5.58
2 bed	10	7 – 12.8
3 bed	10	10 – 12.1

96. Each unit will have access to private amenity space in the form of winter gardens which are accessed from internal living/dining areas. All three bed units have been provided with at least ten square metres of amenity space.

97. The shortfall in private amenity space across the one and two bed units has been calculated and is estimated to be 43.36sqm across the 41 private dwellings units and 39.13sqm across the 14 affordable housing units.

98. Options were explored to have an on-site amenity space either to the rear of the building or on the roof which have been discounted after careful consideration as they were assessed either not be viable (in the case of amenity space on the roof top) or likely to result in privacy or amenity issues for neighbours (if positioned above the garages to the rear of the building). It is therefore acknowledged that providing communal amenity space (including play space) would not be achievable in this form of development.

99. The applicant has sought to mitigate the shortfall in private amenity space and communal amenity space by making a significant contribution to phase 3 of the Marlborough Sports Garden on Union Street which is a protected open space which is undergoing works to improve the quality of the space and to improve landscaping. This contribution is in addition to the standard S106 contribution for open space in this area and will be secured through a legal agreement.

100. It is proposed that the delivery of this space will be mitigated through the provision of on-site amenity space which will be dealt with in the following section under child play space.

Child play provision

101. London Plan policy 3.6 sets out the Mayors requirement for the provision of play and informal recreation space. Core Strategy policy 7 in support of this strategy requires new development to provide play space for children as required by the Mayor’s Play and Informal Recreation Supplementary Planning Guidance (2012) and the councils Residential Design Standards SPD (2011). Based on the methodology within these documents the scheme is estimated to generate a yield of between 13-14 child bed spaces. A minimum of ten square metres of play space per child bed space is

generally expected to meet the needs of children from a development across a range of ages.

102. Owing to site constraints playable space will not be provided on the site and, as described above the applicant has agreed to make a contribution to off-site provision over and above the normal SPD requirements to upgrade nearby play space and the Marlborough Sports Garden. Works to improve these and other spaces will mitigate the increase intensity of use that will come from this development and will be secured by a legal agreement.

Wheelchair accessible housing

103. London Plan Policy 3.8 requires 10 per cent of new housing to be designed to be wheelchair accessible or easily adaptable for residents who are wheelchair users. Saved policy 4.3 of the Southwark Plan also requires a minimum of 10 per cent of the units to be designed to meet the South East London Housing Partnership Guide for Wheelchair Housing as set out in appendix 1 of the Residential Space Standards SPD (2011). The council normally expects one wheelchair accessible parking space for each wheelchair accessible dwelling in accordance with saved policy 5.7. Taking account of the number of wheelchair accessible dwellings proposed to be delivered (6); up to six spaces would be expected to be provided on this site. However a slightly lower number can be accepted if a development is located in an area with a public transport accessibility level of six or in the central activities zone. Both these criteria apply to the site and this development.
104. Guidance in the adopted Sustainable Transport SPD sets out that these requirements are subject to site constraints and recognises that each site should be assessed on a case by case basis taking account of the physical limits of a site and other social and environmental considerations.
105. Whilst a policy compliant number of wheelchair housing units (ten per cent) has been proposed that will meet the required floor space standards, the applicant has reported that it will not be possible to provide six corresponding wheelchair accessible car parking spaces on this site. One car parking space is proposed that will be linked to a social rented affordable housing unit and the applicant has explained that this is the most that they can incorporate in the scheme taking account of their need to re-provide the existing garages to the rear of the building and a Network Rail electricity substation.
106. The applicant has explored the option of providing off-site parking nearby within Nelson Square Gardens but officers consider any space that could realistically be secured would be well in excess of a distance that would be considered convenient for wheelchair users. Even taking account of slightly reduced number of wheelchair parking spaces that may be permitted on a site with excellent accessibility to public transport, officers are not satisfied that the level of parking for wheelchair users is acceptable and this would impact on the take up of units.
107. In exceptional circumstances, where an applicant can demonstrate that it is not viable or feasible to meet the council's wheelchair housing requirements, the draft S106 SPD explains that a commuted sum can be secured through a section 106 planning obligation to mitigate such scenarios. Based on the discussion above it is accepted that although provision has been made for wheelchair users in terms of dwellings, not all of these units will have an associated car parking space. Whilst providing much needed accommodation, these constraints limit the provision this development can reasonably make for people with wheelchair housing needs.
108. To mitigate against this the applicant has agreed to pay a policy compliant sum of £90,000 based on the expected cost for the council to make adaptations to existing

properties to meet the needs of disabled occupiers. This will be secured by a legal agreement.

Internal noise

109. The immediate area is mixed in character having office, retail, and commercial uses and this site is immediately adjacent to a public house elevated railway line. Noise sensitive receptors will be introduced to the site with new residential dwellings and as such future occupiers will be exposed to environmental noise from these sources and other noise generating uses on the site.
110. Taking account the mixed character of the immediate area, there is a reasonable expectation that a good standard on internal noise can be achieved with the new development. Provided details of sound insulation are submitted and where appropriate noise tests are undertaken prior to the occupation of residential units, officers consider that a good standard of internal noise can be achieved.

Hours of operation

111. The scheme will have an auditorium which will have some public use and from time to time performances in connection with the LCCM. It is not proposed as a 'venue' for concerts or a place that will generally be used for commercial entertainment. Notwithstanding this, in order to prevent noise from people coming and going from the site adversely impacting residential occupiers above and nearby it is recommended that a condition is imposed that would limit the hours of use of the auditorium to ensure it is not in use outside the hours of 07.30 to 22.00.

Daylight/sunlight within the development

112. By virtue of the distance of separation between the windows to the new dwelling and nearby properties being in excess of 21 metres it is anticipated that all new dwellings units and private outdoor amenity spaces will experience a good standard of daylight and sunlight.

Summary

113. The scheme will provide dwellings units that will exceed minimum standards, all of which will have private amenity space and with the minimum level achieved for all three bed units. Whilst a communal space will not be provided on site it a contribution to improve nearby spaces is proposed that will deliver good quality space which is strongly supported and it will provide wider benefits.

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

114. Strategic Policy 13 requires new development to be designed to avoid amenity and environmental problems that affect how we enjoy the environment in which we live and work. Saved policy 3.2 of the Southwark Plan states that planning permission for development will not be granted where it would cause the loss of amenity, including disturbance to noise to present and future occupiers in the surrounding area or on the application site. Saved policy 3.1 also states that new development should not cause material adverse effects on the environment and quality of life.
115. The following properties have been identified as sensitive receptors and assessed for daylight sunlight impacts:
 - 48-52 Great Suffolk Street
 - 54-58 Great Suffolk Street
 - 53 Surrey Row (Also known as the La Gare Apartments)
 - Applegarth House

- Rowland Hill House
- Lord Nelson Public House

116. In terms of daylight, an assessment of the 'Vertical Sky Component' (VSC) has been carried out. The assessment estimates the likely amount of daylight reaching a window expressed as a percentage. The British Research Establishment advises that the windows of neighbouring properties should achieve a VSC of at least 27 per cent, and notes that if the VSC is reduced to no less than 0.8 times its former value (i.e. 20 per cent reduction) following the construction of a development, then the reduction will not be noticeable.
117. A 'No Sky Line' (NSL) assessment has also been carried out in respect of daylight. This assessment estimates the distribution of light within a room taking account the area of a room at desk height that can see the sky. The BRE guidance suggests that the NSL should not be reduced to less than 0.8 times its former value (i.e. a 20 per cent reduction).
118. In terms of sunlight, an assessment of Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH) has been undertaken. This is required to be considered for all windows facing within 90 degrees of due south (windows outside of this orientation do not receive direct sunlight in the UK). The guidelines advise that windows should receive at least 25 per cent APSH, with 5 per cent of this total being enjoyed during the winter months. It should not be reduced to less than 0.8 times its former value.
119. In terms of overshadowing, an assessment of the effects of the development on outdoor amenity areas has been assessed. The guidance recommends that for an area to appear adequately sunlight throughout the year, at least half of the garden or amenity area should receive at least two hours of sunlight on 21 March. If, following a development it does not achieve this or the area that can receive this is less than 0.8 times its former value, the loss of sunlight is likely to be noticeable.

48-52 Great Suffolk Street

120. These buildings are three storeys in height with a fourth floor set back, located to the south east of the site beyond the railway line.
121. Six windows have been assessed at this property. The analysis shows that five of the six windows would experience a reduction in VSC of more than 20 per cent. However the reduction experienced is considered likely to be minor as the reduction is between 21 per cent and 25 per cent which is marginally above the recommended target of 20 per cent.
122. A NSL assessment was also carried out for these windows to assess daylight impacts on these properties which concludes that tested rooms will not experience a reduction of more than 20 per cent. Based on the analysis, the impact of the development fall within an acceptable range in accordance with the BRE guidelines and daylight impacts acceptable.
123. In terms of sunlight, the analysis shows that two of the six windows assessed would experience reductions of more than 20 per cent. However those reductions are estimated to be between 22 per cent and 29 per cent which is considered to be minor and not such that it would adversely impact upon internal living conditions.

54-58 Great Suffolk Street

124. This site is immediately to the south of the 48-52 Great Suffolk Street. Consent for a four storey building has been granted (12-AP-3706) which is under construction. An assessment of the development on that building has been provided.

125. Thirteen windows have been assessed at this site. The analysis shows that, in terms of VSC, three of the thirteen windows will experience a reduction of more than 20 per cent. However the reductions experienced are considered likely to be minor as the transgressions are between 25 per cent and 28 per cent which is marginally above the recommended target of 20 per cent). It is noted that the remaining ten windows will comply standards and that the results of a NSL assessment show that all but one of the thirteen windows will meet the required standard set out in BRE guidelines. Based on the analysis daylight impacts to windows tested will be acceptable.
126. In terms of sunlight, the analysis shows all of the windows tested will meet BRE guidelines and criteria.

