

Item No. 5.2	Classification: Open	Date: 23 April 2015	Meeting Name: Planning Committee
Report title:	<p>Development Management planning application: Application 14/AP/3844 for: Outline Planning Permission</p> <p>Address: AYLESBURY ESTATE, LAND BOUNDED BY ALBANY ROAD, PORTLAND STREET, BAGSHOT STREET, ALVEY STREET, EAST STREET AND DAWES STREET, LONDON SE17</p> <p>Proposal: Outline application for: demolition of existing buildings and phased redevelopment to provide a mixed use development over 18 development parcels comprising a number of buildings ranging between 2 to 20 storeys in height (12.45m - 68.85m AOD) with capacity for up to 2,745 residential units (Class C3), up to 2,500sqm of employment use (Class B1); up to 500sqm of retail space (Class A1); 3,100 to 4,750sqm of community use; medical centre and early years facility (Class D1); in addition to up to 3,000sqm flexible retail use (Class A1/A3/A4) or workspace use (Class B1); new landscaping; parks, public realm; energy centre; gas pressure reduction station; up to 1,070 car parking spaces; cycle parking; landscaping and associated works.</p> <p>The application is accompanied by an Environmental Statement pursuant to the Town and Country Planning Regulations (Environmental Impact Assessment) 2011.</p>		
Ward(s) or groups affected:	Faraday		
From:	HEAD OF DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT		
Application Start Date 21/11/2014		Application Expiry Date 12/02/2015	
Earliest Decision Date 30/01/2015		PPA Date: 31/07/2015	

RECOMMENDATION

1. That planning permission is GRANTED subject to conditions, the applicant entering into an appropriate legal agreement, and referral to the Mayor of London;
2. If it is resolved to grant planning permission, it is confirmed that the environmental information has been taken into account as required by Regulation 3(4) of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011;
3. That it is confirmed that, following issue of the planning decision, the Head of Development Management should place a statement on the Statutory Register pursuant to Regulation 24 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 which contains the information required by Regulation 21 and for the purposes of Regulation 24(1)(c) being the main reasons and considerations on which the
- 4.

Planning Committee's decision was based shall be set out as in the report.

5. In the event that the requirements of (a) are not met by July 31st2015 , the Head of Development Management be authorised to refuse planning permission, if appropriate, for the reasons set out under paragraph 408.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Introduction

6. Constructed between 1966 and 1977, the Aylesbury Estate covers an area of 28.5 hectares containing approximately 2700 dwellings. At the time it was built, the plans for the estate were considered innovative and aspirational – elevated walkways linking the blocks would enable people to walk from the Peckham 'Five Estates' through Aylesbury and the Heygate to the Elephant and Castle. The walkways would separate pedestrians from the traffic, with parking garages at ground floor and the decks becoming social spaces for the residents.
7. However, over the following 30 years the estate became one of the most deprived areas in south London, with a high incidence of crime, ill health and low levels of employment and educational achievement.
8. The Aylesbury Estate was awarded New Deal for Communities (NDC) status in 1999 with a budget of £56 million to improve the physical environment, raise living standards and improve the life chances of residents. The NDC and the council worked together to deliver social, education and training programmes. In 2009 the Aylesbury NDC was succeeded by the Creation Trust, a charity delivering projects, events and consultation programmes and ensuring the existing community has a voice in the regeneration process.
9. In 2002 the council embarked upon plans for refurbishing the estate. However, structural surveys highlighted the extent of works needed to the fabric and it was concluded that the cost of refurbishing the estate to an acceptable standard would be prohibitive. Work to the individual blocks could not overcome the fundamental shortcomings of the layout of the estate, with its lack of active frontages, confusing and difficult pedestrian routes, and hostile architecture, and would limit opportunities for inward investment to support the regeneration. It was decided that in order to secure a long term sustainable future for the area, a more comprehensive programme would be needed, and in 2005 the council took the decision to redevelop the estate.
10. Preparation of the Aylesbury Area Action Plan (AAP) began in March 2007. The council worked with the NDC and masterplanners Urban Initiatives on options, and carried out public consultation and background studies. Following an Examination in Public in 2009, and receipt of the report from the appointed Inspector, the council formally adopted the AAP in January 2010. The policies in the AAP have significant weight in any decisions on applications in this area. It is part of the statutory development plan and deals directly with the redevelopment of the Aylesbury Estate.
11. During the Plan preparation period, two early phases of redevelopment came forward. Phase 1A in the south west corner of the estate has delivered 261 new homes, plus shops and a community centre (the Southwark Resource Centre). Site 7, in the north east corner of the estate is currently under construction, and will provide 147 new

homes. Both were developed by L&Q Housing, and Phase 1A was recently awarded a Civic Trust commendation.

12. In 2012 the council began the process of selecting its development partner to deliver the Aylesbury masterplan. Following a lengthy and rigorous procurement process, the council selected Notting Hill Housing Trust (NHHT). In April 2014 a development partnership agreement and business plan were agreed by the partners to secure the comprehensive regeneration of the Aylesbury estate by 2032. NHHT will be working with Barratt London to deliver this comprehensive scheme.
13. The guiding objective of the AAAP is to deliver a new neighbourhood, better integrated with the wider area, with a mix of housing types and tenures. It aims to replace 2758 dwellings with around 4,200 new houses and flats, together with new shops, community facilities, workspaces, open spaces and other infrastructure.
14. The estate bounds Burgess Park, where a £6 million programme of investment, including a new competition-standard BMX track, playground and lake improvements has recently been undertaken. Consultation on Phase 3 works was recently carried out, which could include further sports and youth provision.
15. The future phases of the Aylesbury redevelopment would be delivered through two applications – a full application for the first development site (FDS) and an Outline application for Phases 2, 3 and 4. The application for the FDS (14/AP/384) is included elsewhere on this agenda. Together, these developments have the potential to transform the area, achieving the AAAP objective for an attractive, mixed neighbourhood where people would choose to live.

Site location and description

16. The application site, measuring approximately 22 hectares, currently accommodates around 2080 homes across approximately 50 residential blocks that range in height between four and 14 storeys. There are large long linear housing blocks between 10 and 14 storeys with large expanses of open space and integrated garages at ground floor level. The largest of these include Wendover and Taplow which are built in a Jespersen architectural style that is characterised by pre-fabricated techniques, including a pre-cast concrete wall panel, floor and ceiling slabs. Eight to four storey blocks of similar architectural style are more centrally located within the estate (e.g. Missenden), alongside red brick estate buildings (typically two to five storey storeys) and a short row of dwelling houses and maisonettes.
17. The estate has a concentration of community facilities along Thurlow Street, including the Thurlow Community Centre, the Aylesbury Youth Centre, the Aylesbury Learning Centre and a Medical Centre. There is a central communal heating system served from a large boiler room within the centre of the estate. There are approximately 414 trees spread across the estate, but mainly within the Aylesbury estate amenity spaces. Residential dwellings on the estate remain for the most part occupied.
18. To the north the site is bounded by East Street where there is a street market and a local parade of shops. Retail provision is also located nearby on both Walworth Road and Old Kent Road to the west and east respectively. To the south the site is bounded by Burgess Park and Surrey Square lies adjacent to the estate to the east. Michael Faraday School and the University Academy of Engineering, South Bank adjoin the site to the west.

19. There are a number of heritage assets in proximity to the site including the following conservation areas: Liverpool Grove, Cobourg Road, Trafalgar Avenue, Glengall Road and Addington Square. There are no Listed Buildings within the site boundary but there are some Listed Buildings on Portland Street and within Burgess Park.

Details of proposal

20. The details of the outline scheme are described in the Development Specification, Parameter plans and Design Code. All other documents submitted provide supporting information which is considered in the main body of this report. The application is also accompanied by an Environmental Statement.
21. Consent is being sought for the principle of the proposal including the upper and lower limits of development and the areas where new access points will be situated. The purpose is to move towards a more detailed outline planning permission that cover specific elements at a later stage. These later stages are called 'reserved matters' and in the case of the outline proposal will include:
 22. **"access"**: the accessibility to and within the site, for vehicles, cycles and pedestrians in terms of the positioning and treatment of access and circulation routes and how these fit into the surrounding access network;
 23. **"appearance"**: the aspects of a building or place within the development which determine the visual impression the building or place, including the external built form of the development, its architecture, materials, decoration, lighting, colour and texture;
 24. **"landscaping"**: the treatment of land (other than buildings) for the purpose of enhancing or protecting the amenities and includes screening by fences, walls or other means, the planting of trees, hedges, shrubs or grass, the laying out or provision of gardens, courts or squares, water features, sculpture, or public art, and the provision of other amenity features;
 25. **"layout"**: means the way in which buildings, routes and open spaces within the development are provided, situated and orientated in relation to each other and to buildings and spaces outside the development;
 26. **"scale"**: means the height, width and length of each building proposed within the development in relation to its surroundings.
27. The proposed amount of development is set out in the Development specification, with some detailed provisions set out in supporting documents. Overall the scheme is seeking to provide:

Table 1: Residential accommodation

	Amount
Residential (Class C3)	<p>288,700(GEA) sq.m (max.) / 2745 dwelling units (max.) 230,000 (GEA) sq. m (min.)/ 1,700 dwellings (min.)</p> <p><u>Affordable dwellings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 50% by habitable room <p><u>Target rent</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 75% of all affordable habitable rooms <p><u>Intermediate</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 25% of all affordable habitable rooms <p><u>Private</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 50%by habitable rooms
Dwelling Mix (minimum)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3% - Studios (maximum) • 70%- 2 or more bedrooms • 20% - 3 bedrooms • 7% - 4 bedrooms • 3% - 5 or more bedrooms
Residential standards (minimum)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AAAPfloorspace standards • London Plan floorspace standards • 10% wheelchair accessible dwellings • Lifetime homes standards • Minimum Code for Sustainable Homes Rating Level 4.
Private amenity space (minimum)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6sq.m per 1 or 2 bed flat • 10sq.m per 3 or 4bed flat/maisonette • 50sq.m per 4 or 5bed dwelling house
Child Play Space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20,300sq.m (Indicative)
Residential Cycle Parking (minimum)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicative amount – 4,898cycle spaces
Car parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1098 parking spaces (maximum) • 20% equipped with electric vehicle charging facilities • 20% equipped with passive electric vehicle charging facilities

Other land-uses

Table 2:Proposed non-residential floorspace

	Minimum	Maximum
Business space (B1)	600sq.m	4,900*sq.m
Retail (Class A1)	800 sq.m	2,500* sq.m
Health Centre, Community and Leisure (Class D1)	3,100sq.m	4,750 sq.m
Flexible space (A1, A3, A4 or B1)	600 sq.m	3,000sq.m
Cycle space standards for non-residential uses	A1 – 1 space per 250sq.m	
	A2-A5 - 1 space per 250sq.m	
	B1 – 1 space per 90 sq.m	
	D1 (Nurseries/schools) - 1 space per 8 staff + 1 space per 8 students	
	D1(Health centre) – Health centre – 1 space per 5 staff	
	D1 (other) – 1 space per 8 staff	
	Indicative total – 195 spaces	
Energy Centre	2.5MWe Combined Heat and Power Energy Centre	Not specified.

*This total includes flexible space. The maximum retail/employment maximum cannot both be achieved.

Public open space provision

28. Twelve new areas of public open space will be created providing Civic space and Parks that will provide playspace as well as general amenity space. Street gardens will also be provided along Albany Road and Thurlow Street that will have an amenity and social function.

Table 3:Overview of open space provision

	Minimum (sq.m)
Civic open space	2,830
Parks	14,129
Street gardens	7,216
Community gardens	840
Total	25,015

Highways commitments

29. New streets will be provided that will create a variety of routes through the estate and open spaces. In addition to the new streets two new vehicle access entrances will be created into the estate from Portland Street and Kinglake Street. Highways works to Albany Road, Thurlow Street, East Street and Portland Street are proposed that include the provision of new trees, lampposts and other street furniture that will form part of the public realm and support way-finding.

Phasing

30. The strategy for bringing forward the outline scheme has been to sub-divide the large area into three phases:

Development Phase	Start	Finish
Phase 2	January 2016	February 2025
Phase 3	May 2021	January 2027
Phase 4	June 2023	March 2035

31. Each phase is sub-divided into development parcels. The parameter plans show 18 sub-divided 'development parcels' which have been apportioned to ensure the right amount and type of development comes forward at any one time.
32. With the exception of development parcels 10, 11 and 16 all other development parcels have the potential to be mixed-use in character providing a mix of residential and either retail/workspace and/or health and community use. The distribution and amount of floor space will be controlled by the development specification and parameter plans and will be determined as part of the approval of each reserved matters application.
33. The following tables set out the amount of development proposed for each of phase. The implementation of this permission would follow on from phase 1 which is in part completed (Site 1a), under-construction (Site 7) or under consideration (FDS) and so the first phase proposed under the outline scheme is Phase 2 in the overall masterplan for the Aylesbury Estate.

Phase 2 (Development parcels 4, 5, 6, 7, 18)

Table 5: Proposed development in Phase 2

	Maximum	Relevant Development Parcel(s)
Dwellings	3944 Habitable rooms 1,047 units	4, 5, 6, 7, 18
Retail (A1/A3/A4)	1,500 sq.m	4, 6, 7
Employment/workspace	1,500 sq.m	4, 6, 7

(Class B1)		
Health/community /early years (Class D1)	4,100 sq.m	4, 7, 18
Basement	Phase 2a – 5,560 sq.m Phase 2b/2c – 5,745 sq.m	4,18
Energy Centre	2.5MWe Combined Heat and Power Energy Centre	4

**Phase 3
(Development parcels 8& 9)**

Table 6:Proposed development in Phase 3 (illustrative)

	Maximum	Relevant Development Parcel(s)
Dwellings	828 habitable rooms 178 units	8, 9
Retail (A1/A3/A4)	500 sq.m	9
Employment/workspace (Class B1)	3,300 sq.m	8, 9

**Phase 4
(Development parcels 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17)**

Table 7:Proposed development in Phase 4 (illustrative)

	Maximum	Relevant Development Parcel(s)
Dwellings	5,887 Habitable rooms 1,520 units	10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17
Retail (A1/A3/A4)	1,000 sq.m	12, 13, 14, 15, 17
Employment/workspace (Class B1)	1,200 sq.m	12, 13, 14, 15, 17
Health/community /early years (Class D1)	750 sq.m	17
Basement	18,365sq.m	14, 16, 17

Parameter plans and development parcels

34. The parameter plans set the limits of the proposed development by defining maximum

building heights, the distribution of land uses, amount of open space, vehicular access, circulation routes and the phasing of development and demolition. The parameter plans also establish the envelope or 'development parcels' in which buildings will be developed. The design code details that all development including areas that are overhung by balconies, projecting bay windows, ground floor spill out space and privacy strips i.e. for front gardens will be contained within this envelope. The parameter plans also define areas of public accessible open space and no build zones.