53 Surrey Row (La Gare Apartments)

127. These buildings are located immediately to the south of the site perpendicular to the development. These properties are three storeys and in residential use.
128. Twenty windows have been assessed at this property. The analysis shows that ten of the 20 windows tested will experience a reduction in VSC of more than 20 per cent. However, a NSL assessment has been carried which concludes that the BRE guidelines will be met, in respect of daylight. Based on this analysis, daylight impacts to these will fall within an acceptable range in accordance with BRE standards.
129. In terms of sunlight, the analysis shows that all of the windows tested will meet BRE guidelines and criteria.

Applegarth House

130. This buildings is six storeys in height and located to the south of the application site. Applegarth is one of four large residential blocks which fronts onto Nelson Square Gardens and forms the eastern block. The building is in residential use.
131. Twenty one windows have been assessed at this property. The analysis shows that nine of the 21 windows tested will experience a reduction in VSC of more than 20 per cent. The reduction experienced is likely to be modest as it will fall within a range of 22 per cent – 26 per cent which is marginally beyond recommended target of 20 per cent.
132. A NSL assessment was also been carried out which concludes that BRE guidelines will be met, in respect of daylight. Taking both these assessments it is considered that daylight at the tested windows at this property will fall within an acceptable range in accordance with BRE standards.
133. In terms of sunlight, the analysis shows that all of the windows tested will meet BRE guidelines and criteria.

Rowland Hill House

134. This building is part 7, part 9 storeys in height and one of four large residential blocks which fronts onto Nelson Square Gardens. The property also fronts onto Union Street and is in residential use.
135. Twenty five windows have been assessed at this property. The analysis shows that 12 of these windows will not meet the BRE VSC criteria. Further analysis shows that 11 of those windows are located within doors which serve dual aspect living rooms and that each of those rooms have a main window with a southerly aspect which is not affected by this development. The remaining window serves a ground floor kitchen that is served by a main window also on the south elevation.

136. A NSL assessment concludes that BRE guidelines will be met for all windows tested and so daylight these windows will fall within an acceptable range. Based on this analysis, the distribution of daylight within rooms will fall within an acceptable range in accordance with BRE standards.
137. In terms of sunlight, the analysis shows that all of the windows tested will meet BRE guidelines and criteria.

Lord Nelson Public House

138. This building is two storeys in height and occupies a plot adjacent to application site across Nelson Square carriage way. Whilst the ground floor of the building is a public house, there is residential accommodation on the upper floor.
139. Two windows have been assessed at this property. The results of the daylight analysis show that, in terms of VSC, neither of these windows will meet the BRE criteria. However, taking account the results of the No Sky Line analysis, one of windows would fall within an acceptable range and other would experience a reduction of 33%. This window is reported to serve a bedroom.
140. In terms of sunlight, the analysis shows that whilst the winter requirement is satisfied the total sunlight requirement will not be met for both windows. This is by virtue of the position of these windows in relation to the new development. These windows are reported to serve bedrooms and are positioned on the east of the building directly facing the application site. The position of these windows is considered to such that any comprehensive redevelopment of the site is likely to impact upon the upper floors of this property. It is also noted that the resulting standard of sunlight to these windows would comparable to those achieved under the consented scheme (11/AP/3506) for a nine storey building.

Summary of Daylight/Sunlight

141. It is acknowledged that there will be noticeable sunlight impacts for two bedroom windows at the Lord Nelson Public House. However these impacts must be considered in the context of the BRE guidelines which advise that it is a guide that should be use flexibly, particularly in highly urbanised locations and which considers bedrooms to be less important compared to living rooms and kitchens.
142. Daylight and surrounding properties will continue to be commensurate with the existing situation and will fall within a range that is in accordance with BRE standards. Based on this analysis the scheme is considered to have acceptable impacts particularly when against the benefits of the scheme.

Outlook and privacy

143. The Residential Design Standards SPD advises that the design of new development should not have a negative on neighbouring properties. The SPD does not formally define what is meant by 'good' outlook. However it recognises that improvements to outlook can contribute to better internal living conditions. It also advises that new development should achieve a separation distance of 12m at the front of a building and any elevation that fronts on to a highway and a minimum distance of 21 metres between new development and existing properties at the rear.
144. Taking account the distance of separation between the proposed development and properties at 48-52 Great Suffolk Street, 54-58 Great Suffolk Street, Applegarth House, Rowland Hill House and the Lord Nelson Public House and the orientation of windows at these properties it is considered that the scheme will not result in the loss of privacy or overlooking for these existing properties and occupiers of the new dwellings. Concerns have been raised by occupiers of 51 and 53 Surrey Row that roof terraces at these properties will be overlooked by the new development and create a

sense of enclosure to the detriment of residential amenity. These buildings are also known as the La Gare Apartments and assessment of the development is set out below.

51 Surrey Row and 53 Surrey Row (La Gare Apartments)

145. These buildings are located immediately to the south of the site in close proximity to the development. They comprise a four storey building and a series of three storey terraced buildings with roof terraces. These buildings comprise a mix of office space, live-work and residential units. The main concerns are that the series of terraces which belong to residential dwellings will be overlooked to the detriment of the standard of privacy at these dwellings. Further more that the building is imposing and would adversely impact upon outlook.
146. The development will introduce dwellings at a height that will overlook these properties by virtue of the relationship between these sites and the position of residential dwellings with a southerly aspect will overlook seven terraces across these buildings. However by virtue of the difference in levels between residential accommodation at these sites, the development will not create direct views from the proposed residential dwellings or LCCM premises to these terraces.
147. Taking account the design of the facade which has a ceramic cladding system across all elevations it is considered that views from the proposed upper floors of residential accommodation will be limited to oblique views, particularly if we consider the position of windows to the proposed residential accommodation which will be much higher than the adjacent terraces. Officers consider that the design of the facade and relationship between the proposed residential units will enable users of these terraces to maintain a good standard of privacy in the context of a central London environment.
148. The design of the building has been assessed to have a high standard of architectural design and will relate well to its surroundings including its relationship to nearby dwellings and buildings in what is a dense urban area. Whilst the building will be prominent in views from these terraces, outlook from these properties will remain of a good standard owing to the position of the development in relation to nearby windows.

Summary of impacts on outlook and privacy

149. The development will not create overlooking issues or result in the loss of privacy to the extent that would warrant the refusal of planning permission. Furthermore the standard of outlook from properties will remain of a good standard and in accordance with residential design standards.

Impacts during construction

150. Comments were received indicating the need for account to be taken of the potential impacts of the development during construction in the event planning permission is granted. The principal construction impacts likely to result from this development are air quality impacts resulting from dust generating activities and vehicle emissions from construction traffic. In addition, noise and vibration impacts during the demolition and construction period may require mitigation given roads nearby the site already experience a high level of road and construction traffic.
151. Measures to limit these impacts to an acceptable level have been proposed that would reduce potential impacts on neighbouring occupiers however a condition requiring the submission of further details in the form of a construction management plan is recommended.

Transport issues

152. Saved policy of 5.1 requires major development to be located near transport nodes. Saved policy 5.2 states that planning permission will be granted for development unless there is an adverse impact on the transport network or if provision for adequate servicing is not made. Saved policy 5.3 requires provision to be made for pedestrians and cyclists and saved policies 5.6 and 5.7 relate to car parking. Core Strategy policy 2 reasserts the commitment to encourage walking, cycling and the use of public transport rather than travel by car.

Existing context

153. The site has a Public Transport Accessibility Rating (PTAL) of 6a reflecting excellent access to all forms of public transport. The site is also within a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) and close to Blackfriars Road which forms part of the Transport for London Road Network.

Trip generation

154. The proposed development is car free, with the exception of the re-provided garages and one disabled parking space, and therefore the majority of trips to the site are predicted to be undertaken by foot, cycle or public transport. Based on this analysis the residential component is unlikely to have an adverse impact on the surrounding road network.
155. In terms of LCCM, the development will increase the student population accessing the site resulting in more journeys to the site. No car parking is provided for the LCCM and so users will access the college by public transport, foot or cycle given the high Public Transport Accessibility Level of the site. Given the relatively small scale of the scheme and taking into account the existing use and previously consented scheme, coupled with a broad range of public transport options in the area, it is unlikely that the increase development will have a significant impact on public transport. Notwithstanding this a contribution towards TfL's Blackfriars Road Urban Realm Improvement has been suggested by the GLA as the main access to the site is likely to and from Southwark tube station and bus stops / cycle routes on Blackfriars. The applicant has agreed the principle contributing to these works although the level of contribution will be finalised with the GLA in the event of approval.

Car parking

156. The site is within a controlled parking zone and so visitors to the site will not be able to park within the immediate vicinity unless they are in possession of parking permit. The scheme is proposed as 'car free' and so to minimise traffic impacts a condition requiring residents and the LCCM to be prevented from being eligible to apply for parking will be secured by condition. Three years free car club membership for each eligible resident adult within the new development should also be secured by legal agreement.

Disabled car parking

157. The applicant has demonstrated with sufficient reasoning why it will not be possible to provide the required number of on-site disabled car parking spaces to match the wheelchair accessible units provided. It is accepted that it would be impractical to provide any more disabled parking on-site.
158. The disabled space provided will be tied to the three bed social rented unit at fourth floor level. A contribution has also been secured to off-set the lack of on-site wheelchair parking that will go towards to upgrade of existing homes for wheelchair users in the borough. This will be secured a legal agreement as set out earlier in this report.

Cycle Parking

159. On site cycle parking provision will accord with the London Plan policy but falls short of Southwark Plan policy by four spaces. The shortfall relates to the provision of visitor spaces which are required under the local plan. The facilities provided are 'street pod' which in terms of design are acceptable. However it is recommended that further improvements be made to minimise the number of doors required to access these facilities which can be secured by condition.
160. It is recognised that there are cycle hire facilities in close proximity at Southwark Station which is one of the top ten per cent most used stations on the underground network. The presence of these facilities is considered to mitigate against the shortfall against the Southwark Plan standards although further mitigation may be required in the long term given the intensity of use of these facilities is likely to increase as a result of this development.

Cycle Hire Scheme

161. The applicant has agreed to the principle of a payment to fund a new docking station or extending an existing station nearby. It is considered that a contribution to fund such works will mitigate against the shortfall of on-site facilities and would be in accordance with strategic objectives for this part of the borough. The level of which will need to be finalised with the GLA as part of the stage two referral.

Travel Plan

162. A Travel Plan was submitted with the application for both the education and residential component which seeks to promote more sustainable travel choices such as walking, cycling and public transport. However it is recommended that an updated travel plan is secured by condition to demonstrate that the action plan which achieves quantifiable objectives in agreement with the local planning authority.

Servicing, deliveries and refuse collection

163. Servicing and refuse collection is to be undertaken from Nelson Square carriageway. Details regarding where servicing vehicles will wait and the collection point for waste is will be secured by condition by way of service management plan to ensure transport and amenity impacts on amenity are minimised for existing and future occupiers and with due regard to the needs of the emergency services.

Demolition and construction impacts.

164. It is recommended that details of construction traffic movements for each phase of works during demolition and construction is secured by condition. This is to ensure that adequate consideration has been taken to the approach to construction and takes account of construction works ongoing at nearby sites.

Impact on trees and biodiversity

165. The site is dominated by buildings and hard-standing with limited areas of space recolonising vegetation and two saplings. An assessment submitted with the application shows that the ecological value of the site is low and enhancement measures are recommended. These measures include landscaping using native species, the removal of non-native and invasive species and the provision of nesting opportunities within the fabric of the new building. It is also recommended that the new garages be fitted with a biodiverse roof. The implementation of these measures should be secured by condition.

Sustainable development implications

166. Policy 5.2 of the London Plan requires major developments to provide an assessment of their energy demands and to demonstrate that they have taken steps to apply the Mayor's energy hierarchy – “Be lean, Be clean, Be Green”. Residential and non-domestic buildings are required to improve on 2010 Building Regulations by 40%. Policies 5.5 and 5.6 require consideration of decentralised energy networks and policy 5.7 requires the use of on-site renewable technologies, where feasible.

Be lean - use less energy

167. The scheme will incorporate a number of passive design measures aimed at reducing the amount of energy required by the new buildings including high levels of thermal insulation, low air permeability, energy efficient lighting and internal winter gardens. The development is estimated to achieve a reduction of 17 tonnes per annum (13 per cent) in regulated CO₂ emissions compared to 2010 building regulations through energy efficiency measures.

Be clean - supply energy efficiently

168. A thermally led natural gas powered CHP system to provide hot water heating demand and electricity is proposed that will make provision for energy to be exported to the grid during periods of excess electricity generation. The development is estimated to achieve a reduction of 30 tonnes per annum (28 per cent) in regulated CO₂ emissions compared to 2010 building regulations through this second part of the energy strategy.

Be green

169. Air source heat pumps are proposed to meet the cooling demand of the building. The development is estimated to achieve a reduction of 9 tonnes per annum (12 per cent) in regulated CO₂ emissions compared to 2010 building regulations through this third part of the energy strategy.

Energy summary

170. Based on the analysis above, the scheme will achieve a reduction in 56 tonnes of CO₂ per year in regulated emissions which is an equivalent of to an overall saving of 45 per cent in terms of carbon emissions. Notwithstanding this, the applicant has made a number of commitments which it is recommended should be secured by condition. These include the commitment to ensuring the development is designed to allow future connection to a district heating network and the installation of a site heat network. Further details on the location of the on-site energy site, proposed heat pump system and management arrangements and electricity sale strategy for the CHP system should be secured by legal agreement.

Code for Sustainable Homes

171. The proposed dwellings have been designed to achieve a Code for Sustainable home rating of level four and will include water efficiency measures to achieve a maximum daily water usage of 105 litres/person/day. A condition requiring the submission of post-construction certificates to demonstrate these standards have been achieved is recommended in the event of approval.

BREEAM

172. A BREEAM rating of ‘Excellent’ rating is proposed to be achieved for the LCCM part of the new building. This will be in exceed the target rating of ‘Very Good’ for new education facilities in accordance with Strategic policy 13. A condition requiring the submission of post-construction certificates is recommended in the event of approval.

Flood Risk

173. The Environment Agency has no objection to the scheme, in terms of flood risk.

Land contamination / Groundwater assessment

174. A desk study was submitted which indicated the presence of contamination at this site. The full extent of contamination has not been established and so it is recommended that conditions be applied which would ensure that the risks from land contamination to the future users are minimised, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers and neighbours.

Wind

175. The implications of the development upon wind conditions in and around the site have been assessed and the conclusions show that wind conditions around the base of the building and within the immediate surrounding area will remain at an acceptable level. Notwithstanding this, the study shows that mitigation by way of wind breaks may be required to alleviate conditions at the north-west corner for the benefit of users of the cafe and internal space on this elevation. The applicant has sought to mitigate these impacts by way of low level landscaped windbreaks which are shown on plan as two diagonal benches. Officers agree with the conclusions reached in the Wind Study and consider that the wind impacts will be acceptable in terms of pedestrian safety for the general public. In any case, detailed drawings of the proposed benches should be secured by condition.

Planning obligations (S.106 undertaking or agreement)

176. Saved policy 2.5 'Planning obligations' of the Southwark Plan and policy 8.2 of the London Plan advise that Local Planning Authorities should seek to enter into planning obligations to avoid or mitigate the adverse impacts of developments which cannot otherwise be adequately addressed through conditions, to secure or contribute towards the infrastructure, environment or site management necessary to support the development, or to secure an appropriate mix of uses within the development. Further information is contained within the Council's Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document.

177. Heads of Terms based on the council's Planning Obligations SPD have been a subject of negotiations during the course of the application. The following table sets out the contributions required based on the s106 SPD and accompanying toolkit compared to what the applicant has offered:

Topic Area	SPD Requirement	Applicant's Offer
Affordable housing	£1,700,000	£1,100,000
Education	£67,765	£67,765
Employment during construction	£42,361	£42,361
Employment during construction management fee	£3,206	£3,206
Public open space, children's play space and sports development	£73, 255	£153,255
Transport Strategic	£45,639	£45,639
Transport specific	£29, 839	£29, 839
Public realm	£41,250	£41,250
Health	£64,138	£64,138
Community facilities	£9,662	£9,662
Wheelchair accessible units	£90,000	£90,000
Travel Plan Monitoring	£3,000	£3000
Total	£2,170, 115	£,1,650,115
Admin fee (2%)	£43,402	£33,002

Total (including admin fee)	£2, 213,517	£1,683,117
------------------------------------	--------------------	-------------------

Education

178. A contribution towards education provision in Southwark to cover the capital cost of providing new school places that are likely to result from this development. The applicant has agreed to pay £67,765 which is in accordance with the sum required under the section 106 SPD toolkit.

Employment and construction through the development and management fee

179. A contribution of £42,361 will be made towards the placement of unemployed jobseekers from the local area into jobs through the councils Work Place Co-ordinator programme. The applicant has agreed to pay the sum and management fee in full in accordance with the S106 toolkit.

Public open space and sports development

180. The toolkit generates a figure of £73,255 which will contribute towards the improvement amenity spaces in close proximity to the site in accordance with the SPD toolkit. The applicant has also agreed a further contribution of £80,000 towards to the delivery child play space and open space in the locality. The Marlborough Sports Garden has been identified as a project that will benefit from this contribution, although the final decision on allocation would be made once the monies are available.

Transport strategic

181. A contribution of £29,839 will be made to contribute towards the borough strategic transport projects. The applicant has agreed to pay the sum in full in accordance with the S106 toolkit.

Transport site specific

182. A contribution of £27,500 will be made that will fund improvements to crossings in the local area. The applicant has agreed to pay the sum in full in accordance with the S106 toolkit.

Public realm

183. A contribution of £41,250 has been secured that will be used to carry out improvements to the pavement on Union Street and nearby. These works will also make good any adverse impacts that may result through the demolition and construction phase of the scheme.

Health

184. A contribution of £64,138 has been agreed that will go towards improving access to healthcare facilities including local GP clinics and mental services.

Community facilities

185. A contribution of £9,662 has been agreed that will go towards the upgrade of local community facilities in accordance with S106 toolkit.

Wheelchair accessible units

186. A contribution of £90,000 has been agreed that will go towards to the cost of adapting homes to meet the needs of disabled occupiers in accordance guidance in the Draft S106 SPD (2014).

Travel Plan Monitoring

187. A contribution of £3000 has been agreed that will go towards the costs of monitoring of travel plans.

Other S106 requirements

188. A community use strategy will also be secured by legal agreement setting out the strategy for how the London Centre of Contemporary Music will work to engage, support, educate and provide training for young people and local residents wanting to get involved in the creative industries. This include a commitment to providing scholarships on full time courses and subsidies on part time evening courses, short course and full time short courses ranging from 85% -70% below the market price. It will also include opportunities for internships, hot desking space for cultural organisations and working with the Southwark Arts Music and Youth Services and offering the use of the basement auditorium space free to local organisations. In doing, it is considered that there will be an adequate mechanism to ensure the local community benefits from securing this organisation. The strategy and its outputs will be tied to LCCM who are the intended occupiers of the building.