Design code

35. The Design code sets out a number of key design principles that will guide the detailed design of reserved matters applications. It is a series of guidance and instructions that architects of future phases must respond to and it will inform the council's assessment of design quality. It adds more detail to the high level guidance in the AAAP. Mandatory rules and general design expectations are established that will guide the overall legibility, character and design quality of each subsequent application. Whilst it is a detailed document it is not intended to be overly prescriptive or inflexible given the long timescales of the regeneration programme. The document therefore focuses on the core design principles that will guide the detailed design of future buildings.
36. The proposed scale and massing of the outline application focuses height along the key routes of Thurlow Street (6-8 storeys) and the Park Edge (Albany Road). Tall buildings (up to 20 storeys) are proposed at key junctions and gateways into the core of the Aylesbury Action Area. Heights typically drop east and west away from Thurlow Street to mid and low densities in response to the built form of the existing neighbouring buildings where heights are much lower (2-4 storeys).
37. The design code is structured around six character areas that are described as: The Park Edge, Community Spine, Thurlow Street, Aylesbury Square (referred to as the Amersham site in the AAAP), the School Neighbourhood and Surrey Square.

Park Edge

38. Albany Road will be enhanced through the introduction of paved pedestrian crossings improving connections between the estate and Burgess Park. On-road cycle lanes and junction improvements will be provided as well as a wide pedestrian edge that will form the setting for a series of mansion blocks creating a well-defined edge to the Park. Six tall buildings are proposed along Albany Road as well as an energy centre that will serve the new neighbourhood. Buildings along this frontage will benefit from panoramic views across Burgess Park.

Community Spine(s)

39. Two east-west community spines will be introduced which are proposed to be pedestrian and cycling focused streets. These routes link community hubs such as schools, health facilities and parks. Parts of the community spine will be pedestrian and cycle access and other parts carrying some traffic, with low speeds. Shared surfaces and narrowed junctions will be created to give pedestrians and cyclists priority. The typology of building and density varies across both spines as they link/form the boundary of the character areas.

Thurlow Street

40. Thurlow Street will be maintained as the main street and public transport route within the site. This application is seeking to upgrade pedestrian and cycle access whilst allowing capacity for improvements to public transport capacity, consistent with the

AAAP. Retail and business space will be focused on the northern end of Thurlow Street, with opportunities for small scale retail space created to the south near to the Park Edge. Buildings are typically mid to high density (440-740 habitable rooms per hectare) and arranged around perimeter blocks.

Aylesbury Square (also known as the Amersham site)

41. The Amersham Site, (referred to as Aylesbury Square in supporting documents) will be a central civic square and the location of a new health facility, community uses and early years facility alongside the potential for new retail and commercial space. The public space will support existing and proposed non-residential uses as one of five key clusters that are being provided within the redeveloped Estate. This forms a development parcel in its own right and is expected to be delivered as the first element of the outline scheme.

The School Neighbourhood

42. This area is intended as a contemporary extension to the Liverpool Grove conservation area marking the transition between the established context and the taller buildings around Albany Road and Thurlow Street. Development will have much lower densities (260-440 habitable rooms per hectare) and will typically be arranged as dwelling houses.

Surrey Square

43. The Surrey Square neighbourhood is proposed as a low to medium density (260-740 habitable rooms per hectare) area which draws on the context of the established area adjoining it. Mansion blocks and Mews houses are expected in this area as the predominant building typology and new linkages will be created to better connect the site with Surrey Square.

Open space

44. A series of the distinctive new squares and open spaces will be introduced within each of the character areas that will become the focal points of these diverse neighbourhoods. The spaces will include a mix of soft and hard landscaping, communal planting spaces, play space, games courts and seating areas.

Changes made during the application

45. Following the submission of the application, detailed design work was undertaken by the applicant in relation to development parcel 18 which will be the first to be delivered in the outline scheme. Development parcel 18 will provide the majority of the community facilities for the AAAP area including the health centre.
46. Changes were made to the parameter plans to allow for a greater flexibility in the design response at reserved matters stage for this development parcel whilst maintaining the overall objectives of the outline scheme. Further design guidance was provided within the design code as well as minor amendments to other parameter plans to reflect feedback received following consultation and clarify key requirements. The changes include amendments to the distribution and minimum amount of non-residential floor space.
47. In summary the key changes to the application were:
 - Development plots are now referred to as development parcels

- Adjustments were made to the development extent parameter plan (formerly the 'development plot' parameter plan), building heights parameter plan and open space parameter plan
 - Subplot 9c has been merged with development parcel 18a
 - The maximum height across development parcel 18 has increased by up to 4metres
 - The site location plan red-line boundary has been extended to include part of Portland Street
 - Circulation and access have been split to form two separate parameter plans
 - Revisions were made to the development specification
48. Notification of these revisions was made via individual letters, site notices and publication in the Southwark News.
49. The applicant notified the council of a number of discrepancies within the submitted planning documentation by way of a letter on April 7th. No material changes were made to the application but all who had either expressed an interest or made a comment on the application were sent a copy of that letter.

Planning history

50. There is no significant planning history for the outline application site since the estate was built. However, as detailed in the introduction, regeneration has already begun with the redevelopment of Site 1A and Site 7 (see history of adjoining sites). There are also detailed proposals for the First Development Site which are being considered alongside this application.

Planning history of adjoining sites

Aylesbury Proposal Site 1A - Open Land East of Red Lion Row & North of Boyson Road, 1-41 Bradenham, 1-12 Redline Close & The Aylesbury Day Centre, London, SE17 2ES.

51. **05/CO/0161**—Demolition of existing garages and out buildings, erection of 45 new dwellings, 10 new garages and a new day centre north of Boyson Road. Demolition of the existing day centre and the erection of 75 new dwellings west of Bradenham Close and public realm improvement works along Bradenham Close and Boyson Road. (Siting Only). **Granted 18/01/2006**. Not implemented.
52. **07/CO/0046**—Outline Planning Application for the demolition of 1-41 Bradenham, 1-12 Red Lion Close, the Aylesbury Day Centre, the elevated pedestrian link across Bradenham Close and the single storey garages on Red Lion Close, and the erection of a series of buildings ranging in height from 1 (c.4.5m) to 10 storeys (29.9m) in height comprising around 260 dwellings, 404m² of retail floorspace, a new day centre and provision of public open space and public realm improvement work. **Granted 11/06/2007**. Completed in 2014 following approval of reserved matters. Now fully occupied.

Aylesbury Proposal Site 7 - 1-27 and 28-59 Wolvertan, Sedan Way, London, SE17 2AA

53. **12/AP/2332**—Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment of the site to provide 147 residential units including flats, maisonettes and houses (30 x 1 bed, 71 x 2 bed,

13 x 3 bed, 28 x 4 bed, 5 x 5 bed) of which 58% would be affordable housing. The proposed residential blocks range between 3 and 10 storeys in height (10 Storeys at Thurlow Street) with a basement car park together with new vehicle access, plant, landscaping, cycle storage and refuse/recycling facilities. **Granted 19/02/2013**. Under construction.

Aylesbury Proposal Site 1B/1C –Land bounded by Albany Road, Portland Street, Westmoreland Road and Bradenham Close, London, SE17 (Comprising 1-35 Chartridge; 36-68 Chartridge; 69-76 Chartridge; 77-105 Chartridge; 106-119 Chartridge; 120-149 Chartridge; Ellison House; 1-28 Arklow House; 42-256 Bradenham and 1-172 Chiltern)

54. **14/AP/3843**—Full planning application for demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment to provide a mixed use development comprising a number of buildings ranging between 2 to 20 storeys in height (9.45m to 22.2m AOD), providing 830 residential dwellings (Class C3); flexible community use, early years facility (Class D1) or gym (Class D2); public and private open space; formation of new accesses and alterations to existing accesses; energy centre; gas pressure reduction station; associated car and cycle parking and associated works. (Recommended for approval and included on the same agenda)

Planning policy

55. The statutory development plan for the borough comprises The London Plan (2011) consolidated with further alterations (March 2015); The Core Strategy (2011) and saved policies from the Southwark Plan (2007). The AAP sits within the council's Local Development Framework and is the key material consideration for all applications in its area. The AAP contains locally specific policies that deal with the redevelopment of the estate. Key policies include 50% affordable housing, dwelling mix and type and identified locations for non-residential uses. The National Planning Policy Framework 2012 provides national planning guidance.
56. The AAP was subject to public and statutory consultation at each stage of its preparation, and the responses to consultation were summarised in the AAP Consultation Report dated May 2009. The plan was also subject to an Equalities Impact Assessment and a Sustainability Assessment.
57. Following an Examination in Public, the Inspectors report was published in November 2009. The Inspector concluded that the estate “shows clear signs of stress, and there is evidence that the built fabric would be expensive to retain in the long term and would in any event be unlikely to achieve a satisfactory residential environment.”
58. He required changes to the affordable housing mix in Phases 1 and 4 to provide more affordable housing in the first phase, balanced by a higher proportion of private housing in the last phase. With this proviso, he was satisfied that the tenure mix was the only one that was reasonably practicable. The AAP is in general conformity with the London Plan and consistent with policies in the Core Strategy and the Southwark Plan. The policies in the AAP are key material considerations.
59. The site is located within the:
- Aylesbury Action Area Core
 - Air Quality Management Area;

- Urban Density Zone;
60. The Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of the site varies between 4 and 2 where 1 is the lowest level and 6b the highest.
61. The site is located adjacent to the Liverpool Grove Conservation Area and the following conservation areas: Cobourg Road, Trafalgar Avenue, Glengall Road and Addington Square.
62. There are no Listed Buildings within the site boundary but there are some Listed Buildings on Portland Street and listed structures within Burgess Park which are set out below:
- No. 1-23 Portland Street (Odd) and attached railings (Grade II) also listed as Aycliffe House
 - Alms houses Chumleigh (Grade II) (Burgess Park)
 - Former church of St George (Grade II) (Burgess Park)
 - Lime Kiln (Grade II) (Burgess Park)
 - Piers and railings to Groundwork Trust Offices (Grade II) (Burgess Park)

Aylesbury Area Action Plan 2010

63. BH1 – Number of homes
 BH2 – Density and distribution of homes
 BH3 – Tenure mix
 BH4 – Size of homes
 BH5 – Type of homes
 BH6 – Energy
 PL1 – Street layout
 PL2 – Design principles
 PL3 – Building block types and layout
 PL4 – Building heights
 PL5 – Public open space
 PL6 – Children’s play spaces
 PL7 – Private amenity space
 TP1 – Designing streets
 TP2 – Public transport
 TP3 – Parking standards: Residential
 COM1 – Location of social and community facilities
 COM2 – Opportunities for new business
 COM3 – Health and social care
 COM4 – Education and learning
 COM5 – Community space and arts and culture
 COM6 – Shopping and retail
 D1 – Phasing
 D2 – Infrastructure funding

National Planning Policy Framework

64. Section 1: Building a strong, competitive economy
 Section 2: Ensuring the vitality of town centres
 Section 4: Promoting sustainable development
 Section 5: Supporting high quality communications infrastructure

Section 6: Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes
Section 7: Requiring good design
Section 8: Promoting healthy communities
Section 10: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change
Section 11: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment
Section 12: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

London Plan 2015 Consolidated with Alterations since 2011

65. Policy 1.1 Delivering the strategic vision and objectives for London
Policy 2.5 Sub-regions
Policy 2.9 Inner London
Policy 2.14 Areas for regeneration
Policy 3.1 Ensuring equal life chances for all
Policy 3.2 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 3.7 Large residential developments
Policy 3.8 Housing choice
Policy 3.9 Mixed and balanced communities
Policy 3.10 Definition of affordable housing
Policy 3.11 Affordable housing targets
Policy 3.12 Negotiating affordable housing on individual private residential and mixed use schemes
Policy 3.13 Affordable housing thresholds
Policy 3.14 Existing housing
Policy 3.15 Coordination of housing development and investment
Policy 3.16 Protection and enhancement of social infrastructure
Policy 3.17 Health and social care facilities
Policy 4.1 Developing London's economy
Policy 4.2 Offices
Policy 4.3 Mixed use development and offices
Policy 4.6 Support for enhancement of arts, culture, sport and entertainment provision
Policy 4.7 Retail and town centre development
Policy 4.8 Supporting a successful and diverse retail sector
Policy 4.9 Small shops
Policy 4.10 New and emerging economic sectors
Policy 4.11 Encouraging a connected economy
Policy 4.12 Improving opportunities for all
Policy 5.1 Climate change mitigation
Policy 5.2 Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
Policy 5.3 Sustainable design and construction
Policy 5.4A Electricity and gas supply
Policy 5.5 Decentralised energy networks
Policy 5.6 Decentralised energy in development proposals
Policy 5.7 Renewable energy
Policy 5.8 Innovative energy technologies
Policy 5.9 Overheating and cooling
Policy 5.10 Urban greening
Policy 5.11 Green roofs and development site environs
Policy 5.12 Flood risk management