Applegarth

189. Following consultation with residents of this building the applicant has agreed to carry out landscaping work in the immediate vicinity of the building and to refurbish a store and laundry room with the Applegarth building. These works will not be funded by S106 monies secured to mitigate the impacts of this development but are in addition to the Council's standard requirements. These works will be secured through the legal agreement.
190. In accordance with the recommendation, if the Section 106 Agreement is not signed by 29 August 2014 the Head of Development Management should be authorised to refuse permission, if appropriate, for the reason below:

'In the absence of a signed Section 106 Agreement, there is no mechanism in place to avoid or mitigate the impact of the proposed development on the delivery of affordable housing, employment, public open space, the transport network, the public realm, health care services or mechanism to ensure the LCCM will deliver outcomes that are beneficial to the wider community. The proposal would therefore be contrary to saved policy 2.5 of the Southwark Plan (2007), strategic policy 14 of the Core Strategy (2011) and Policy 8.2 of the London Plan (2011) and the draft Affordable Housing SPD (2011)'.

Other matters

Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

191. S143 of the Localism Act 2011 states that any financial sum that an authority has received, will, or could receive in the payment of CIL as a material 'local financial consideration' in planning decisions. The requirement for Mayoral CIL is a material consideration. However, the weight to be attached to a local finance consideration remains a matter for the decision-maker. Mayoral CIL is to be used for strategic transport improvements in London, primarily Crossrail.
192. Taking account of the existing buildings that will be demolished, the scheme will result in a net increase of 7055 sqm of floor space (Gross Internal Area). Based on this assessment, the CIL liability is estimated to be £246,925.

Pre-application advice

193. The applicant entered into pre-application discussions with officers commencing in December 2012. Officers issued a formal response in May 2013 which set out advice on key planning issues raised by the proposal. The applicant took on board much of the pre-application advice prior to submission of this application resulting in amendments and a revised scheme which has been assessed in this report. The

details of the pre-application response are held electronically by the local authority.

Conclusion on planning issues

194. The application proposes a high density mixed used scheme that will provide the LCCM with new facilities, and a range of residential apartments. The loss of the existing building and office space has been justified and the proposed mix of uses is appropriate in this location in the Central Activities Zone and Bankside, Borough and London Bridge Opportunity Area. The inclusion of the LCCM would add to the mix of artistic and cultural uses in Bankside, and support the objectives of the adjacent Strategic Cultural Area.
195. The replacement building has a suitably high standard of design to meet the expectations for a tall building and high density development. Whilst it would be very prominent in views around Union Street, it would be a dynamic and visually exciting addition to an area which already contains a diverse mix of building styles and types. It provides an excellent quality of residential accommodation as well as a defined and recognisable entrance to the LCCM.
196. The affordable housing offer combines 14 on-site affordable units with an in lieu payment of £1.1 million. This is below the policy expectation of 35%. Whilst it is accepted that it would not be practicable or viable to provide 35% affordable housing on site, the advice from the DVS following scrutiny of the submitted viability appraisal is that the scheme could support a larger in lieu payment of up to £1.7 million. This is a serious shortcoming of the application. In determining the application, consideration must be given to all aspects of the proposal, including the benefits of seeing an underused site brought into productive use, and the social and economic benefits of delivering new facilities for the LCCM as part of the wider Bankside cultural area. If the developer commits to bringing forward this building in a timely manner, then the certainty of securing the LCCM may be of sufficient weight to override the reduced level of affordable housing. It is recommended that this would be a reasonable approach in the specific circumstances of this case.
- 197 Taking account of the above, it is considered that, in line with the NPPF, there is no substantive reason to withhold planning permission. Therefore it is recommended that planning permission be granted, for a period of 18 months only, subject to completion of a legal agreement, and referral to the GLA..

Community impact statement

198. In line with the Council's Community Impact Statement the impact of this application has been assessed as part of the application process with regard to local people in respect of their age, disability, faith/religion, gender, race and ethnicity and sexual orientation. Consultation with the community has been undertaken as part of the application process.

a) The impact on local people is set out above.

Consultations

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

Consultation replies

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

Summary of consultation responses

201. 7 letters of support, 24 letters of objection

Support

202. LCCM are an organisation dedicated to the highest standards and bring together an extraordinary range of musicians and freelance teaching staff. This type of development should be supported.

203. Comments

Concern over vehicle and pedestrian access to Nelson Square and Applegarth House both during and after construction

Letters of objection

204. • The proposal at 14 storeys high would exceed the limits in planning policy
• The design is bulky and not appropriate in this area
• The building will result in a sense of enclosure
• It would adversely impact on the amenity of residents of the La Gare Apartments
• An inadequate wind study has been carried out on the impacts of the building which would have significant wind impacts.

Informal Presentation to Members

205. A presentation of the scheme was held on 12 February 2014, attended by Councillors Nick Dolezal and Adele Morris.

Statement of Community Involvement

206. A Statement of Community Involvement was submitted which detailed that pre-application consultation was carried out by the applicant. It detailed that information about the scheme was provided at public exhibitions and meetings to publicise plans and answer questions about the proposals and to provide reassurance that key issues would be addressed in the design of the project. This included engagement with Nelson Square Tenant & Resident Association, Applegarth House Tenant Management Organisation and The La Gare Management Committee. A series of one to one meetings were held with Tate Galleries, Lord Nelson Public House, Waterloo Quarter BID and Better Bankside. Consultation was also held with London Borough of Southwark, Metropolitan Police, the GLA, Transport for London and the Environment Agency. The applicant also engaged with local Ward Members and the Member of Parliament for Bermondsey and Old Southwark. In total, 14 one-to-one meetings were held, five public meetings were attended, and a public exhibition was attended by 23 people.

207. The report concludes that comments were predominantly supportively of expanding the LCCM but that concerns were raised regarding the design of the scheme and its impact on Applegarth House and La Gare apartments, the proposed bulk and massing of the building, the loss of garages, disruption during construction, the level of affordable housing and loss of daylight and sunlight.

Human rights implications

208. 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.

209. This application has the legitimate aim of providing a mixed-use development

comprising housing, an education institution and a cafe. The rights potentially engaged by this application, including the right to a fair trial and the right to respect for private and family life are not considered to be unlawfully interfered with by this proposal.

SUPPLEMENTARY ADVICE FROM OTHER OFFICERS

210. No comments received.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Site history file: TP/1474-235 Application file: 13/AP/3815 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 5461 Council website: www.southwark.gov.uk

APPENDICES]

No.	Title
Appendix 1	Consultation undertaken
Appendix 2	Consultation responses received
Appendix 3	Recommendation

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Gary Rice, Head of Development Management	
Report Author	Daniel Davies	
Version	Final	
Dated	19 June 2014	
Key Decision	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Strategic director, finance & corporate services	No	No
Strategic director, environment and leisure	Yes	Yes
Strategic director, housing and community services	No	No
Director of regeneration	No	No
Cabinet member	No	No
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team	19 June 2014	

APPENDIX 1

Consultation Undertaken

Site notice date: 27/11/2013

Press notice date: 21/11/2013

Case officer site visit date: 27/11/2013

Neighbour consultation letters sent: 15/11/2013 and 20/12/2013

Internal services consulted:

Environmental Protection Team
Transport planning
Design and conservation
Public realm
Ecology Team

Statutory and non-statutory organisations consulted:

Greater London Authority
Transport for London
Environment Agency
London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority
Thames Water

Neighbours and local groups consulted: Letters were sent to properties with 100 metres of the site including (but not exclusively) Rowland Hill House, Applegarth House, Vaughan House, Helen Gladstone House and Pakeman House on Pocock Street. Letters were also sent to properties on Great Suffolk Street and the La Gare Apartments which include 51-53 Surrey Row.

Re-consultation: N/A.

APPENDIX 2

Consultation Responses Received

Internal services

Public realm (support with comments)

The red line boundary encroaches into the adopted highway extent along Union Street where it is shown to step out. The applicant should be made aware that the publicly adopted footpath along Union Street measures between 2.6-2.8m.

The proposed site plan shows landscaping within the adopted highway extend fronting Nelson Square. This is likely to be unacceptable as this will create a pinch point.

Public Realm welcomes the resurfacing of the publicly adopted footpaths fronting Union St and Nelson Square but the specifications for this must be in accordance with Southwark Streetscape Design Guide (see notes above). The developer will need to enter into a highways agreement (s278) with the London Borough of Southwark to carry out the footpath resurfacing works along Union St and Nelson Square.

Public Realm would prefer to adopt the triangular section of private forecourt which is shown to be surfaced in the same material as the adopted footpath for the reasons outlined above. This could be included in the s278 agreement (combined s278/38). Regardless there should be a planning condition attached ensuring that the design of this area of open space is approved by Public Realm prior to commencement of development.

No details provided about expected level of servicing. Suitability of this occurring from Union St should be discussed with the Transport Planning Team

Environmental protection team (support with comments)

Noise & Vibration - Conditions are recommended concerning internal noise levels, plant noise, and operational noise to ensure that acceptable internal noise levels are achieved within proposed residential dwellings and existing dwellings nearby.

Air quality – Conditions are recommended to ensure that the dispersal of exhaust gasses from the gas-fired boiler is adequate and protects the environment from pollution.

Odour - An odour control condition is requested to ensure that the adequate measures are implemented to minimise the emission of food smells from the kitchen in association with the D1 use and the proposed A3 uses.

Land Contamination – Contaminants have been identified on site. A condition requiring a remediation strategy is recommended to ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other off-site receptors.

Construction Management – Conditions are recommended to ensure that occupiers of neighbouring premises and the wider environment do not suffer a loss of amenity by reason of pollution and nuisance as a result of construction activities.

Artificial Lighting- To ensure any that any fixtures being installed as part of the development will not cause any unnecessary light spillage / disturbance to neighbours, a condition is needed to review plans before installation.

Transport planning team (support with comments)

The Transport team do not object to this application in principle. However, the following issues should be addressed:

A condition requiring a detailed construction management plan should be submitted for each phase of the works proposed to ensure that appropriate mitigation is in place during demolition and construction.

A condition requiring the submission of details indicating where delivery vehicles will load/un-load from is recommended. The council will seek to ensure that no servicing takes place on Union Street.

The proposed materials/ layout of the public realm which sits adjacent to Union Street will need to be provided to the Council for review to ensure the works tie in with the existing highway.

The specifications for the resurfacing of the publicly adopted footpaths fronting Union Street and Nelson Square must be in accordance with Southwark Streetscape Design Guide. The developer will need to enter into a highways agreement (s278) with the London Borough of Southwark to carry out the footpath resurfacing works along Union Street and Nelson Square.

The applicant should provide details of where bins would be stored on collection and ensure that the location is appropriate and would not obstruct vehicles, pedestrians or emergency vehicles.

The persons moving the bins from the storey to Nelson Square have to negotiate between three and four separate doors. The applicant should revise the layout to reduce the number of doors (or provide assisted doors) and reduce the distance the bins have to be moved.

An updated residential travel plan and education travel plan should be provided that includes objectives, targets (including base mode share), measures to achieve those targets, a program of monitoring, funding identified and person/team responsible for delivery together with a (minimum) five year time frame, with interim targets at year one, three and five.

It is unclear whether users of the garages will be able to park in the area outside of their garage. If vehicles park at this location they may block access to the rear of the site, obstructing access to the LCCM cycle store and bin store. A condition should be applied restricting the parking of vehicles in this area.

Cycle parking

Access to the residential and LCCM cycle storage areas require users to pass through a number of doors. If these doors are required, it is recommended that these doors are 'assisted' to facilitate cycle users easier access to storage facilities.

An additional four spaces should be provided for the residential occupiers of this development.

Car parking

A condition preventing future occupiers of the development being eligible for on-street

parking permits is recommended in order to prevent possible overspill parking from the development.

It is proposed to introduce a single disabled parking car parking space to serve the LCCM and the residential element of the development. Southwark Council's Sustainable Transport SPD note the requirement for one disabled car parking space for each disabled flat or house – however where the development is located in the Central Activities Zone and the PTAL is 6, a slightly lower number of disabled spaces will be acceptable. In this development a total of 6 apartments could be occupied by people who may have a legitimate need for a disabled car parking space. It is recommended that a minimum of two disabled parking bays are made available (one solely for use by the residential element of the development and the other shared). If this is not possible, the applicant should undertake a survey and assess the demand and accessibility of existing facilities to demonstrate where disabled drivers could park in order to easily access the development.

Ecology officer (support with comments)

The submitted ecology report makes a number of recommendations which are best met by planning conditions. These are conditions relating to the installation of bird boxes within the development and the planting of native species. This will ensure the development makes a positive contribution towards biodiversity.

Statutory and non-statutory organisations

Greater London Authority

The main issues raised in the Stage 1 report are summarised as follows:

Land uses: the application is generally acceptable in strategic planning terms however, further discussion is needed together with some consequent changes on the issues set out below to ensure conformity with London Plan policies:

Housing and affordable housing: the mix of affordable units is welcomed. However, the overall affordable housing contribution falls below the 35% requirement of the Saved Southwark Plan Policy 4.4. The applicant has submitted a viability report which provides justification for 12% affordable housing provision. An independent assessment of the viability report is required, to be commissioned either by the GLA or the Council.

Child play space: site constraints mean that meeting the full requirements of the Mayor's Providing for Children and Young People's Play and In formal Recreation SPD (2008) may not be feasible. Arrangements for providing access to and the possibility of contributing to necessary upgrade works to Nelson Square Gardens should be clarified and secured in the section 106 agreement.

Urban design: the scheme is well designed and successfully accommodates both music school and residential uses. The residential quality of the proposal is high, however further clarification of internal and winter garden floor areas is required.

Density: given the nature of the site and the overall design quality of the scheme a density higher than the London Plan guidelines is acceptable.

Inclusive design: the applicant should confirm that all the units meet lifetime homes standards and indicate where the wheelchair accessible units are located and provide large scale plans of these units.

Energy: The applicant is encouraged to address the comment raised before compliance with the London Plan energy policy can be confirmed. Further clarification is required

from Southwark Council on the status of the Southbank proposed energy network.

Transport: the proposal is broadly supported. Confirmation of provision for disabled and car club parking and facilities for staff and student cyclists is required. Contributions towards additional cycle hire provision and urban realm improvements on Blackfriars Road are sought to be secured by a Section 106 agreement, alongside standard provisions such as the travel plan.

Transport for London

The closest part of the Transport for London Road Network (TLRN) is the A201 Blackfriars Road, which is 150m from the site. It has an excellent public transport accessibility level (PTAL) of 6a (centre of site), on a scale of 1 to 6 where 6 is the highest due to the proximity of Southwark Jubilee Line/Waterloo East Network Rail station and bus routes on Blackfriars Road.

The site is within the congestion charge and cycle hire scheme areas and Blackfriars Road is the proposed route for the north south cycle superhighway into central London.

Car Parking: No car parking will be provided, bar one Blue Badge space and the replacement of eight garages that are used by residents of the adjacent housing. To fully comply with the London Plan whilst it is accepted that it is impractical to provide any more disabled parking on site, further provision for resident or visitor Blue Badge holders could instead be considered in the adjoining Nelson Square, where the transport assessment (TA) indicates there is no on-street parking stress. Provision of a car club space in Nelson Square should also be considered to supplement an existing space 250m away. Both Blue Badge and car club spaces should be funded through the s106 agreement. The s106 agreement should also prevent residents from being eligible for on-street car parking permits.

Public Transport impacts: Given the relatively small scale of the development and taking into account the existing use and previously consented scheme, coupled with a broad range of public transport options in the area, it is unlikely that there will be a significant impact on public transport capacity.

Cycle parking and cycle hire: On-site cycle parking provision accords with London Plan policy. Changing facilities for staff and students such as lockers and showers should be provided.

The closest cycle hire docking station is at Southwark station, which is one of the top 10% most used stations on the network. Other stations in the area are also very well used and / or small. Given the uplift in demand from the new residents and increase in students, a contribution of £187,000 is sought through the s106 agreement that could fund a new 24 point docking station or extension of an existing station nearby, consistent with other nearby developments.

Travel Plan, deliveries and servicing and construction management: A construction logistics plan, deliveries and servicing plan and travel plan, all developed in line with current TfL best practice guidance, should be secured by way of the s106 agreement or condition. Network Rail should be satisfied that the development can be constructed without impacting on operations or safety of the adjacent railway viaduct.

S106 funding: The site lies with the Crossrail s106 collection area, however this particular development would not trigger payments.

In addition to the contribution towards cycle hire expansion, three years free car-club membership for new residents should be secured. It is also considered appropriate and

consistent with other development in the area that a contribution of £150,000 is secured towards the Blackfriars Road Urban Realm improvement scheme, as the main access to the site is from Blackfriars Road (LU station and bus stops, as well as walking and cycling).

Conclusion and summary

In strategic transport terms, the proposed development is broadly supported and is generally appropriate for the location, however the following transport issues should be addressed / clarified / confirmed prior to determination:

- Provision of disabled and car club parking and changing facilities for students and staff who cycle
- A contribution of £187,000 towards additional cycle hire provision and £150,000 towards Blackfriars Road Urban Realm improvements
- Securing the travel plan / deliveries and servicing plan, construction logistics plan and car parking management plan by way of condition / legal agreement.

Design review panel (support with comments) (pre-application scheme)

The Panel accepted that the site provided an opportunity for redevelopment and welcomed the retention of the LCCM on the site but had major concerns regarding the current proposals including its arrangement and architectural expression, its public realm and its sustainability strategy.

The applicant argued that the proposed height and massing could be justified on the basis that the new development would act as an 'urban marker' linking Tate Modern to Southwark Station. The Panel were unconvinced by this justification but felt that a tall building could be appropriate in this location subject to the design being of an exemplary quality. However, the Panel did not feel that the proposals presented were of the requisite quality.

The architectural form of the proposals was an extrusion of the square site overlaid with two oblique diagonals. These diagonals defined the form of cut out at the lower levels and influenced the location of the core and the open space at the north east corner of the site. The Panel were unconvinced by the justification for the diagonals and felt that the formal consequences were detrimental to the design. The resulting open space turned its back onto Union Street and did not encourage permeability across the site from Union Street to Nelson Square., whilst the planning of the core appeared contorted especially in relation to the layout the LCCM which lacked clarity.

Next the Panel considered the elevational treatment. The design was split into two components a solid base containing the glazed cut-out that defined the entrances to the LCCM and private residential and a glass box above that defined the residential component. The designers had presented their concept for a triple-glazed facade with a 'graphic equaliser' display pattern created by areas of translucent glass formed using a honeycomb inter-layer within the triple-glazed construction. There was the implication of a diagonal ridded glazing pattern distinguishing the NW corner from the rest of the glazed volume. The Panel felt the two-part split of the design had merit but had serious concerns with other aspects of the architectural expression particularly in relation to the upper residential levels:

- The visualisations presented showed on the upper levels as an abstract glass box formed from frameless glazing, whilst some of the elevational studies indicated a more ridded solution – with areas of offset grid used as a design feature. The panel felt that the glazing technology proposed for this element is critical its architectural expression and to the success or failure of a tall building in this location and a lot more work was required to arrive at a consistent and

credible set of proposals which successfully address issues raised by the Panel such as how opening sections are incorporated to flats and winter gardens and what will be seen behind the areas of clear glass.