Policy 5.13 Sustainable drainage
 Policy 5.14 Water quality and waste water infrastructure
 Policy 5.15 Water use and supplies
 Policy 5.16 Waste self-sufficiency
 Policy 6.1 Strategic approach
 Policy 6.3 Assessing effects of development on transport capacity
 Policy 6.4 Enhancing London's transport connectivity
 Policy 6.5 Funding Crossrail and other strategically important transport infrastructure
 Policy 6.7 Better streets and surface transport
 Policy 6.9 Cycling
 Policy 6.10 Walking
 Policy 6.11 Smoothing traffic flow and tackling congestion
 Policy 6.12 Road network capacity
 Policy 6.13 Parking
 Policy 7.1 Building London's neighbourhoods and communities
 Policy 7.2 An inclusive environment
 Policy 7.3 Designing out crime
 Policy 7.4 Local character
 Policy 7.5 Public realm
 Policy 7.6 Architecture
 Policy 7.7 Location and design of tall and large buildings
 Policy 7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology
 Policy 7.9 Heritage-led regeneration
 Policy 7.10 World Heritage Sites
 Policy 7.11 London View Management Framework
 Policy 7.12 Implementing the London View Management Framework
 Policy 7.14 Improving air quality
 Policy 7.15 Reducing noise and enhancing soundscapes
 Policy 7.18 Protecting local open space and addressing local deficiency
 Policy 7.19 Biodiversity and access to nature
 Policy 7.21 Trees and woodlands
 Policy 8.2 Planning obligations
 Policy 8.3 Community Infrastructure Levy

Core Strategy 2011

66. Strategic Policy 1 – Sustainable development
 Strategic Policy 2 – Sustainable transport
 Strategic Policy 3 – Shopping, leisure and entertainment
 Strategic Policy 4 – Places to learn and enjoy
 Strategic Policy 5 – Providing new homes
 Strategic Policy 6 – Homes for people on different incomes
 Strategic Policy 7 – Family homes
 Strategic Policy 10 – Jobs and businesses
 Strategic Policy 11 – Open spaces and wildlife
 Strategic Policy 12 – Design and conservation
 Strategic Policy 13 – High environmental standards
 Strategic Policy 14 – Implementation and delivery

Southwark Plan 2007 (July) - saved policies

67. 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 planning 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.

68. Policy 1.1 Access to employment opportunities
Policy 2.2 Provision of new community facilities
Policy 2.5 Planning obligations
Policy 3.1 Environmental effects
Policy 3.2 Protection of amenity
Policy 3.3 Sustainability assessment
Policy 3.4 Energy efficiency
Policy 3.6 Air quality
Policy 3.7 Waste reduction
Policy 3.9 Water
Policy 3.11 Efficient use of land
Policy 3.12 Quality in design
Policy 3.13 Urban design
Policy 3.14 Designing out crime
Policy 3.18 Setting of listed buildings, conservation areas and world heritage sites
Policy 3.19 Archaeology
Policy 3.20 Tall buildings
Policy 3.21 Strategic views
Policy 3.22 Important local views
Policy 3.28 Biodiversity
Policy 4.1 Density of residential development
Policy 4.2 Quality of residential accommodation
Policy 4.3 Mix of dwellings
Policy 4.5 Wheelchair affordable housing
Policy 4.6 Loss of residential accommodation
Policy 5.1 Locating developments
Policy 5.2 Transport impacts
Policy 5.3 Walking and cycling
Policy 5.4 Public transport improvements
Policy 5.5 Transport Development Areas
Policy 5.6 Car parking
Policy 5.7 Parking standards for disabled and the mobility impaired
Policy 5.8 Other parking
- Regional Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) and guidance
69. Providing for Children and Young People's Play and Informal Recreation (2012)
Sustainable Design and Construction (2006)
The Mayor's Energy Strategy (2010)
The Mayor's Transport Strategy (2010)
The Mayor's Economic Development Strategy (2010)
The Mayor's Housing SPG (2012)
Planning for Equality & Diversity in London (2007)
The Mayor's Climate Change Mitigation and Energy Strategy (2011)
- Southwark Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs)
70. Sustainability Assessment (2009)

Sustainable Design and Construction (2009)
Design and Access Statements (2007)
Section 106 Planning Obligations (2054)
Residential Design Standards (2011)
Affordable Housing (2008)
Draft Affordable Housing (2011)
Sustainable Transport (2008)

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Summary of main issues

71. The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:
- Environmental Impact Assessment
 - Principle of the proposed redevelopment in terms of land use and conformity with planning policies
 - Affordable Housing
 - Dwelling size and mix and density
 - Quality of accommodation
 - Non-residential land uses
 - Urban design, including layout, height and massing and open space
 - Impact on strategic and local views and the setting adjacent listed buildings and conservation areas
 - Transportation & Highways including cycling
 - Impact on trees
 - Impact on the amenities of occupiers of neighbouring properties
 - Energy
 - Flood risk
 - Site contamination
 - Archaeological matters
 - Equalities implications
 - Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

Environmental impact assessment

72. The proposed development falls under Schedule 10b 'urban development projects' of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2011 (the 2011 regulations). Accordingly an environmental statement (ES) was submitted which has assessed the likely effects of the proposed development.
73. Although two planning applications have been submitted (a full application and an outline proposal) a single ES has been compiled which reports the impacts of the following development scenarios:
- The detailed full planning application as a standalone proposal (FDS)
 - The comprehensive development/site wide option (FDS and the outline application combined)
74. An assumption of the environmental assessment is that the detailed application (FDS) would be implemented first, followed by the outline application and not the other way around. The assessment therefore examines the impact of the detailed application as

a standalone proposal together with the effects of the combined applications on the local environment (comprehensive development) in a particular sequence of phases. An amendment to that sequence of phasing was submitted in February 2015 to include plot 9c within Phase 2a rather than Phase 3. The variation was assessed and it was concluded that it did not generate significant environmental effects.

75. The structure of the ES broadly follows the council's formal scoping opinion which identified key areas where there are likely to be significant environmental effects. These are:
- Demolition and construction
 - Climate change
 - Townscape, Visual and Cultural Heritage effects
 - Ecology and Nature Conservation
 - Socio economics
 - Transport
 - Noise and Vibration
 - Air Quality
 - Wind
 - Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing
 - Archaeology
 - Ground conditions, Hydrogeology and Contamination
 - Water Resources, Water Quality, Flood Risk and Drainage
 - Telecommunications
76. As only outline approval is being sought at this stage for a large majority of the AAAP Core, the ES has assessed the impact of a three dimensional envelope within which the development would take place. This envelope establishes the parameters of the proposal for which planning permission is sought. This includes, amongst other things, maximum floor areas for each of the proposed land uses, building heights, minimum areas of publicly open space as well as minimum and maximum residential floorspace.
77. Several letters expressed the concern that ES did not consider alternatives for the outline scheme. The main concern being that refurbishment instead of demolition was considered as an option or the environmental effects of this option.
78. The AAAP establishes the principle of redevelopment including demolition to achieve objectives that would transform the layout of the estate. This approach is supported by the Secretary of State as indicated in the Inspectors Report on the AAAP. Based on this analysis, it is considered that there is no reasonable alternative to demolition and redevelopment if the objectives of the AAAP are to be achieved. For this reason officers accept that it would not be necessary to study alternatives to comprehensive redevelopment and are satisfied that it would not be necessary this is an acceptable approach it is will in accordance with an up to date local plan.
79. Phased redevelopment of the estate with residents in-situ, will have direct, indirect, long term implications for a large number of residents and small local businesses as well as short and medium term effects during the construction of estate. The estate's proximity to Burgess Park and the proposal to provide a network of parks, social infrastructure as well as cycling infrastructure and improved transport links has the potential to provide opportunities for improved leisure facilities, health facilities,

transport access and access to employment opportunities in the north of the borough. Implementation of the AAAP through phased development therefore has the potential to impact on individuals or groups at different parts of the project, the considerations of which have been detailed within the assessment of this report. Based on the ES analysis, in the event of approval, it will be necessary to condition the phasing of development so that it comes forward in accordance with the phases assessed.

80. Where adverse environmental impacts are identified it is not necessarily the case that planning permission should be refused. Consideration must also be given to whether those impacts are capable of being mitigated or reduced to a level whereby the residual impact would not be so significant or adverse. The ES identifies residual effects of the development on the environment which are the likely effects following the implementation of mitigation measures. Mitigation may lessen the severity of an adverse effect which has been identified to the extent that it would not necessarily warrant the refusal of planning permission.
81. Within the context of this report the significance of effects is set out in reference to the overall impact of the outline scheme and the proposed detailed phase (FDS) which is being considered alongside this application. Cumulative effects which take account of the comprehensive development together with committed developments have also been considered. Reference to the masterplan and the wider Aylesbury regeneration programme takes account of the comprehensive development together with site 7 which is undergoing construction and site 1a which has recently been completed.

Principle of development

82. The NPPF sets out the Government's strong commitment to delivering sustainable development. At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development including a focus on driving and supporting sustainable economic development to deliver homes. It promotes housing delivery, seeks to widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities. It encourages the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed and also promotes mixed use developments. The NPPF also states that permission should be granted for proposals unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework as a whole.
83. In 2005 the council made a corporate decision to comprehensively redevelop the Aylesbury Estate rather than begin an extensive refurbishment programme. Key to this decision was the recognition that many of the existing residential buildings within the estate are poor in terms of energy efficiency and becoming increasingly difficult and expensive to maintain. The shortcomings of the fundamental design and block layout create a hostile and illegible street environment which contributes to crime and safety issues. The key objectives of the AAAP are for:
 - A successful neighbourhood incorporating the highest design standards;
 - A good mix of uses and a layout that will meet the needs of current and future generations;
 - High quality social rented and private homes that address a variety of local needs, including those of the elderly and vulnerable;
 - Create an outstanding environment with excellent parks and great streets which are accessible for all;

- Improve quality of schools and community facilities;
- Create a place with a strong sense of community;
- Improve access and transport;
- Create well designed streets, squares and parks;
- Improve social and community facilities;
- Build homes that meet Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4; and
- Implement a Combined Heat and Power scheme for power generation.

84. Objections have been received which oppose the demolition of the estate citing that its refurbishment would generate more benefits and fewer dis-benefits than the demolition and comprehensive redevelopment.

Aylesbury Area Action Plan (AAP)

85. The key objective of the AAP is to create a vibrant new neighbourhood with mixed tenure housing, shops, meeting places, work places, recreation, green space and improved transport connections. The AAP underwent a comprehensive programme of public consultation and was supported by the Aylesbury NDC (now Creation Trust) as well as the majority of estate residents who expressed a view. It was found to be sound by the Inspector and is now a key planning document with significant weight in determining applications within its area.

86. The AAP establishes the principle of comprehensive estate redevelopment involving the demolition of existing buildings, encouraging higher densities and the provision of social, environmental and other infrastructure to create a neighbourhood that improves the standard of housing and meets a housing need. This approach is consistent with London Plan Policy 3.7 (Large Residential Developments) which supports a plan led approach to the redevelopment of large sites. Accordingly the principle of demolition and redevelopment is supported in policy terms subject to adequate housing re-provision, a good standard of housing and social infrastructure provision in accordance with AAP policies and London Plan Policy 3.14 (Existing Housing).

Housing provision

87. The Aylesbury Estate originally contained around 2,758 homes and several buildings have already been demolished to make way for redevelopment in Phases 1A and Site 7. This outline proposal is seeking to demolish 2080 homes accounting for 75% of the original estate. London Plan Policy 3.14 resists the loss of housing, including the affordable housing, without its planned replacement at existing or a higher density. This policy states that at least equivalent replacement floorspace should be provided in housing developments. Guidance within the Mayor's Housing SPG makes clear that the re-provision of housing may be considered in terms of units numbers and/or habitable rooms.

88. A key objective of the AAP (Policy BH1 Number of homes) is to increase the number of homes on the estate and to introduce new private and intermediate homes that will contribute to the creation of a mixed community. A more balanced mix of tenures is a key policy aspiration of London Plan Policy 3.9 (Mixed and balanced communities) particularly where there are concentrations of deprivation. The AAP states an aspiration for approximately 4200 new homes across the footprint of the existing estate. The outline proposal is seeking to provide up to 2745 new dwellings that will contribute towards this total. This figure is based on an illustrative masterplan

submitted with the application. Whilst the illustrative masterplan would not have the status of a 'approved plan' under any planning permission (since it was submitted for illustrative purposes only), it does indicate that the maximum 2,745 homes is not an unreasonable assumption, subject to detailed design and amenity testing. However, in line with the normal provisions of an outline application and Environmental Statement, the application also includes a minimum scenario, which sets out the lowest quantum of development which would be permissible under the outline application. In terms of housing, this is stated to be 1,700 new homes. It is therefore necessary to assess whether this minimum scenario would also deliver the policy requirements in terms of new housing and affordable housing. An indicative dwelling mix and tenure split is set out in the development specification which is summarised in Tables 11 and 12.

Aylesbury Estate – Housing baseline (May 2008).

89. Whilst the estate originally comprised entirely social rented accommodation, over time a number of units have been purchased by tenants through the 'right to buy' scheme. The Mayor of London's Housing SPG clarifies that the 'right to buy' properties should not be included within the affordable housing baseline for the estate. The housing baseline is set out in the table below and is taken from May 2008 before regeneration commenced and dwellings were demolished.

Table 8: Aylesbury Estate housing baseline (May 2008)

Unit type	Social Rent	Leasehold	Totals
Studio	31	7	38
One-bedroom	841	102	943
Two-bedroom	605	141	746
Three-bedroom	541	171	712
Four-bedroom	197	73	270
Five-bedroom	34	15	49
Total Units	2,249	509	2758
Total habitable rooms	6,887	1,773	8,660

Aylesbury Estate – early redevelopment phases

90. Since the 2008 baseline, a number of early phases of the estate redevelopment have taken (or are taking) place – these are known as 'site 1a' and 'site 7' (see planning history). The cumulative housing contribution of these early redevelopments is as set out in the table below:

Table 9: Aylesbury Estate – early redevelopment phases

Unit type	Social Rent	Intermediate	Private market	Totals
One-bedroom	43	18	69	130
Two-bedroom	57	44	107	208
Three-bedroom	19	0	11	30
Four-bedroom	25	0	10	35
Five-bedroom	4	0	1	5
Total Units	148	62	198	408
Total	541	162	198	1,294

habitable rooms				
------------------------	--	--	--	--

91. Table 10 below sets out the housing provision proposed within the detailed planning (full) application that is being considered alongside this proposal.