- The use of honeycomb translucent glass was justified as a solar shading device to prevent overheating to the fully glazed elevation. However, this was at odds with the application of the translucent panels in the form of a 'graphic equaliser' which implies that the lower level flats are enclosed in entirely translucent glass whilst the upper units were enclosed in entirely clear glass. The panel did not feel that this worked either environmentally or functionally as the lower flats need views and the upper flats need solar shading. Again the Panel feel that the proposals have not been explored in enough detail and are not credible.
- The applicants argued that the project was a sustainable solution and would achieve CfSH Level 4 and a 40% carbon savings against Part L. The applicant stated that where there were winter gardens the build up would include a double glazed unit with honeycomb inter-layer and a triple glazed inner skin to the accommodation. Elsewhere the build up would be triple glazing with the honeycomb inter-layer. The U values of triple or even quintuple glazing falls well below the values that are required by part L let alone any improvement on this. The Panel did not believe that the environmental target could be achieved with a full glazed envelope and air conditioning to the residential and believed that the proposals would need to be radically reworked in order to achieve this target. Again the Panel felt that the consequences of such a reworking would need to be fully worked through before it is resubmitted.
- Whilst the Panel supported the principle of blind tenure, they questioned whether the proposed air-conditioned sealed glass design would meet the requirements of an RSL and their tenants.
- The solid material to the base was described as glazed brick. This needs to be developed in more detail in relation to the comments raised regarding the relationship with the street. Samples and visual references are required.

The Panel do not consider that the proposals to be coherent or credible in their current form and are not well enough developed or executed to justify a tall building on this site. The technical and visual implications of a fully glass residential building have not been adequately considered and they challenged the designers to review the design of the facade to address the deficiencies identified.

In relation to the building layout the Panel welcomed the generous entrance with publicly accessible café which will open up the LCCM to engage more with the surrounding area. However they felt that the linkage between the Foyer and the publicly accessible performance space was unconvincing. The basement area was shown with one means of escape stair when two would be required. They also questioned the feasibility of a single means of escape stair serving both the residential and educational uses. These observations called into question the deliverability of the design in its current form and the Panel felt that full resolution of these issues could have a major impact on the proposals and should be properly worked through.

Other concerns raised in relation to the layout were:

- The access to the cycle storage and the refuse enclosure for residents which required residents to exit and re-enter the building.
- The LCCM rooms appeared to be arranged along overly long and inefficient

corridors that snaked around the core and residential stairs.

- The entrance to the affordable housing is via a long corridor with no natural light whilst the private residential enjoys the triple height glazed entrance facing Union Street. The entrance to the affordable residential is even omitted from one of the visualisations. This imbalance in the consideration given to the two residential entrances is at best unfortunate.

In relation to the public realm and the relationship to the street the Panel supported the proposition of a covered open area in front of an animated entrance to the LCCM. However, they had a number of concerns with the current proposals:

- The space did not relate to Union Street as the principle street frontage
- The shape of the space would create a dead corner
- The entrance to the residential block was given equivalence to that of the LCCM, which did not seem appropriate given that the former is private and the latter is institutional. As a consequence the LCCM lacked a significant presence in this design.
- The affordable entrance needs more prominence on the street (see above)
- More consideration needs to be given to the hard landscaping, lighting and street furniture and proposals submitted to cover these areas.
- The extent of any improvements to surrounding pavements needs to be clarified.

In conclusion, the Panel supported the principle of redeveloping the site to provide enhanced facilities and improved access to LCCM as well as much-needed housing in his significant location. They also felt that the site could take a building of the scale proposed subject to design and execution being of a high enough quality. They did not believe that the design presented met these quality thresholds or gave a sufficient presence to LCCM and had concerns and the deliverability of many of the key components. They raised serious questions over its architectural expression, its internal arrangements, its sustainability as well as its relationship with the street. The Panel encouraged the architects to review their design. They asked for changes to address their concerns and invited the scheme to return to the DRP before a planning application was submitted.

Environment Agency (support)

No objection to the scheme on flood risk grounds within the direct remit of the Environment Agency.

Thames Water (support with comments)

No objection to the scheme with regard to wastewater infrastructure capacity. However they advise that no piling shall take place until a piling method statement has been submitted and approved. It is recommended that these details be secured condition.

London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority

No comments received.

Crime Prevention Design Advisor

No comments received.

Neighbours and local groups

Conservation Area Advisory Group for Southwark (objection)

The CAAG group were concerned about the dominance and 'shouty' nature of this proposal which offers little to the rich context of the Union Street Conservation area and general Bankside scene.

This site is not contiguous with a Conservation Area but may be visible from four nearby Southwark conservation areas (Valentine Place, King's Bench, Union Street and Thrale Street) and the following Conservation Areas in Lambeth (Mitre Road and Ufford Street, Lower Marsh and possibly Roupell Street).

It may also affect views of the City's St Paul's Heights area and from St Paul's. Of these Conservation Areas three have been considered in the "Music Box" Townscape and Visual Assessment Report (TVAR): Union Street, Kings Bench, Valentine Place (TAVR section 2, p.23 following). Note none of the Lambeth conservation areas have been considered and this is of concern.

CAAG advise this building lacks human scale, is inhumane, harsh as a design, with poor street level interaction, overly self-referential and alien to the North Southwark context. The comparison is with a music box, but inflated to 14 storeys high. This is not the basis for a building sympathetic to the area. One argument used in support that it is a landmark on the way to the Tate Modern: the idea that lining the back streets of Bankside and The Borough with high rise buildings will ease pedestrian movement is fallacious.

Blackfriars Action for Responsible Development (BARD) (objection)

In terms of overall design a majority were positive about the 2012 proposal and disappointed that the revised offering was back to the "cubist" format which seems to be being reflected in new buildings everywhere in one form or another and Southwark Planning's default preference.

There are still considerable reservations about the height and bulk of the new proposal. It really is shoehorned into this small site and still far too high. 14 stories, if that's till the plan, is well in excess of the height of surrounding structures and contravenes planning policy for heights in the area (both existing policy - seven stories and affirmed in the draft SPD for Blackfriars Road). Southwark planners have already required the developer to reduce height from 18 to 14 stories but why is even this seen as acceptable?

Concerns over access to Nelson Square for vehicles of all kinds, loss of light and other amenities, including access, at Rowland Hill House on Union Street and the impact on the community garden immediately to the south of Octavia House. The developer doesn't seem to have any proposals for creating new open green space - the proposals actually seem likely to result in a reduction in this area!

The loss of the garages behind the site in order to develop it. There is a particular issue here about personal security. Construction over the garages would replace the open space which currently gives access from Union Street to Applegarth House, with a narrow, closed-in, dark alleyway. This is a threatening prospect for many residents.

Resident, 161 Applegarth House, Nelson Square Gardens SE1 0PZ (objection)

The scheme will:

- Confine Applegarth House to a very tight space.
- Access to Applegarth House would be seriously compromised as it would be reduced to a very narrow alley
- This would seriously affect security when getting in and out of the building as visibility would be reduced.
- Reduce the views & light of the flats at Applegarth House

- Reduce the resale & rental value of the flats

The new development should not take any of the garages as these belong to Applegarth House, as stated in the New Management Agreement signed off by Applegarth House Coop. and Southwark Council on 25th September 2013.

There are concerns about the effects of noise, dust, pollution and disruption over an extended period of time. It is vitally important that emergency services have access to the forecourt of Applegarth House at all times. It will therefore be vitally important vehicles or materials do not cause an obstruction, even for a short period of time.

Local resident, 192 Applegarth House, Nelson Square Garden SE1 (objection)

We do not object to the site being redeveloped in principle. The area is in need of regeneration and a new, sympathetic proposal which relates to the surrounding buildings and streetscape, both in scale and design would be hugely beneficial for the area. However, the proposal put forward by SPPARC Architecture and Sherwood Property Holdings Ltd does none of the above, instead it is majorly oversized and imposes security threats to the entrance route to Applegarth House. It forms a dark, cold, narrow passageway through to, as well as visually blocking, the entrance to Applegarth House from the main street (Union Street).

I'd ask that these serious concerns be considered and these plans be carefully scaled back.

Local resident, 193 Applegarth House, Nelson Square Gardens SE1 (objection)

This scheme blocks out the light to residents homes. The height of this development will overshadow the gardens and create a wind tunnel to the whole of the forecourt of Applegarth House and ruin our gardens.

The proposed development will mean that the building is much closer to Applegarth House and will create a sense of enclosure.

As the development does not provide include any open spaces, it will encourage students to congregate in our gardens at all hours of the day and night.

The development will have a big impact on the lives of everyone living in Applegarth House for the duration of the build and after with noise, dirt, dust, making coming in and out of Nelson Square for emergency vehicles and residents when there are lorries delivering to the site

Local resident, 204 Applegarth House, Nelson Square Gardens, London SE1 (objection)

This proposal is comparatively higher than the initial proposed structure and is considered as likely to result in the following impacts:

- Create dangerous wind tunnels of Union Street
- Would add to footfall in the area, which currently, is just about bearable
- There is no step back in the new design to stop the problem of overlooking
- Views of the city to the east will be completely closed off
- The communal courtyard outside of Applegarth House will be overshadowed completely and rendered useless during the summer months

In the Blackfriars Draft SPD it is acknowledged that Blackfriars Road is where the greatest height increase will be allowed. And equally that scale should reduce as you move away from that major street. This proposal completely contradicts that policy.