Table 10:Aylesbury Estate - proposed detailed phase (FDS)

Unit type	Social rent	Affordable rent	Intermediate	Private market	Unit type
One-bedroom	108	27	37	199	371
Two-bedroom	68	0	48	183	299
Three-bedroom	63	0	15	30	108
Four-bedroom	20	0	2	10	32
Five-bedroom	18	0	0	2	20
Total Units	277	27	102	424	830
Total habitable rooms	1014	54	326	1327	2721

92. Table 11 below sets out a schedule of accommodation for the outline proposal, based on the submitted illustrative masterplan. This sets out the tenure split under the maximum scenario (2,745 units).

Table 11:Aylesbury Estate –Outline proposal (maximum/illustrative masterplan)

Unit type	Social rent	Intermediate	Private market	Totals
One-bedroom	264	118	283	665
Two-bedroom	329	175	463	967
Three-bedroom	189	39	310	538
Four-bedroom	160	36	192	388
Five-bedroom	76	10	101	187
Total units	1,018	378	1,349	2,745
Total habitable rooms	3,955	1,292	5,412	10,659

93. Table 12 below sets out a schedule of accommodation for the outline proposal. This sets out the tenure split under the minimum scenario (1,700 units).

Table 12:Aylesbury Estate – proposed outline application (minimum)

Unit type	Social rent	Intermediate	Private market	Totals
One-bedroom	163	73	175	411
Two-bedroom	205	108	287	600

Three-bedroom	117	24	192	333
Four-bedroom	99	22	119	240
Five-bedroom	47	6	63	116
Total units	631	233	836	1,700
Total habitable Rooms	2,448	800	3,350	6,598

Reprovision of housing

94. Table 13 below provides an overview the proposed reprovision of housing across the Aylesbury Estate regeneration programme. It sets out the contribution made by the early phases, the FDS against both the minimum and maximum number of dwellings proposed under this application.

Table 13: Housing reprovision overview against Aylesbury Estate baseline (May 2008) – minimum and maximum scenario

		Minimum scenario	Maximum scenario
Estate baseline	<i>units:</i>	2,758	2,758
	<i>habitable rooms:</i>	8,660	8,660
Early phases	<i>units:</i>	408	408
	<i>habitable rooms:</i>	1,294	1,294
Proposed detailed phase	<i>units:</i>	830	830
	<i>habitable rooms:</i>	2,721	2,721
Proposed outline phase(s)	<i>units:</i>	1,700	2,745
	<i>habitable rooms:</i>	6,598	10,659
Regeneration programme total	<i>units:</i>	2,938	3,983
	<i>habitable rooms:</i>	10,613	14,674
Net change against baseline	<i>units:</i>	+180	+1,225
	<i>habitable rooms:</i>	+1,953	+6,014

95. Across all phases of the regeneration programme the cumulative impact is a net gain of 180 dwellings (+1,953 habitable rooms) under the minimum scenario or a net increase of up to 1,225 dwellings (+6,014 habitable rooms) under the maximum scenario. Increasing the housing supply in Southwark and London is a key driver of the AAP and London Plan policy and in this respect the outline proposal will contribute to these aims even under the minimum scenario by increasing the net number of dwellings across the estate.
96. AAP Policy BH1 (Number of homes) assumed around 4,200 new dwellings would be reprovided across the estate. However, fewer dwellings have come forward at the detailed design stage for Site 7 (147 rather than 165) and the FDS (830 rather than 880). The maximum number of dwellings proposed under the outline proposal is 1.5% fewer than envisaged under the AAP (2,745 rather than 2,786) (AAP Policy MP2 –

Proposal sites). It is noted that the shortfall on earlier phases was 11% for site 7 and 6% for the FDS. The applicant has demonstrated that delivering a greater number of dwellings will be difficult to achieve whilst also securing high quality design and good standards of amenity for new and existing surrounding residents as well as ensuring sufficient open space. Based on this analysis it is considered that the maximum number of dwellings proposed (3,983) may be the most that the outline scheme could realistically provide taking the need to balance the new for new housing stock as well as ensuring good standards of design. However, a key consideration is the re-provision of affordable housing.

Reprovision of affordable housing

97. A significant number of objections expressed the concern that the outline proposal would result in less affordable housing and a net loss of social rented units on the estate. Table 14 below provides an overview of the re-provision of affordable housing across the Aylesbury Estate taking account of the contribution made by the early phases and proposed detailed application against the minimum and maximum number of dwellings that could be delivered under this proposal.

Table 14: Affordable Housing re-provision overview against Aylesbury Estate baseline (May 2008) – minimum and maximum scenario

		Minimum scenario		Maximum scenario	
		Social rent	All affordable	Social rent	All affordable
Estate baseline	<i>units:</i>	2,249	2,249	2,249	2,249
	<i>habitable rooms:</i>	6,887	6,887	6,887	6,887
Early phases	<i>units:</i>	148	210	148	210
	<i>habitable rooms:</i>	541	703	541	703
Proposed detailed phase	<i>units:</i>	304*	406	304*	406
	<i>habitable rooms:</i>	1,068*	1,394	1,068*	1,394
Proposed outline phase(s)	<i>units:</i>	631	864	1,019	1,396
	<i>habitable rooms:</i>	2,448	3,248	3,955	5,247
Regeneration programme total	<i>units:</i>	1,083	1,690	1,471	2,012
	<i>habitable rooms:</i>	4,057	5,345	5,564	7,344
Net change against baseline	<i>units:</i>	-1,166	-559	-778	-237
	<i>habitable rooms:</i>	-2,830	-1,542	-1,323	+457

*Includes 27 units (54 habitable rooms) at affordable rent

98. When combined with all phases of the regeneration programme the outline minimum scenario would result in a net loss of -559 affordable dwellings or -1,542 affordable habitable rooms. Under the maximum scenario there would be a net loss of -237 affordable units but an increase of +457 affordable habitable rooms. The net increase arises because of the replacement of existing smaller dwellings by new larger affordable family sized homes in accordance with the AAAP (Policy BH4 Size of homes). Studios and one bedroom flats currently account for over 35% of the existing

housing stock on the estate which is proportionally higher than what would be policy compliant (30% maximum) under the AAAP. A mix of tenures on the redeveloped estate is a key objective of the AAAP and in accordance with policy intermediate tenures have been taken into account when calculating affordable housing provision.

99. The AAAP anticipated a loss of affordable units but expected that loss to be much less significant in terms of affordable habitable rooms. This proposal demonstrates that no net loss of affordable housing in terms of habitable rooms could be achieved across the estate if the outline proposal was delivered at or close to the maximum scenario. The minimum number of habitable rooms needed to be delivered through the outline scheme to ensure there is no net loss of affordable housing overall is 4,790. Based on the maximum number of 2745 units, the illustrative masterplan would deliver a growth of 457 habitable rooms of affordable housing.
100. The delivery of a quantum of new housing close to the stated maximum of 2,745 is not an unreasonable assumption given that the estate would remain at a density that is well within the range expected for this area (200-700hr/ha). An average site wide density of 381 habitable rooms per hectare is achieved under the minimum scenario and 531 habitable rooms per hectare under the maximum scenario which is well below the 700 hr/ha set out in the AAAP. These densities are gross and take account of roads within the red line boundary.
101. However, the applicant has acknowledged the importance of fully replacing affordable housing as part of its Aylesbury estate redevelopment. With Phase 1A and Site 7 in place, and assuming that the FDS scheme is delivered in line with the current application, then an additional 4790 habitable rooms of affordable housing in phases 2, 3 and 4 would be required to deliver full replacement of the baseline.
102. The applicant has therefore confirmed that they will commit to provide 50% of all habitable rooms as affordable housing, in line with AAAP policy BH3, or a minimum of 4790 habitable rooms of affordable housing under the outline application, whichever is the greater. This would ensure future phases will secure full replacement affordable housing, when measured by habitable rooms.
103. This will be secured by a legal agreement along with a site wide affordable housing delivery strategy that will set milestones for the required number of affordable habitable rooms on a phase by phase basis. This is a key consideration. For this reason the scheme should be strongly supported in accordance with AAAP Policy BH1 (Number of homes) Policy BH2 (Density and Distribution of homes) and London Plan Policy 3.14 (Existing Housing).
104. London Plan Policy 3.12 seeks the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing on residential schemes and the need to promote mixed and balanced communities. The policy recognises that councils may set local affordable housing targets, taking into account local considerations including the existing housing mix in an area. In the case of the AAAP, there is a target of 50% affordable housing and split of social housing rented and intermediate homes that was agreed by the Mayor and the Inspector to be in conformity with the London Plan. However following a request from the GLA, the applicant submitted a viability statement and the GLA have indicated that they accept the proposed level of affordable housing is the maximum reasonable amount in accordance with London Plan Policy 3.12.

105. A key objective of the AAAP is to broaden the tenure mix of the estate, whilst providing new and improved affordable housing. Officers are satisfied that subject to a legal agreement the regeneration of the Aylesbury Estate can be delivered with no net loss of affordable housing whilst providing a mix of tenures. This is welcome and would represent a substantial planning benefit that is key consideration. The proposal will provide 50% affordable housing in line with AAAP policy BH3 (Tenure mix) and the legal agreement will ensure that there is no net loss of affordable housing when measured in terms of habitable rooms. For this reason, officers are satisfied that there are no overriding planning reasons that would require an affordable housing review of future detailed phases since the scheme is compliant with AAAP policy BH3.

Residential tenures

106. A significant number of objections expressed the concern that the majority of the replacement affordable units will not be social rent but affordable rent dwellings where up to 80% of market rents can be charged.

107. The AAAP requires 50% of new homes to be affordable and 50% to be private ownership. Of the affordable homes, 75% are required to have a social rent tenure and 25% are required to be intermediate.

108. Social rented accommodation is a tenure of affordable housing where rents are determined through the national rent regime. The method for calculating the level of rent for this tenure is based on a pre-set formula and does not include service charges.

109. The applicant has explained that the majority of affordable dwellings (75%) will be social rented. In a letter submitted to the council they have clarified that in all cases references to ‘target rent’ are referring to the social rent tenure. This is consistent with policy and will be secured by legal agreement. On this basis officers are satisfied that target rent are referred to in the planning documentation are, in planning terms, not distinguishable from the social rented tenure. For this reason the term ‘social rent’ is referred to in this planning report.

110. Table 15 below provides an overview of the proposed residential tenures across the Aylesbury Estate. It sets out the contribution made by the early phases and proposed detailed application against an illustrative mix that could be delivered under the outline proposal.

Table 15: Residential tenures overview against AAAP Policy BH3 (Tenure mix)

		Social rent	Intermediate	Private	Total
	AAAP Tenure Target (%)	37.5	12.5	50	100
Early phases	<i>habitable rooms:</i>	541	162	591	1294
	<i>%:</i>	41.8%	12.5%	45.7%	100%
Proposed detailed phase	<i>habitable rooms</i>	1,070	326	1,327	2,723

	%:	39.3%	12%	48.7%	100%
Proposed outline phase(s):	<i>habitable rooms:</i>	3,955	1,292	5,412	10,659
	%:	37.1%	12.1%	50.8%	100%
Regeneration programme total	<i>habitable rooms:</i>	5,566	1,780	7,330	14,676
	%:	37.9%	12.1%	50%	100%
Net change against AAAP tenure target	%:	+0.4%	-0.4%	0	-

111. Taking account of the contribution of early and proposed detailed phases the proposal will deliver 50% affordable habitable of which around 75% would be at social rent and 25% intermediate. The remaining habitable rooms (50%) would be private in accordance with AAAP policy BH3 (Tenure mix). The tenure split is detailed in the development specification and will be delivered even if the total number of units or habitable rooms changes as a result of detailed design, subject to achieving the 4,790 habitable rooms within the outline to secure full replacement of affordable housing.
112. The introduction of intermediate tenures will provide a wider range of affordable tenures which is in keeping with the aspirations of the action area. The introduction of intermediate housing will include shared ownership and shared equity products as well as intermediate housing products designed specifically for the needs of Aylesbury leaseholders who wish to remain in the area. Affordable housing re-provision in this way is in accordance with the intention of London Plan Policy 3.14 and AAAP Policy D1 (Phasing).

Dwelling sizes

113. The AAAP requires a mix of housing sizes to be provided on the redeveloped estate to help meet the re-housing needs of existing Aylesbury residents and to provide a mix that will meet the wider needs of residents in the borough (Policy BH4 Size of homes). A maximum of proportion of studios is set out (3%) as there is no identified need for studio units in the affordable sector, in addition to a minimum proportion of homes with two or more beds (70%), three bedrooms (20%), four bedrooms (7%) and five or more bedrooms (3%). Together with the detailed application and early phases of the regeneration programme the proposed size of homes across the estate is set out in Table 16 below.
114. **Table 16:** Dwelling sizes overview against AAAP Policy BH4 (Size of homes) – Maximum scenario/Illustrative masterplan

		Two or more bedrooms	Three bedrooms	Four bedrooms	Five or more bedrooms	
	Size target (%)	70% (minimum)	20% (minimum)	7% (minimum)	3% (minimum)	Total
Early Phases	<i>units</i>	278	30	35	5	408
	%	68.1%	7 %	8.5%	1.2%	-

Proposed detailed phase	<i>units</i>	459	108	32	20	830
	%	55.3%	13%	3.8%	2.4%	-
Proposed outline phase(s)	<i>units</i>	2080	538	388	187	2745
	%	75.8%	20%	14%	6.8%	-
Regeneration programme total	<i>units</i>	2,817	676	455	212	3,983
	%	70.7%	17%	11.4 %	5.3%	-
net change against AAAP size of home target		+0.7%	+13.7%	+4.4%	+2.3%	

115. Based on the illustrative masterplan, the scheme would deliver over and above the minimum dwelling size mix requirements set out in the AAAP which is welcome. A large proportion of dwellings would have three or four bedrooms reflecting the needs of existing tenants on the Aylesbury Estate and the borough wide need for more family housing. The development specification guarantees policy compliant levels in terms of dwelling mix but early design work on the illustrative masterplan shows that the ambition is to create a higher proportion of larger homes.
116. Whilst the overall proportions of each dwelling size will differ across the phases of the outline scheme officers are satisfied that in totality, the scheme will contribute to a policy compliant mix of dwellings across the redeveloped estate. Where two bedroom dwellings are proposed it is recommended that at least half should be designed to accommodate four people, rather than three person two bedroom homes, in accordance with policy BH4. As such homes will be more flexible in accommodating the changing needs of the population and their living arrangements over time. This will be secured in the legal agreement as part of the housing delivery strategy.

Residential mix

117. The AAAP requires a range of dwelling types to be provided across the redeveloped estate. Policy BH5 (Type of homes) specifies that there should be a proportion of houses (23%), maisonettes (17%) and flats (60%) to meet the needs of the existing and future population. At this outline stage, the applicant has provided an illustrative accommodation schedule based on the illustrative masterplan which shows the proportions of different types of home that could be delivered across the site. Table 17 below sets out the proposed mix of dwellings types taking account of the early phases and the detailed application under consideration.

Table 17: Proposed type of home

		Flats	Maisonettes	Houses	Total
	Dwelling Target (%)	60%	17%	23%	-
Early phases	<i>units</i>	333	53	22	408
	%	81.6%	13%	5.4%	100%
Proposed detailed phase	<i>units</i>	683	100	47	830
	%	82.3%	12%	5.7%	100%

Proposed outline phase	<i>units</i>	1,710	498	537	2,745
	<i>%</i>	62.2%	18.1%	19.7%	100%
Regeneration total	<i>units</i>	2,726	651	606	3983
	<i>%</i>	68.4%	16.4%	15.2%	100%
<i>net difference against AAAP Target</i>		+8.4%	-0.6%	-7.8%	-

118. The proposed dwelling mix would broadly reflect the aspirations set out in policy BH5 (Type of homes) although somewhat fewer houses would be delivered compared with what was envisaged under the AAAP. The illustrative masterplan demonstrates that even at densities below AAAP expectations that it is difficult to provide more houses due to the amount of land needed compared to other dwelling types. A higher proportion of larger homes, including three bed, four bed and five bed or more properties, is a key driver of policy BH5 and so in this respect the potential contribution of the outline scheme is significant. The proposed weighting towards the delivery of large family homes is a key material consideration and so, on balance, the outline scheme can be supported.
119. To secure the delivery of a genuine mix of dwelling types it is recommended that delivery mile stones are set for the different types of homes across the remaining phases. The mix will be secured as part of a site wide housing strategy that will set out how a range of dwellings types will be provided to meet general needs accommodation as well as the needs of wheelchair users and people with other disabilities. The strategy will be secured by a legal agreement.
120. Based on this analysis, officers are satisfied that despite the shortfall in houses, the scheme will provide a genuine choice of homes of different typologies and sizes that is capable of meeting the needs of existing Aylesbury residents as well as other housing needs within the borough. This will broadly be in compliance with AAAP Policy BH5 (Type of homes) and BH4 (Size of homes).

Density

121. AAAP Policy BH2: Density and distribution of homes specifies the density ranges for development blocks
122. Based on the illustrative masterplan the outline proposal would have a density of 502 habitable rooms per hectare if the maximum number of dwellings are built. Under the minimum scenario the density would be 307 habitable rooms per hectare. These densities are based on gross figures and take account of the all the land and roads within the estate. The actual density each proposal would be higher if surrounding roads were not taken into account. These densities fall within an acceptable range in accordance with policy BH2 (Density and distribution of homes)

Quality of accommodation

123. Policy BH7 (Sustainable Design and construction) requires all homes in the action area core to achieve at least a Code for Sustainable Homes rating of 4 (or equivalent in any successor rating system). New dwellings are required to be well designed, provide good quality living conditions (saved policy 4.2; AAAP appendix 6) and 10% are required to be suitable for wheelchair users in accordance with saved policy 4.3 of the Southwark Plan (Mix of dwellings), Residential Design Guidance (2011) and

London plan policy 3.8. (Housing choice).

124. The existing estate has generous sized flats and similar large dimensions are required for new dwellings. The AAAP states an aspiration for floor areas equivalent to Parker Morris plus 10% for social rented tenure, Parker Morris plus 5% for intermediate tenure and the basic Parker Morris Standard for private housing. Since the AAAP was adopted, space standards have increased with the introduction of minimum dwellings sizes in the London Plan (2011) and the adoption of the Southwark Plan Residential Design SPD (2011). The result is that the minimum space standards in the AAAP have been superseded by larger space standards in these more recent documents. Where larger dwelling sizes apply, more weight will be placed on the attainment of these more recently adopted space standards.
125. The internal design and layout of new dwellings is not known at the outline stage but the design code and development specification state the commitment for all new dwellings to meet minimum space standards in the AAAP. Where relevant minimum London floorspace requirements will apply where they are larger than the AAAP minimum. Ten percent (10%) of all dwellings will be designed to meet the needs of wheelchair users in accordance with the South East London Wheelchair Housing Design Guidance which, when considering the overall mix, would meet a local need and represent a genuine step change in housing quality over the existing situation.
126. At least 75% of all new apartments will have dual aspect ensuring cross ventilation and a choice of views. Private and communal amenity space will be provided in accordance with AAAP standards as well as play space within residential courtyards. A minimum Code for Sustainable Home rating of 4 is proposed for new dwellings resulting in much higher environmental performance standards when compared to the existing estate. There is a reasonable expectation that good standards of internal noise can also be achieved for new dwellings subject to conditions and where appropriate noise tests to be undertaken prior to occupation. Based on this assessment a high standard of accommodation will be provided in accordance with BH7 (Sustainable design and construction) and design guidance in Appendix 5 of the AAAP.

Housing summary

127. Based on the analysis above, officers are satisfied that the scheme has the potential to provide high quality homes across all tenures providing a range of dwelling sizes and dwelling typologies that will make the new neighbourhood attractive for a wide audience. The layout and detailed design of dwellings will be dealt with at the detailed design stage with care taken to ensure adequate light and privacy will be provided for new dwellings. There are sufficient controls within the design code, development specification and the AAAP to ensure that at reserved matters submission the council can ensure that a high standard of homes is secured.

Non-residential Land use Commitments

128. The AAAP states an aspiration for the redeveloped Estate to have new shops, work opportunities, schools and learning places, health facilities and places for the community to meet and use. It advocates the clustering of facilities together in five main locations which are identified as the Amersham Site, Thurlow Street, East Street, Westmoreland Road and Michael Faraday School. Table 18 below sets out the area-based land commitments proposed under this proposal.

Table 18: Proposed retail, business, health and community facilities (Outline application)

	Amersham Site (Plot 18)	Thurlow Street	East Street	Westmoreland Road	Michael Faraday School
Proposed Outline (Phase 2)*	Medical/ Community / Early years facilities (up to 4,100sq.m) Retail (A1, A3, A4) (up to 3000 sq.m) Workspace (Class B1) (up to 3000 sq.m)			N/A	N/A
Proposed Outline (Phase 3)*		Retail (A1, A3, A4) (up to 500 sq.m) Workspace (Class B1) (up to 3,300 sq.m)		N/A	N/A
Proposed Outline (Phase 4)*		Retail (A1, A3, A4) (up to 1,000 sq.m) Workspace (Class B1) (up to 1,200 sq.m)		N/A	Medical/ Community / Early years facilities (up to 750sq.m)
*Note the provision of non-residential use in each phase is subject to site wide maximum targets as set out in development specification.					

129. Land use commitments are set out in the development specification and on the ground floor uses parameter plan. The proposed distribution of land uses is broadly in accordance with the AAAP (COM2 Opportunities for new business; COM3 Health and social care; COM4 Education and learning; COM5 Community space and arts and culture; COM6 Shopping/Retail). Health and community uses will be clustered on and around the Amersham Site, with office and retail uses spread across key nodes on Thurlow Street and the community spine.
130. Minimum and maximum floorspace for retail, health, community and employment uses are proposed at this outline stage as the applicant is seeking flexibility to respond to the needs of the local population over the lifetime of regeneration programme. Flexible floorspace is also proposed in addition to the minimum committed floorspace which is capable of being used for either retail uses (Class A1/A3/A4) or workspace (Class B1).
131. Site wide AAAP commitments for retail, employment and community infrastructure include:
- Retail 1750sq.m (A Class Uses)
 - Health, social care and flexible community facilities (Class D1) (4500sq.m)
 - Pre-school facilities 1150sq.m (Class D1)
 - Employment floor space 2500sq.m (Class B1)

- An energy centre

132. Table 19 sets out the maximum amount of floorspace that will be delivered by the outline application alongside what is committed through the FDS and earlier phases.

Table 19: Overview of proposed retail, business, health and community facilities - Maximum scenario

	Retail uses (A1-A5) (sq.m)	Offices and employment use (Class B1) (sq.m)	Health, social care, community and pre-school facilities (Class D1) (sq.m)
AAAP Floorspace Target	1,750	2,500	5,650
Early phases baseline	404sqm	0	1800
Proposed detailed phase	0	0	263
Proposed Outline phase	2,500	4,900	4750
Regeneration Programme total	2,904	4,900	6,813
net change against maximum	+1,154	+2,400	+1,163

133. The table below sets out the minimum amount of floorspace that will be delivered by the outline application alongside what is committed through the FDS and earlier phases.

Table 20: Overview of proposed retail, business, health and community facilities - Minimum scenario

	Retail uses (A1-A5) (sq.m)	Offices and employment use (Class B1) (sq.m)	Health, social care, community and pre-school facilities (Class D1) (sq.m)
AAAP Floorspace Target	1,750	2,500	5,650
Early phases baseline	404sqm	0	1800
Proposed detailed phase	0	0	263

Proposed Outline phase(s)	800	600	3,100
Regeneration Programme total	1,204	600	5,163
<i>net change against minimum</i>	-546	-1,900	-487

134. The proposal is capable of exceeding the expectations of the AAAP if more than the minimum amount is delivered (taking account of flexible floorspace). However it is also capable of falling short of the AAAP expectations if only the minimum is delivered across the outline scheme. Proportionally, the most significant shortfall would arise for the proposed amount of business space and retail floorspace.

Minimum scenario

135. The ES estimates the minimum scenario would result in a net loss of jobs based on the known employment levels within the site in the absence of mitigation. The significance of the effect assessed to be direct, long term, permanent moderate negative effect in terms of socio-economic impacts suggesting a level of intervention will be required if the scheme is to deliver the expectations of the AAAP.

136. Mitigation, such as steps to accommodate existing employers within the final development is estimated to reduce these effects to a level that would not be noticeable. Notwithstanding this, officers have been in discussions with the applicant regarding measures that could be put in place to ensure the scheme has positive effects on the economy of the redeveloped estate and the wider area.

Business space

137. The AAAP (COM2: Opportunities for new business) has an aspiration to provide 2,500 square metres of employment floor space that will be flexible to meet the needs of small to medium sized businesses. The majority of this floor space will be delivered in Phase 3 which is not anticipated to commence until 2021 with a view to completion in 2027. Taking this into account the precise configuration of employment floorspace (i.e. size of unit) and target market is not yet established at this outline stage. It is however noted that the applicant has stated a commitment to meet the aspirations of the AAAP both in the interim and in the long term.

138. The commitments include a minimum of 21 unemployed Borough residents into sustainable employment per year for at least six months at an average of 41 people per year. The applicant will appointment a Training and Employment Adviser who will provide training and support to facilitate access to construction jobs during the development phase of the development. The advisor will work closely with the applicant and support apprentices and trainees to gain sustained employment. This includes an average of 18 per people per year completing apprenticeships or equivalent traineeships at National Vocational Qualification (NVQ) Level 2, Advanced Apprenticeships (NVQ Level 3 or 4) and the opportunity to enrol on Foundation Degree Programme. The opportunities on offer will span other fields including social care, housing management, human resources and grounds maintenance. Pre- and post employment training will be offered (at an average of 25 people per year) as well

as financial support for Borough residents to attain jobs at up to 100 Borough residents per year.

139. In consultation with the council, the applicant is seeking to identify a partner organisation to support SME's and improve their capacity and competitiveness to win business with main contractors on the supply chain for the development. The commitment will be secured by legal agreement ensuring the promotion of a range of contracts with SME companies and organisations based in the Borough to mitigate short to medium term impacts.
140. Notwithstanding this, delivery of 600 sqm of employment floorspace would be less than expected than under AAAP, although officers accept that demand for employment space in this location may change over time. Since the adoption of the AAAP the Old Kent Road has become an Opportunity area that will provide employment space and opportunities. The proximity of Aylesbury to Old Kent Road as well as Elephant and Castle is likely to affect market conditions and the demand and supply for employment space targeted at SME's.
141. Over the medium to long term officers recommend that a strategy be secured that requires consultation with local SME's to inform how employment and retail space will be designed and targeted to meet the needs of local businesses. It will need to take account of the council's Economic Well-being Strategy which promotes good quality, flexible, managed and affordable business space for start-ups and businesses as well as business growth opportunities brought by regeneration. The strategy will include interim uses, such as workspace that will help generate the conditions for the area to support new employment uses over the longer term as development parcels come forward in phases.
142. The strategy would be submitted at the reserved matters stage for Phase 3 which is not anticipated to commence for another 6 years. It will report on the level of fit-out of proposed commercial units, the demand for the type of premises proposed and what consideration has been given to workspace models such as co-working space, incubators and accelerators, which can support growth in new and micro businesses. It will provide information on the proposed commercial rents for spaces, service/additional charges and flexibility of floorspace as well as details on the length and terms of leases including break clauses and notice periods to enable a full and proper assessment of opportunities being provided for local business and organisations over the course of the regeneration programme.
143. In the event that less than a policy compliant amount of floorspace is provided for small businesses and social enterprises mitigation would be required by way of a contribution of up to £3.73 million that would go towards the provision of better quality, more flexible space for business start ups, social enterprises, workspace and employment support along East Street and in close proximity, for example, on Walworth Road and Old Kent Road.
144. These strategies in conjunction with the proposed targets set for training and employment over the lifetime of the scheme are considered to be robust and will ensure employment opportunities are available in the short, medium and long term. Officers consider that these measures would provide adequate mitigation against the minimum scenario and sufficient control to ensure the regeneration delivers floorspace that responds to local needs and has positive economic effects on local employment.