**Local resident, 208 Applegarth House, Nelson Square Gardens, London SE1
(objection)**

Without doubt the redevelopment of the block will be a good thing, but having seen the latest proposals, and viewed the models on display in Octavia House over the summer, the height of proposed plans is of serious concern. This is the main entrance and only road access to Nelson Square, such a tall building will clearly over shadow this, the surrounding residents, and the gardens at the back of Applegarth House. I'd ask that these serious concerns be considered and these plans be carefully scaled back.

**Local resident, 209 Applegarth House, Nelson Square Gardens, London SE1
(objection)**

The development will be tall and in excess of the surrounding structures and will totally obliterate my view leading towards the river and of prestige building like the Tate Modern. It will also affect the light and other elemental phenomena. This might result in our Community Garden being affected, making it harder for plants and flowers to grow in certain areas, spoiling a much loved and popular outdoor resource. I believe there is an existing policy for the height of buildings south of Union Street and I am curious to know why the Octavia House redevelopment is allowed to contravene the existing planning policies?

The effects of noise, dust, pollution and disruption over an extended period may impact upon residential amenity. There is likely to be a transient workforce and security may also be an issue due to distractions and the unintended opportunities they provide. The movement of materials and machinery will be a chaotic and unrelenting hazard, especially to children. It's vitally important that emergency services have access to the forecourt of Applegarth House at all times. I was told, some years ago, a tenant died because the ambulance service was not able to reach them in time due to being blocked by parked cars. Many of the Tenants remember this and they will be very anxious we don't repeat the same mistake. It will therefore be vitally important vehicles or materials do not cause an obstruction, even for a short period of time.

This will be a difficult and stressful period, not just for me, but for all residents living at Applegarth House and I think if we can mitigate the height, pollution, safety and security, this would greatly reduce our objections and concerns and I would be very grateful if you could give some consideration to these issues.

Local resident, Nelson Square Gardens, London SE1 (objection)

I come to you as a concerned resident of Nelson Square. It has come to our attention (via <https://betterblackfriars.wordpress.com/2014/04/22/octavia-house-the-images-they-did-not-show-us/>) that the plans for the new construction on the Octavia House site needs drastic revision to comply with the buildings behind and next to it. I am of course talking about La Gare house and the flats surrounding Nelson Square Gardens.

Looking at the images - that were not shared with the Applegarth house residents in previous consultations - it is woefully apparent just how boxed in and cold the area will become. This new construction is too tall, it doesn't even try to fit with the surrounding buildings. Just one look at the images taken from the park view (a popular children and family spot for the residents) and you can see how this ridiculous building will turn the area into a dark, uninviting secluded area.

We are so proud of this area; we have been here long and we insist that new businesses and neighbours are welcome; we only ask that they show the same respect and determination to build on this community instead of bull dozing in and intimidating

the whole area without even speaking honestly to **all** its residents.

I have appealed against this construction and the one proposed before because it just doesn't make sense. Why here? Why that big? You say it will include public spaces but why are the public not being consulted.

Residents, Apartment 8 La Gare, 51 Surrey Row, London SE1 0BZ (objection)

The scheme is a completely different version of the building that was presented at an earlier meeting about the development. The main objections to this proposal are that:

There is no attempt to "step down towards Surrey Row". This new plan looms over the La Gare buildings and seriously threatens our sense of light and space.

The proposal is for 14 storeys which is far too high. Nine storeys should be an absolute maximum. We are concerned that this will set a precedent and lead to a great forest of tall buildings, ruining the character of our neighbourhood and the experience of living here.

There is no significant outdoor or amenity space. This puts huge and unacceptable pressure on Nelson Square and surrounding areas.

There is no assurance that La Gare will not be overlooked. When a presentation was made to La Gare's directors, great efforts were made to convince us that special louvred cladding would make overlooking impossible. The detailed plans do appear to show louvred cladding but – this time, to our horror- there appear to be sufficient gaps to allow overlooking of roof terraces at number 53 (La Gare) and windows of apartments on the top of 51. This is absolutely unacceptable.

This is a planning application for a great, ugly monolith of a building which will exacerbate wind tunnel effects that have plagued Union Street since Palestra was built.

There is no acknowledgement in the planning submission of the crucial relationship between Octavia House and its nearest neighbour, La Gare – nor any evidence of how this would be addressed. Reference is made to other buildings and spaces bounding the site to the north, east, west and south west but no mention is made to anything to the South.

Local resident, Apartment 2 La Gare, 53 Surrey Row, London SE1 (objection)

The sheer height and block design will effectively create a 44m brick cliff immediately next to the La Gare properties destroying any aspect or sense of space that we currently have. The existing planning permission at least has the highest part of the plan on Union St with the building falling away as it reaches to the La Gare properties.

The height of the building also seems to contradict the Blackfriars draft SPD which will be adopted in January 2014. This policy recommends that the size of any building should be reduced the further it is away from Blackfriars Road. Won't this building be one of the tallest in the area?

Local resident, Apartment 3 La Gare, 51 Surrey Row, London SE1 (objection)

The scale of the proposal is wholly disproportionate to the buildings on the south elevation and completely out of context with the existing buildings roofing lines and levels.

Not only is it 14 storeys high, but rises pretty much sheer from the northern end of 53 La Gare and our roof gardens, and of course looms large over the northern end of 51(La Gare apartments) and even totally dominates the taller buildings of Applegarth House

and Rowland Hill House, to say nothing of the courtyard space between La Gare and Applegarth. In my view, which is shared by my neighbours, this is a cynical attempt to ride on the back of the obvious overall strategy in London to build high and radically increase density. But there is a great distinction between increasing density and 'over development'. This clearly is the latter.

The scheme does not bring any architectural value to the area, nor does it fit the building lines and levels that have been established for many decades. The South Bank has been developed over recent years and the area does not cry out for any more buildings of this nature let alone one that brings nothing in architectural and interest terms and moreover runs roughshod over not only the existing residential developments but also the recently approved development application.

Local resident, 3 La Gare, 53 Surrey Row SE1 (objection)

-14 storeys is far too high for the location.

-No indication has been made that La Gare's roof terraces will not be overlooked.

-What research has been done on the wind tunnel effect on that stretch of Union Street. I have already witnessed an old lady finding it almost impossible to walk steadily due to the effect of the Palestra building

- would cyclists still be able to ride safely if such a high building were built?

Basically, the size and scale and design of the new proposal are all wrong- total overdevelopment of such a small space, presumably to squeeze as much return as possible for the developers, without regard for the location or residents.

4 La Gare Apartments, 53 Surrey Row, London SE1 (objection)

The proposal represents a huge overdevelopment of the site. The footprint of the site is very small and bounded closely on all sides by other buildings and structures. The existing planning approval for a 9 storey building already represents a large development on this site and the new proposal is several times larger. Up to 55 residential units are included compared to nine in the existing permission.

The Design and Access Statement does not pay sufficient attention to the existence of the La Gare building, despite the fact that the proposed development comes right up to the boundary of La Gare. No mention is made of any neighbouring building to the south of the proposed development. The proposal - unlike the existing permission- does not acknowledge the proximity of La Gare by stepping down – it is effectively a 14 storey cliff virtually on our boundary.

The proposal will result in a monolithic structure which will overshadow and dominate everything around it.

When the currently outstanding 9 storey planning approval was considered by the Planning Inspector in 2009 the limited amount of amenity space in the new development was discussed. In that proposal at least four of the nine residential units had outside space, but the developer argued that Nelson Square could provide additional amenity space. The new proposal has no outside space for any of the 55 flats and in fact no even any opening windows.

Is Nelson Square expected to provide amenity space for such a large number of households?

7 La Gare Apartments, 53 Surrey Row, London SE1 (objection)

The proposal is for a 14 storey building. This is much higher than other buildings near or adjacent to the site and will loom over other properties. The northern end of the La Gare

development is 3 stories and our new neighbour would present us with an 11 story cliff within a few feet of our boundary.

The proposed development tries to combine two very attractive ideas: residential development and the Centre of Contemporary Music. It seems to me that trying to put both on the same site and still make it a viable financial proposition for the developer has led to a proposal of vast over-development which is significantly detrimental to the neighbours in La Gare.

I could, of course, add much more but I want to keep to the simple point which is that I think this proposal is inappropriate and will have an adverse impact on the neighbours because of its sheer size and bulk.

Local Resident, 11a La Gare Apartments, 51 Surrey Row SE1 (objection)

The proposed building is much too high and much too close to La Gare where I live, it will undoubtedly have a detrimental effect on the quality of life of all the residents here at La Gare, in particular those living in 53.

Local Resident, Apartment 15 La Gare, 51 Surrey Row SE1 (objection)

The proposed height is out of character with the surrounding buildings and has serious light and density problems. The general height in the area is 6 storeys, the proposed development is double the norm.

Recent developments completed or underway, surrounding the development site which are around 6 stories:

The new apartment buildings in Great Suffolk St., near the redevelopment

Travel lodge in Union St, directly opposite the new development

The apartments near the train overpass at Union St

Whilst the London Authority offices on corner of Union Street and Blackfriars Rd

is slightly higher, it has plenty of light, does not affect other buildings given the space around it and that it is on a main road.

None of them are the height of that proposed.

In summary:

-The height is out of character of the buildings around it and double the height of the existing buildings

-It will block light for the buildings around it

- It is a dense over-development of a relatively small site

Radcliffes Le Brasseur, on behalf of the 51 and 53 La Gare Company Ltd (objection)

We write on behalf of 51 and 53 La Gare Company Limited, a company representing the lessees of 26 apartments at 51 and 53 Surrey Row. We object to this proposal which, will give an undue sense of enclosure not only to them but to many others who live immediately behind and in Nelson Square. We also note that many others including Bard, have objected to this proposal. Our clients are not opposed to a redevelopment consisting of an enhanced London Centre of Contemporary Music and the provision of apartments, but are opposed to a building so much higher than the 2009 consent and which is not stepped back. Such a building will be out of context with this environment and the issuing of a planning consent for such a proposal would be an affront to local residents.