Retail floorspace

145. The AAAP estimates that there is a need for about 850 sq.m of convenience retail. This is less than the 1,750sq.m cited in policy (COM6 Shopping/Retail) which makes extra allowance(900sq.m) for the wider catchment of East Street and Westmoreland Road where it was considered that there was potential for a small number of cafes and restaurants. Officers note however that retail provision within the Aylesbury area will experience increasing pressure from Elephant and Castle following its redevelopment and that whilst the increase in population will lead to a larger potential expenditure pool, the minimum provision proposed (800sq.m) is within an acceptable range of projections envisaged for the new population. Flexible floorspace is proposed across the outline application to meet the convenience needs of the new neighbourhood. The approach taken allows a range of convenience needs to be met (Class A1/A3/A4) at number of locations consistent with the AAAP. The precise details of floorspace will typically be specified at the reserved matters stage which officers consider is reasonable given the timescales for delivery. The scheme has sufficient scope to achieve the AAAP's aim and exceed minimum expectations.

Community space

146. Comments were received that provision should be made for faith groups within the application.
147. A significant level of D class floor space is proposed that could include a range of D class uses such as gym facilities, a library or faith/community related buildings. There is an express commitment in the development specification to provide a medical health centre, community uses and early years provision. It is also noted that applicant is seeking to provide community space within the FDS that would be provided at a peppercorn rent. Notwithstanding this, delivery of 3,100 community space under the minimum scenario would result in less than the AAAP expectations in terms of community space taking account of development committed and proposed under the detailed application.
148. In the event less than a policy compliant amount of floorspace is provided for community use, mitigation would be required by way of a contribution that would go towards the provision or improvement of community space to support the needs of the population. A community use strategy will be secured that details how the D class space might be managed and made available to the local community, including details on how it will be made accessible and affordable for future users.

Maximum scenario

149. Under the maximum scenario the scheme has been assessed to result in direct, long term, permanent moderate positive effects at the borough level. Increased levels of local spending are expected as a result of the new residential population which is projected to be around £27.3 million. The effect will be noticeable in Southwark and neighbouring areas and will have wider moderate positive impacts. These effects would have positive impacts in terms of the capacity of health facilities and in meeting local housing needs. New facilities will be designed to be accessible to meet the needs of those with mobility and wheelchair issues under both scenarios which will be an improvement upon the existing situation.

Summary

150. Taking account of committed uses and flexible space and the maximum scenario, the

scheme is capable of delivering new shops, business space and community facilities including a new health centre and early years facilities. Subject to retail and employment strategies being secured as part of a legal agreement officers are satisfied that under the minimum scenario there are safeguards in place and mitigation that enable the scheme to accommodate the needs of the emerging neighbourhood taking account of the likely changes nearby in Elephant Castle and Old Kent Road. The proposal is considered to comply with the AAAP policies regarding community, health and commercial uses whilst allowing the flexibility to reflect the changes and emerging requirements over the Aylesbury Regeneration programme.

Urban Design

151. The Aylesbury AAAP includes a masterplan which establishes guiding principles for the whole Estate. It broadly promotes a conventional street grid; strong north/south links between Burgess Park and the hinterland to the north; and improved east/ west connections across the estate. Furthermore, the masterplan advocates a reconfiguration of amenity areas within the estate, seeking to draw green space northwards from Burgess Park, and to promote a clear differentiation between public and private amenity spaces. The key aspiration is to create a high quality neighbourhood that is much more successfully integrated with its surroundings than the existing estate.

Layout

152. The proposal draws on the Aylesbury AAAP principles of a simple street layout and block pattern, but has refined the grid from the AAAP masterplan. The AAAP sets out the provision of public open spaces in the form of three 'green fingers' which incorporate a range of places for relaxing, children's play spaces, cycling and walking routes (AAAP Policies MP1 – The masterplan; and PL1 – Street Layout). The green fingers would provide the main areas of public open space within the core of the action area. The north/south alignment of green fingers reflects an aspiration to extend the green area of Burgess Park into the new development. However, a detailed review of the somewhat diagrammatic green fingers in the AAAP concluded that they were too rigid in form and lacked the potential for character and variety. Following detailed design development it was considered that they did not present spaces that would be successfully used by local residents.
153. The green fingers approach has been reinterpreted under the outline proposal to better stitch into the street network whilst still retaining the aspiration for high quality spaces that link with the rest of the AAAP area and Burgess Park. A series of different sized and landscaped public open spaces are positioned across the development, primarily along the key North/ south routes providing a loose chain of green spaces that will give character at local level.

Open space and trees

154. The network of public open spaces ranges in size from a large civic square to small intimate pocket parks. The design and location of spaces has been led by an approach which seeks to retain existing quality trees and locating open spaces on strategic routes and connections through the development and is intended to enhance the experience of movement through the new neighbourhood.
155. Officers carried out walks around the estate with the applicant to establish the main visual contributions derived from trees. These were considered to be along the

existing streets in particular Thurlow Street and Albany Road. A key driver of the layout has therefore been to maintain and incorporate existing tree lined streets, groups of trees which provide value and individual trees that have good form, character and a reasonable life expectancy. This is demonstrated by the shape of development parcels which may otherwise appear irregular. Development parcels 15 and 12 (phase 4) are examples of where the form of a plot narrows where it might otherwise be wider to take account of existing mature trees.

Table 21: Comparison of green fingers and open space network with the outline application

	AAAP Green fingers	Outline Proposed open space network
Open space typology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • King William IV green finger (0.24ha) • Chumleigh green finger (0.72ha) • Bagshot green finger (0.36ha) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Civic Open space (0.28ha) • Parks (1.41ha) • Street gardens and community gardens (0.8)
Total (ha)	1.32	2.49
Net difference (ha)	N/A	+1.17

156. The proposed layout will provide a network of open space of around 2.5 hectares. This would represent close to double what was anticipated within the proposed green fingers set out in the AAAP and does not take account of the publicly accessible space provided as part of the FDS (0.39ha). Table 22 below sets out the amount of public open space proposed across the Aylesbury Estate.

Table 22: Public open space provision

	Public accessible open space (Ha)
Existing Housing Green Space baseline	4.8
Early phases	0.12ha
Proposed detailed phase	0.39ha
Proposed Outline phase	2.49ha
Regeneration Programme total	3
net change against AAAP	-1.8ha

157. Whilst it is acknowledged that there will be a reduction in the overall amount of amenity space compared to the existing estate, the AAAP assumed there would be an increase in density and that new spaces would be designed to maximise attractiveness and usability.
158. The key aspiration of policy PL5 (Public open space) is for it to be of a high quality and accessible for users. Officers are satisfied that the clearer distinction between public and private realm proposed will result in a clear sense of ownership for private amenity (ensuring that they are valued and well-used by residents) and public spaces better used and linked with pedestrian and cycling routes through the estate. The outline proposal will focus public activity on streets and public spaces which will ensure these areas are perceived as welcoming and safe in accordance with AAAP Policy PL1 (Street layout). This is commended and will provide a significant asset for future generations that will include soft landscaping and community gardens.
159. The landscaping strategy sets out a clear vision for high quality open spaces and details include the creation of formal and informal spaces, seating, outdoor gyms and bespoke street furniture as well as the introduction of sustainable urban drainage elements. Overshadowing analysis has shown that Gaitskell Park, Thurlow Park and Aylesbury Square will experience excellent sunlight all year round exceeding minimum guidance. These areas have been assessed as they are the largest public spaces being provided within the development. Based on this analysis, the approach to urban design is considered to be successful and will create high quality public spaces that can accommodate a wide range of uses all year round.

Child playspace

160. A key driver of AAAP policy PL6 (Children’s play space) is for there to be a big improvement in the quality of playspace available to residents. Currently, there is a lack of local play provision especially for younger children within the existing estate and barriers to play include poor quality design and maintenance of play areas, lack of natural surveillance and fear of crime. This scheme is seeking to provide a range of local playable space for young children with high quality play space within private communal courtyards.
161. The Mayor’s SPG ‘Providing for Children and Young People’s Play and Informal Recreation (2008) recommends a standard of 10sqm per child, regardless of age. Based on GLA toolkit the outline scheme would generate a child yield of 2,185 – which equates to around 21,850 sq.m of play space (around 2.2ha).Details of how playspace could be delivered is set out in the supporting landscape strategy. A mix of formal play equipment and natural play elements within residential courtyards as well as provision for doorstep and neighbourhood play areas across the network of local parks. Table 23 below gives an overview of the amount of playspace that will be provided under the illustrative masterplan.

Table 23: Overview of child play provision based on the illustrative masterplan

	Under 5	5-11	12+	Total
Playspace requirement	7,610	8,190	6,040	21,840

Total Area of Play Proposed	7,600	7,500	5,200	20,300
Net difference +/- (sq.m)	-10	-690	-840	-1,540

162. Provision for all age ranges is proposed but it is estimated that there will be a shortfall of around 1540 sq.m which officers note relates mainly to provision made for older children (rather than those under 5 years).
163. Concern that the scheme would not provide adequate play provision for young people (12+) was a comment received during the application and expressed as an objection.
164. The provision of formal sports facilities and active play in Burgess Park is a great asset. Consideration has been given to the opportunities that Burgess Park and other local spaces may offer in terms of play for older children, taking account of the potential for more intense use of this space and other local spaces. The council has recently consulted on further improvements to Burgess Park, including options for additional play and sports facilities. Given its proximity, it is reasonable to expect teenagers from Aylesbury to take advantage of these facilities rather than assuming full provision within the estate boundary. If the shortfall does arise once detailed design is complete the development will make a financial contribution in accordance with the adopted SPD. Officers are also satisfied that it would be appropriate for there to be a mechanism that will help maintain and enhance facilities that will be used by the new population. This will be secured by a legal agreement and contribute towards playable space and sport facilities for older children within Burgess Park, Surrey Square and Faraday Gardens.

Estate management

165. Management of the public realm has been raised as an issue by objectors, the concern being that open space would be private and not publicly accessible. The applicant has confirmed that they will be open to the public as stated on the parameter plans and that they are not intending to restrict access. However, there are on-going discussions regarding whether some or all of the open spaces will be managed by the council or the applicant.
166. At this outline stage the proposal is to secure an option for the council to adopt public open spaces with the legal agreement. This will be assessed on a phase by phase basis for development parcels that deliver public parks and open spaces.
167. It is recommended that an Estate Management Strategy is submitted for each phase at reserved matters stage setting out the maintenance and management arrangements for all non-adopted spaces and infrastructure that will be delivered as part of this development. The strategy will also set out the details of maintenance and management of temporary amenity spaces and public realm that will be provided over the course of the development when phases are under construction. It is expected that estate management arrangements will be agreed prior to the occupation of new dwellings within a particular phase.

Height massing strategy and tall buildings

168. The proposed height of buildings across the site ranges from two to twenty storeys

and seeks to emphasise the hierarchy of the masterplan routes, whilst responding to the varying edge conditions at the fringes of the estate. Accordingly, the scheme proposes low rise housing and flat typologies (of between two and six storeys) at the interface with the established local context, whilst providing a graduated increase in height eastwards (up to eight-storeys either side of Thurlow Street). This approach is broadly consistent with Policy PL4 (Building heights) which requires the height and scale of buildings to respect the setting of conservation areas and for taller buildings to be situated in important locations which are identified as being at key junctions along the Albany Road and at certain points on Thurlow Street as established on the AAAP building heights plan.

Tall buildings

169. It is proposed to locate the tallest buildings (fifteen to twenty storeys) at key junctions along Albany Road fronting Burgess Park, which is in accordance with AAAP Policy PL4 (Building heights). Six tall buildings are proposed along the Park Edge to mark the main entrances to the neighbourhood as well a further tall building on the Amersham site (Development Parcel 18) fronting onto Thurlow Street. The location of these buildings is where there is a strong rationale for townscape marking and way-finding to reinforce the hierarchy of the masterplan routes. In this respect the distribution of buildings in townscape terms is supported and has the potential to create a distinctive park edge signalling the regeneration of the estate.
170. The AAAP requires the design of tall these buildings to be of outstanding architectural and urban design quality. They are required to be elegant, slender and visually separate from adjacent buildings and set within generously proportioned public realm. The design code establishes mandatory criteria that are broadly consistent with these aspirations in that it requires tall buildings to have a well defined base, middle and top and to have a distinctive identity that will contribute to a visually interesting townscape. The concept of taller buildings forming gateway towers within the design code is supported. They are generally located at key junctions and the approach to design will ensure towers relate well to each other and read as a family of buildings. It will help ensure that the detailed design of tall buildings at reserved matters creates a visually interesting townscape ensuring tall buildings are well designed and appropriate for their location.
171. An exemplary standard of design and living accommodation is required where development parcels would exceed 700 habitable rooms per hectare. This is established in the AAAP and set out as mandatory guidance in the design code which will principally apply to the proposed high density blocks which are concentrated along the Park Edge. The detailed design of buildings is not known at this outline stage and so a full and detailed assessment would be carried out at reserved matters.