Local resident, 49 Pakeman House, Pocock Street, London SE1 (objection)

The height and bulk of the proposed structure are well in excess of Southwark's current planning policy requirements, re-affirmed in the SPD likely to be approved later this month. The SPD requires that structures off Blackfriars Road should be in keeping with

local heights and much lower than those on Blackfriars Road itself. Accordingly comparisons with the Palestra Building, which were made by the developers during consultation, are invalid - Palestra faces onto Blackfriars Road, even though it extends at a lower height along the northern side of Union Street.

Further, the proposed structure is shoehorned into this small site, is quite out of keeping with neighbouring buildings and overshadows and dominates its immediate surroundings. The design offers nothing in terms of open public space - this in a "green-space deprived" area of the borough - and will undoubtedly affect adversely the communal garden to the east of Applegarth House.

Of note in particular are the alarming conclusions of the Wind Environment desk study. "Wind effect" is already a significant problem in Union Street and, at the very least, there is a need for a comprehensive study of the site and its surrounding to examine the desk study's conclusions in a practical context.

Finally, it has to be said that the developers have been extremely reluctant to consider the impact of the proposed development on the area to the south. This includes Pakeman House, some 200 metres away, where the visual impact is significant for up to a dozen properties. The consultation process has therefore been thoroughly unsatisfactory, notwithstanding the developer's claims.

Local resident, no address given (objection)

It is clear that the original proposal, which I believe was given considered in a community consultation, took account of the height levels around the site and was at least 'sympathetic' to the buildings around it, being a layered building of different foot print on each floor, and overpowering everything around it.

The fact that the developers original proposal was more in keeping with the building environment around it and the effect on other buildings and residents, only heightens why the current proposal is unacceptable and is a gross overdevelopment of the site.

It is now proposed to have a shear wall, much higher than the original, which will loom over the residential buildings next to it, and in effect be a wall right p to those residences, blocking light, casting shadow, creating wind tunnels and affecting the general residential usage in the vicinity.

The area is a mix of residential, commercial and industrial. This proposal takes no account of where it is to be situated and the serious adverse affect is has on the area and that mix.

Local resident, no address given (objection)

The scheme in its present form represents gross overdevelopment of a very tight site and total disregard for the impact it has on its immediate neighbours. Few people are against the redevelopment of this building and certainly support the need for affordable housing provision in the neighbourhood. The London College of Contemporary Music is also a welcomed neighbour on the proviso that adequate sound insulation is guaranteed.

However, if a 14 storey building is needed in order to accommodate those so called non-market uses, then the overall programme for the building is in appropriate because it constitutes overdevelopment of the site.

When planning permission was granted for an earlier proposal the height certainly mattered as did the principle of stepping back from La Gare and Applegarth House. It is hard to understand why this suddenly no longer applies.

When the currently development and his architectural team were presenting to the residents of La Gare some months ago they were at pains to acknowledge the importance of stepping back. The scheme under consideration is completely different, rising sheer from the northern end of the La Gare roof gardens to a height of 14 storeys. The scheme has an overpowering relationship to La Gare apartments and no supportive argument can be made in relation to La Gare, or indeed the total overpowering of the access and amenity space between La Gare and Applegarth House.

The presence of Palestra is seen as a precedent to go to the height of 14 storeys for Octavia House, but this building fronts Blackfriars Road first and foremost. However that building totally overpowers and intimidates residents in Rowland Hill House and contributes to the increasing wind tunnel effect along Union Street. The new Octavia House will do the same.

If allowed at 14 storeys on streets as narrow as Union Street, Octavia House also sets a dangerous height and bulk precedent for redevelopment all around the adjacent streets. Southwark's own policies acknowledge taller buildings along Blackfriars Road in the full acknowledgement that on small streets buildings will be smaller. In the Blackfriars Draft SPD it is acknowledged that Blackfriars Road is where the greatest height increase will be allowed. And equally that scale should reduce as you move away from that major street. Octavia House as currently proposed, flies in the face of this policy. Indeed it is a taller than a recent permission granted for a building on Blackfriars Road at the western end of Surrey Row.

There is concern that the scheme would result in overlooking which the applicants convinced us at a presentation that it would not owing to a special louvered cladding. The detailed plans do show a louvered cladding but with sufficient gaps to allow overlooking a roof terrace at 53 and windows of apartment on the top of 51 (La Gare apartments).

Local resident, 136 Rowland Hill House SE1 (objection)

Whilst welcoming the giving of a home on Union Street to the London School of Contemporary Music (it will be change from the normal hotels, flats, and student residences with which this area is currently overloaded) it is considered that

The proposal for 14 storeys is over the planning policy limit for the side streets in this area. Its design (now reversed from what was a fairly imaginative proposal) is bulky, square and unimaginative. This street is the main entrance for visitors going to the Tate Modern and some effort should be made to have designs that have some design merit.

The design involves removing an amenity from long standing residents of Applegarth (their garages) in order to force in an unsuitable and bulky building. As usual residents will suffer a loss from the development including in this case, loss resulting from overshadowing of one of their green space, a garden well used and loved by them. It is worth pointing out that older people and children particularly value such small oases amidst this greatly overdeveloped area.

The wind tunnel in Union Street created by the ghastly Palestra building and other developments is already a serious concern. The report attached to this planning application is a desk report and inadequate, yet even this raised significant concerns. The planning committee must act responsibly and insist on proper scientific study of the problems as they exist and in the future with the addition of Octavia House.

There will be yet more residents in an area with grossly inadequate open space and amenities.

There is also the issue of vehicle and pedestrian access to Nelson Square and Applegarth House both during and over construction.

Local Resident, SE1, no address given (objection)

Why is it necessary to build 14 storeys which would tower above all the blocks of flats in Nelson Square and be out of keeping with the surroundings.

Parking in this area is already at a premium without adding to it making it even more difficult for residents.

Contemporary Music must mean more unavoidable noise in an already busy and noisy part of London even if soundproofing is incorporated in the construction.

Is it intended to be yet another ugly soulless glass house monstrosity as we already have on the north side of Union Street.

Local resident, no address given (objection)

The current submission for the redevelopment of Octavia House on Union Street is wholly unacceptable in its present form and represents gross overdevelopment of a very tight site and total disregard for the impact it has on its immediate neighbours.

The London School of Contemporary Music is also a welcomed neighbour on the proviso that adequate sound insulation is guaranteed

The current submission may result in overlooking issues.

The height and bulk of the development and adjacency to its neighbours. As residents in and around Nelson Square we are aware of the cogent arguments put forward to grant the earlier permission and see absolutely no reason for these to be altered to satisfy this new and radically oversized submission.

John Smart Architects, 124 Southwark Street SE1 (support)

In addition to the architectural design merits we believe the proposed building is sympathetic and measured response aligned to the general redevelopment of the surrounding area and has a commendable mix of educational space and residential space (including affordable units) which will bring welcome benefits to the local community.

Business Owner, 23-39 Great Suffolk Street SE1 (support)

As a local business that owns a Health and Fitness club: I support the application and welcome the design and mix of the Music College and new residents'.

Former LCCM Student, no address given (support)

As a student I studied on a 2 year HND course in trumpet at LCCM before the development of their BMus degree courses. Due to my experiences, I eagerly continued onto taking the degree in music production. I have consequently witnessed LCCM evolve and grow considerably as years have gone by.

In my opinion, the quality of teaching and the skill sets of the tutors is second to none. The LCCM has always retained a unique ethos, intention and identity without ever compromising its aims to assure students such as myself become consummate professionals in our fields. The directors simply put, have a true belief in providing an education that gives budding musicians, songwriters, composers and producers the skill

sets needed to make them today's professionals.

Since leaving in 2009 I have joined as an admissions assistant and have been involved in a number of professional music jobs via the tutors recommendations. I feel privileged to have great support by LCCM to be able to evolve my music endeavours after leaving and i know that they have helped other leavers as well as myself.

To be able to expand and evolve within their central London hub would improve the local community immensely. LCCM are always involved with the local community be it helping the council assisting in music education to providing customers for the varied coffee and food/pub outlets. On top of this LCCM are providing jobs to local citizens in our resources team, cleaners and facility equipment.

The local area is awash of creative and tourist hotspots that we promote when potential students come for their auditions they can make a day to absorb the area. I am very excited about opportunities that the music box will bring.

Former LCCM Student, no address given (support)

We need facilities like LCCM in Southwark as the area has for centuries been known for its artistic heritage and long may this continue.

Resident, 32 Quadrant House, Burrell Street, London SE1 0UW (support)

We need facilities like LCCM in Southwark as the area has for centuries been known for its artistic heritage and long may this continue.

Resident, 8 Greswell Street, London SW6 6PP (support)

The scheme would create a dynamic and valuable resource to the local area and provide much needed education facilities for people wanting to gain skills for the creative industries.

Resident, 122 Underhill Road, London SE22 0QJ (support)

LCCM is an organisation dedicated to the highest standards in music education, Darius Kwaji and his staff are committed to bringing together an extraordinary range of musicians on the freelance teaching staff and making their experience available to the widest possible range of students. The college has grown in a positive and sustainable way providing a wide range of full time and part time courses that promote an ever increasing number of regular concerts and club performances by students in various London venues including many within the immediate vicinity.

The new building will allow LCCM to expand its courses into media beyond just music and to reach out to the local community to involve local Southwark resident in this vital cultural resource.

As a Southwark Resident, I strongly believe that LCCM should stay within the borough and that this new building will ensure the future of this unique institution in its current location.