General building heights, scale and design

172. Predominant heights along Thurlow street will be six to eight storeys and mainly composed of mansion block buildings with central courtyards. Heights away from Thurlow Street (east and west) will gradually decrease towards the fringes of the action area core where buildings will be predominately composed of lower density mansion blocks, mews housing and town houses. These lower density edges will have a prevailing height of between four and two storey buildings responding to the height and massing of the established adjacent neighbourhood. General building heights will be controlled by the building heights parameter plan and high level guidance on height transition between areas with contrasting height is provided in the design code.

173. The illustrative masterplan expects buildings across the outline scheme to be composed mainly of perimeter blocks that will be a mix of mansion blocks, mews blocks and town houses. Mandatory guidance in the design code details that principal frontages of these blocks will be active and provide natural surveillance to streets and open spaces by having prominent entrances, windows, balconies and, where appropriate, breaks between buildings. Maisonettes will also be required to be delivered at ground floor level to increase the frequency of doors along the street.
174. The design code sets out guidance for these buildings in each of the character areas establishing principles that guide building form, density, privacy strips and private amenity space. Continuous building lines are required on development parcels adjacent to the Liverpool Conservation Area, where consistency is established as a key design quality. More variety is, however, allowed for within the medium scale perimeter blocks away from this area where the design code encourages the use of articulation of a street façade to allow glimpses into rear courtyards and add interest to the street. Much larger development parcels and perimeter blocks are proposed along the main routes (i.e. Thurlow and Albany Street) with much smaller sub-divided development parcels on the edges which respond to the established urban grain and local context. This hierarchical approach to development parcels and block typologies proposed can be supported as it will accommodate a range of housing types to come forward and homes designed to look directly on to the street with rear gardens in accordance with the AAAP (policy PL3 Building block types and layout).

Privacy and overlooking within the development

175. Minimum privacy standards are set out in the design code which are broadly consistent with established policy at a distance of 21 metres between flats. However minimum distances are proposed at the rear of dwelling houses of approximately 15 metres which differs from adopted Residential Design Guidance. Whilst the distance proposed is less than that proposed for mansion blocks and other buildings the design rationale is based on typical distances between existing dwelling houses in the surrounding area. The distance may in certain instances be appropriate as it is generally accepted that the approach to securing a good standard of privacy will vary in response to the local context, typology of building and block. As the precise location of buildings within development parcels is not known at this stage officers are satisfied that it is appropriate for the design of dwellings to respond to the context, providing a balance to the pressures of building at higher densities in order to ensure functionality and amenity in new homes. It has been demonstrated by the housing design on the FDS that privacy can be protected by good design and careful internal layouts even where separation distances are less than 21 metres. Therefore, there is sufficient design guidance within the development plan to ensure that an adequate standard of privacy is achieved at reserved matters.

Micro-climate considerations

176. At this outline stage the detailed design of buildings has not been established and so assumptions have been made regarding the design of buildings, location of habitable rooms within the proposed development parcels and private amenity spaces for daylight, sunlight, overshadowing and wind analysis.

Daylight

177. The analysis of the outline application has focused on development parcels 6a, 6b, 8b, 14a, 15a, 16a representing a spread across the action area and focusing on

blocks where officers considered internal daylight is most challenging. The analysis has informed the detailed design guidance in the design code and will inform the design of reserved matters.

178. In terms of daylight, the applicant has estimated Average Daylight Factor (ADF) which looks at the quality and distribution of light within a room based the analysis on the internal layout that are being considered for similar buildings within the FDS. The assessment has focused on the ground, first and second floor of buildings on the basis that these would be the worst affected units.

Table 24: Daylight assessment based on illustrative masterplan

Illustrative Masterplan	Average daylight factor		
	No. of spaces tested	No. of spaces that pass	% of spaces that pass
6A (medium density)	33	30	91%
6B (medium density)	30	30	100%
8B (medium density)	21	21	100%
14A (High density)	39	28	72%
15A (High density)	33	24	73%
16A (High density)	33	29	88%
Total	189	162	86%

179. The results show a high degree of compliance on medium density blocks with lower daylight levels achieved at the base of high density blocks. To ensure a good standard of daylight is achieved to internal living spaces the design of higher density buildings will require careful consideration. It may be necessary to locate rooms that require a lower level of light, e.g. circulation areas, corridors or bathrooms in certain parts of these buildings in order to maximise daylight to living spaces. Notwithstanding this, a daylight analysis will be required with all reserved matter applications when development parcels come forward. Officers are satisfied that through intelligent design, it would be possible ensure new dwellings receive good standards of daylight to the majority of habitable rooms.

Sunlight

180. In terms of sunlight, an assessment of Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH) has been undertaken. The guidelines advise that windows should receive at least 25% APSH, with 5% of this total being enjoyed during the winter months.
181. The results show that sunlight would be of a good standard for all the development parcels assessed. The facades facing into the courtyards facing north-east did not achieve the targets because of their orientation. Accordingly, the design code specifies that single aspect north facing dwelling will not be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that their design allows for sufficient daylight and ventilation.

Overshadowing

182. 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 sunlit throughout the year, at least half of the garden or amenity area should receive at least 2 hours of sunlight on 21st March.
183. The analysis shows that most private and communal amenity spaces will have a good standard of sunlight with the exception of the higher density blocks. The design implication being that communal amenity spaces for these buildings is most likely to be best placed at upper levels and on the roof as these spaces would receive excellent standards of sunlight. The provision of good quality rooftop amenity space and balcony areas will be important in these buildings to demonstrate an exemplary standard of design and so it will be important for the architects of future phases to carefully consider the design of tall buildings to ensure they deliver good quality amenity spaces. In design terms, this presents an opportunity for high quality roof gardens along the park edge that would benefit from views across Burgess Park. Officers are satisfied that well lit communal amenity spaces can be provided at reserved matters.

Wind effects.

184. Negligible wind effects are anticipated to occur at ground level within the public realm and on private amenity spaces adjacent or near to the site boundary based on the modelling of the illustrative masterplan. Windier than desired conditions may occur on the balconies and roof areas of the tall buildings within the site. It has been reasonably assumed that these spaces would primarily be used for sitting and the ES states that without adequate protection or sheltering elements these spaces may be much windier than normally expected for the anticipated use of this space and the significance of these impacts is stated as likely to be moderate to minor negative.
185. To mitigate the impact of wind on balconies and roof top amenity spaces it is suggested that balconies above tenth floor level be recessed and include screens for protection. The standard of roof top amenity areas can be maximised by providing screens where appropriate to ensure that wind speeds are mitigated to a level that is in keeping with desired conditions. These matters will need to be taken into account when assessing the overall design quality of tall buildings to ensure that they are sensitively designed to provide adequate private and communal amenity spaces for future residents.

Architectural design

186. The design code establishes a series of guiding principles that will guide the subdivision of development parcels and the broad approach to the design of buildings. The principles established will successfully contribute towards creating a high quality new neighbourhood. However much useful detailed guidance has been provided across a range of documents some of which is supporting guidance and not an approved document. This includes the landscaping strategy which details the approach to the design of open spaces as well as the design and access statement which provides a narrative on the anticipated evolution of the scheme's design.
187. Given the long term nature of the project, officers consider it will be useful for the design of reserved matters applications to learn from earlier phases as they come forward for approval. It will also be necessary to develop more detailed guidance that

illustrates how the proposed character areas will be architecturally distinctive. For these reasons it is recommended that further phases are informed by detailed design codes which pull together the plethora of information that has been developed for this submission and structured in a way that clearly sets out the role development parcels play within a phase. The detailed design code will clearly set out the context of each development parcel, making reference to the character area(s) in which it sits and those adjacent and setting out the proposed design approach including the amount of development, layout, scale appearance, landscaping, inclusive access and movement considerations, parking design and where appropriate a detailed section on buildings. It will emphasise the need for exemplary building design and consideration given to inclusivity and accessibility for all proposed buildings and spaces within a reserved matters application. It will set out this approach on phase by phase basis setting out the relationships between constituent development parcels and surrounding infrastructure and interrogate how the design of parcels can contribute towards a locally distinctive neighbourhood that has a visually interesting townscape. It will further develop the high level guidance provided within the design code and allow the architectural design of the scheme to evolve with the regeneration programme.

Impact on strategic and local views and the character and setting of listed buildings and/or conservation areas

Heritage Assets

188. The Outline Application Site is not located in a Conservation Area. However, the Liverpool Grove Conservation Area is immediately adjacent to the estate boundary, and to the northeast of the outline application site. The Cobourg Road and Addington Square Conservation Areas are also within view of the site. Within the Addington Square Conservation Area is a designated London Square; Addington Square. Further to this, English Heritage requested an assessment of the impact of the development proposals on the Grosvenor Park Conservation Area.
189. While section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 does not strictly apply here, because no development is proposed within a conservation area, it nonetheless sets a useful test for judging the impacts of the proposed development on the neighbouring Liverpool Grove Conservation Area, as well as the Addington Square, Sutherland Square and Grovesnor Park Conservation Areas. Section 72 indicates that, 'special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area'. The analysis within this section of the report considers whether the application pays special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the nearby Conservation Areas.
190. Furthermore, Saved Policy 3.18 of the Southwark plan (2007), 'Setting of Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas and World Heritage sites' seeks to effectively manage development to ensure that it will not have a detrimental impact on the *setting* of heritage assets, including conservation areas.

Liverpool Grove Conservation Area

191. The majority of this conservation area was built between 1903 and 1908 and the urban form of the area is relatively dense, but generally low rise with flats fronting onto courts and quite broad streets of houses and maisonettes. The external appearance of the buildings is varied, designed as such in order to avoid the monotony of repetitive

terraces. It is also characterised by mature tree planting in many of the streets.

192. The existing slab-block buildings of the Aylesbury Estate are visible from a number of vantage points within the Conservation Area. By virtue of their monolithic and unbroken appearance, strong horizontal emphasis, insensitive scale and unrelieved use of grey concrete they are considered to create a harmful backdrop to the conservation area that does not respond sensitively to the heritage asset and its setting. It is therefore considered that the redevelopment of the estate and the replacement of the existing slab-blocks with more sensitively designed brick buildings, featuring greater variety and interest in their built form would result in an enhancement to the setting of the conservation area. This is particularly considered to be the case at the boundary between the conservation area and the existing estate, for example on Merrow Street and Trafalgar Street. The Liverpool Grove Conservation Area Appraisal Statement identifies 122- 190 Trafalgar Street as key unlisted buildings in the conservation area. The redevelopment of the estate would result in the removal of the large slab-block that currently terminates Trafalgar Street and its replacement with more sensitively scaled and designed buildings. As such, it is considered that the settings of these undesignated heritage assets would also be enhanced.

Addington Square Conservation Area

193. The Addington Square Conservation Area comprises an eclectic mix of early 19th Century buildings. Addington Square itself is a designated, formal London Square enclosed on three sides by terraces and semi detached housing with Burgess Park on the fourth side. Of the buildings enclosing the square, Number 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13-16, 33-42, 47 and 48 Addington Square are all Grade II listed and have substantial group heritage value. Only the FDS proposals would have any substantial visual impact on Addington Square. This is demonstrated in View 13 as assessed in the Visual Impact Assessment.
194. Of the other listed buildings in the Addington Square Conservation Area, the proposed redevelopment would be visible from the rears of Nos 117 -129 Camberwell Road. These views are not from the public realm and the impact on the setting of the heritage assets is considered negligible.

Cobourg Road Conservation Area

195. This small conservation area is found on the far side of Burgess Park, connected to Old Kent Road. Within the conservation area, Nos 29, 31, 47, 51, 53, 55, 61, and 63 Cobourg Road, Hanover House and Rosetta Place are all Grade II listed. The existing Aylesbury Estate, particularly the long, slab like Wendover Building is visible from the conservation area. It is considered that the redevelopment of the estate and the replacement of this insensitively scaled and designed slab building would be beneficial to the setting of the conservation area and listed buildings. The proposed redevelopment would create a more visually rich and varied backdrop to views out of the conservation area. The majority of the proposed buildings would be finished in brick and therefore create a warmer setting than the grey concrete of Wendover House and a more recognisable 'London' townscape typology. This beneficial impact is demonstrated in View 5, as assessed in the Visual Impact Assessment.

Grosvenor Park Conservation Area

196. This small conservation area to the west of Burgess Park and the south west of the existing Aylesbury Estate contains a mix of 19th Century buildings. Within the

conservation area, Nos 21-36 Urlwin Street are Grade II listed. The conservation area is separated from the proposed development site not only by distance, but also by the physical barriers of the railway line and Camberwell Road. Neither the existing buildings of the Aylesbury Estate within the outline application boundary or the proposed development parameters are visible within the Conservation Area. As such, the impacts of the development on these heritage assets would be negligible and would not cause any harm to its significance.

197. In addition to the Conservation Areas, the development proposals also have the potential to impact upon the setting of a number of listed buildings.

Grade I Listed Buildings

Church of St. Peter, West gates and Gate Piers, Liverpool Grove

198. This heritage asset, a fine example of the work of renowned architect Sir John Soane is some distance from the Outline Application site, on the western side of the Liverpool Grove Conservation Area. However, it is considered to be of very high heritage value, as denoted by its Grade I listed status. The material submitted in support of the application demonstrates that the proposals would not be visible from this asset or its setting. The impact is therefore considered negligible. This is the same for the terrace of Grade II listed housing at Numbers 28 to 58 Liverpool Grove to the south of the church.

Grade II Listed Buildings

Aycliffe House and attached railings, and the adjacent terrace of Grade II listed houses on Portland Street (nos 1-23 odd)

199. Both Aycliffe House and the terraced housing date from 1903-1914 and are finished in brick with stone dressings. They are of heritage value not only for their physical appearance and built fabric, but their group value as part of the Brandon Estate, an example of "homely" working class housing erected by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners under the guidance of Octavia Hill. The existing concrete slab buildings of the Aylesbury Estate represent a stark contrast to the traditional domestic scale and materiality of these buildings, and from certain vantage points are considered to dominate their settings. The redevelopment with more sympathetically scaled, designed and detailed buildings, finished predominantly in brick, would represent an enhancement to the setting of these heritage assets. This beneficial impact is demonstrated in View 15, as assessed in the Visual Impact Assessment.

62, 65, 66-84, 86, 86A, 88, 90 and 92 Camberwell Road

200. Views of much of the existing estate from the setting of these listed buildings are obscured by mature planting and trees in Burgess Park. The proposed redevelopment would be visible from Numbers 66 and 84, but the views would be very minimal and of no harm to the setting of the heritage assets and would have a minor beneficial impact.

Alms-houses, Chumleigh Gardens

201. This range of Alms-houses, arranged in a U-shaped plan form around a central landscaped courtyard are rare survivors of the dense built fabric that occupied the site of Burgess Park prior to WWII bomb damage. From the courtyard, the low rise blocks of the Aylesbury Estate, fronting onto Albany Road are visible. The redevelopment

proposals would replace these with taller residential blocks fronting onto Albany Road. However, they would be finished in brick, a more appropriate material for the backdrop to this heritage setting. As such, it is not considered that the redevelopment proposals would result in any harm to the setting of these heritage assets.

Lime Kiln, Burgess Park

202. This is the only surviving structure from the Lime Works that once occupied this part of the Burgess Park Site. The concrete slab blocks of the Aylesbury Estate currently form an intrusive and insensitive backdrop to this important historic structure. Their redevelopment and replacement with more sensitively designed and scaled buildings would be considered an enhancement to the setting of this heritage asset.

Groundwork Trust Office and Attached Chimney, Wells Way

203. This fine Edwardian building is a former public library and bathhouse dating from 1902. The bathhouse chimney is a particularly prominent landmark when viewed from Burgess Park. The low rise blocks of the existing Aylesbury Estate can be seen at the northern end of Wells Way. As a result of their unbroken appearance, horizontal emphasis and grey concrete finish, they are not considered to represent a sensitive backdrop to the setting of these heritage assets. As such, although the redevelopment proposals would see them replaced with taller buildings, the greater degree of articulation and variety in built form proposed and the use of warmer, more traditional brick as the predominant facing material would result in an enhancement to the setting of this listed building.

English Martyrs School Flint Street

204. The English Martyrs Roman Catholic School on Flint Street dates from 1875 (extended 1905) is a lavishly decorated brick and stone building of a bold design. As such, it is considered an unusual design for a board school of this period. It is found some distance to the north of the existing estate, but as a result of the large scale and unapologetic design of the existing estate buildings, the taller of the slab blocks (Wendover and Taplow Houses) are not only visible in, but in many ways dominate the setting of the school. It is considered that the redevelopment of the estate and the replacement of these monolithic concrete blocks with more sensitively designed, well articulated brick buildings would enhance the setting of this heritage asset. The associated Roman Catholic Church of the English Martyrs on Rodney Road and its Presbytery, found to the north of the primary school would also benefit from the removal of Wendover and Taplow House, although as they are less visible, the impact of redevelopment here would be diminished.

Undesignated Heritage Assets

205. Paragraph 135 of the NPPF expects Local Authorities to take into account the effect of proposals on the significance of non-designated heritage assets when determining an application. It states that *“In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.”* Of the undesignated heritage assets likely to be affected by the redevelopment proposals, the impacts on 122- 190 Trafalgar Street are discussed above. The other pertinent non designated heritage asset is the Queen Anne Public House on the corner of Aylesbury Road and Dawes Street. This is an attractive local landmark. At present its setting is dominated by the slab-block of Taplow House, which despite being some distance away, has a substantial visual impact. As such, the replacement of the imposing slab block is considered to represent an opportunity to enhance the setting

of this building.

206. The majority of the proposed development in this area of the site would be terraced housing and low scale (up to four storeys) apartment buildings that would respond well to the existing context. However, directly across Dawes Street from The Queen Anne would be a larger eight storey building marking the location of the new Aylesbury Square. Although this would be taller than the surrounding context, it is considered appropriate to mark the location of this important new civic space with some height. Any harm caused to the setting of the undesignated heritage asset can be outweighed by the public benefit of the resultant improvements to the legibility of the area. The impact of the height would also be mitigated by more appropriate use of materials and greater articulation and visual richness on the façade. This would be an important consideration in the assessment of the design at the reserved matters stage.
207. Paragraph 128 of the NPPF requires applicants to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected by their proposals, including any contribution made by their setting. It states that *“the level of detail should be proportionate to the assets’ importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance. As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary.”* The Townscape, Built Heritage Visual Assessment submitted in support of the application demonstrates that the proposed development would not result in any harmful impacts on the significance of the surrounding heritage assets and their settings. Indeed, it is considered that the removal of the insensitive, monolithic, concrete slab-block buildings on the existing estate and the proposals to introduce more sensitively designed, well articulated buildings, predominantly finished in more contextual brick would be beneficial to both listed buildings and conservation areas. The edges of the Liverpool Grove Conservation Area in particular would benefit from redevelopment of the estate. Based on this analysis it is considered that the assessment set out in the ‘Townscape, Built Heritage and Visual Impact Assessment’ fulfils this requirement of the NPPF requirement.
208. Paragraph 137 of the NPPF states that *“Local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development ... within the setting of heritage assets to enhance or better reveal their significance. Proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset should be treated favourably.”* It considered that the outline scheme complies with this requirement and with Saved Policy 3.18 (Setting of Listed Buildings, Conservation Areas and World Heritage Sites) of the Southwark Plan (2007) as it would preserve or enhance the immediate or wider setting of listed buildings; any important view(s) of listed buildings; the settings of any conservation areas; or views into or out of any conservation areas.

Views Assessment

Strategic views – Local View Management Framework (LVMF)

209. There is a single strategic view from which the outline proposal would be visible within this framework. It is a panorama view from Alexandra Palace looking south. Within this view, St Paul’s Cathedral, The London Eye, BT Tower and the Shard are all visible landmarks.

View 1A.1 From Alexandra Palace

210. The outline application site sits to the right of centre in this long distance view. Under the minimum building heights scenario two of the buildings would be visible within the ridgeline and ridgeline of trees in the Crouch Hill/ Finsbury Park area. Under the maximum building heights scenario, up to seven of the buildings would be visible from this view.
211. As a result of the distance the outline scheme would be perceived to be lower in scale than the more prominent landmarks within this view and would be nestled within and screened by vegetation. As a result, the buildings are likely to be barely perceptible to the naked eye, and it is therefore concluded that impact on this view would be negligible. It is also worth noting that when considered in relation to the cumulative impacts of the scheme with nearby developments, there are other buildings which are significantly taller and have a more substantial impact on this LVMF view. As a result, these other developments are likely to draw the eye away from the Aylesbury development.

Local Views

212. A number of local views were identified prior to the submission of the application. These views were considered important as the outline proposal is likely to have significant effects on the built environment and the image of London.

View 01 Flint Street, north of East Street, looking southeast down Thurlow Street

213. If the outline application site were to be developed to the minimum parameters proposed, the new buildings would be shorter than the existing slab block on the site and screened by retained mature Plane trees in summer. If the site were to be developed to the maximum parameters, although they would be physically shorter than the existing slab block on the site, they would be perceived as being taller because they would be closer to the road. The visual impact would be softened by the mature Plane trees, particularly in summer. For both the minimum and maximum parameters, the buildings would frame Thurlow Street providing enhanced definition of the public realm, active frontages and a marked improvement to the existing streetscape. The impact of the development on this view is therefore considered to be beneficial. It is also worth noting that when considered in relation to the cumulative impact of other development proposals in the area surrounding the Aylesbury, the development at Site 7 would complement the proposals under consideration and frame both sides of Thurlow Street, providing the enclosure that is currently lacking and marking the importance of this thoroughfare. Together they will create a coherent street scene.

View 02 Surrey Square to the west of the junction with Flinton Street looking southwest

214. This view is taken from a residential street, outside the Grade II listed terrace at number 20-54 Surrey Square. The listed terrace provides a strong, well-defined edge to the right hand side of the street when viewed from this position. At the termination of the view is the slab block of the Wendover and Wolverton buildings on the existing Aylesbury Estate, although they are partially screened by trees in Surrey Square Park, particularly during the summer.
215. If the outline application site were to be developed to the minimum parameters proposed, it would be visible at the termination of this view, significantly below the

height of the existing slab blocks and substantially screened (particularly in summer) by the trees in the park. If the site were to be developed to the maximum parameters, again the majority would be lower than the existing slab block (with a small exception to the right that would be very slightly higher). Again the trees in the park would substantially screen them. In both cases, views into the development site will be created by the removal of the slab block and the arrangement of the new buildings. This would create sense of connectivity and give extra depth to the view, both of which are considered beneficial.

View 03 Eastern end of Smyk's Road on southern footpath outside No. 77 looking southwest

216. This view is dominated by the height and mass of the slab blocks of the Wendover and Ravenstone Buildings within the existing estate. The existing slab blocks cause harm to the otherwise attractive street scene and the existing trees in front of the slab do little to soften this harmful impact.
217. If the outline application site were to be developed to the minimum parameters proposed, it would be seen at the termination of the view, but substantially lower than the existing slab blocks and of a scale that responds well to the existing two storey terraces. If the site were to be developed to the maximum parameters, it would have a perceived height similar to that of the lower to the two slab blocks (Ravenstone). As a result they would be perceived as taller than the existing terraced dwellings, but would not be overbearing or dominant as the existing Wendover building is. It is therefore considered that the change would be beneficial.

View 04 Eastern End of Albany Road

218. This view is taken from Albany Road. To the right is an attractive two-storey terrace of residential dwellings. To the left are the mature trees along the boundary of Burgess Park. In the distance, the large slab block of Wendover on the existing estate is visible.
219. Whether the outline application site was to be developed to the minimum or maximum parameters proposed, it would be seen in the centre of this view. The landmark tower proposed at the junction of Albany Road and Thurlow Street would become the focal point of the view. It is considered that, given the prominence of the routes that meet at this point, the introduction of a new landmark building here is appropriate. The submitted Design Code offers sufficient comfort that the tall building will be of high architectural quality, using materials that are more appropriate to the surrounding townscape character than those of the existing slab block of Wendover. If this were to be built to the maximum parameters proposed, it would be significantly taller, but it is not considered that this would have a harmful impact. Through the removal of the inappropriate Wendover building and the creation of a landmark building to aid legibility, it is considered that subject to detailed design, the changes to this view have the potential to enhance it.

View 05 Coburg Road, looking west over the lake in Burgess Park

220. This view was selected to assess the impact of the development on the Coburg Road Conservation Area and the settings of a number of Grade II listed buildings including numbers 29, 31, and 49 to 63 (odd) Coburg Road. The park dominates the foreground of the view, with the large lake in the mid distance. On the other side of the park, the large slab block of the Wendover building and the concrete CHP chimney are visible.

221. Whether the outline application site was to be developed to the minimum or maximum parameters proposed, it would have a significant impact on the backdrop of this view. The 'gateway' landmark towers proposed at the junction of Albany Road/ Thurlow Street would become the focus of the view, in the centre of the new development. Other proposed buildings along the Park Edge would also be visible along the tree line to the left of the view, including the other gateway landmark towers at the entrance to Portland Street. To the right, the majority of the proposed buildings, in both the minimum and maximum parameters would be screened by trees in the park.
222. Given the prominence of Thurlow Street and Albany Road, it is considered appropriate that the gateway towers proposed at this junction should become a new focal landmark on the skyline. The submitted Design Code offers sufficient comfort that the new buildings will be of high architectural quality, using materials that are more appropriate to the surrounding townscape character than those of the existing slab blocks on the estate. Furthermore, as a backdrop to the park, the proposed development would introduce a far greater degree of visual interest through variation in the skyline than the existing slab like structures on the estate. Accordingly, it is considered that, through the removal of the inappropriate slab-like structures on the estate, the introduction of new landmark buildings to aid legibility, and the creation of a more varied and interesting skyline, the changes to this view have the potential to enhance it.

View 07 Burgess Park Bridge Looking West

223. This view is taken from the southern end of the bridge across the lake in Burgess Park, looking north towards the development site. In the foreground is the lake itself. The wildflower mounds and tree planting on the edge of the park, which are of significant screening value, define the mid distance. Beyond this, the blocks of the existing estate are visible.
224. Whether the outline application site was to be developed to the minimum or maximum parameters proposed, it would have a significant impact on the backdrop of this view. The 'gateway' landmark towers proposed at the junction of Albany Road/ Thurlow Street would become the focus of the view, with other proposed buildings along the Park Edge also be visible, interspersed with the trees that define the edge of the park. To the far left hand side of the view, where the tree cover is significantly reduced, the landmark towers marking the entrance to Portland Street would be clearly visible.
225. This is a very similar view to View 05, although a greater proportion of the proposed development would be visible. As with that view, it is considered appropriate, given the prominence of Thurlow Street and Albany Road, that the gateway towers proposed at this junction should become a new focal landmark on the skyline. Furthermore, as a backdrop to the lake, the proposed development would introduce a far greater degree of visual interest through variation in the skyline than the existing slab like structures on the estate. Accordingly, it is considered that, through the removal of the existing blocks, the introduction of new landmark buildings to aid legibility, and the creation of a more varied and interesting skyline, the changes to this view have the potential to enhance it.

View 08 Top of mound in centre of Burgess Park, looking northwest towards Thurlow Street

226. This view is taken from the top of the grass mound at the centre of Burgess Park that was introduced during improvement works in 2012. As a result of the higher viewing

position, a view above the tree line along Albany Road is available. The view is on the alignment of Thurlow Street within the estate. The foreground of the view is dominated by the grassy landscape of the park. A dense line of trees can be seen in the mid distance, following Albany Road. The trees screen the lower levels of the buildings on the estate. Wendover, on the right hand side of Thurlow Street is the predominant feature in the backdrop to this view. The Shard is also visible in the long distance.

227. Whether the outline application site was to be developed to the minimum or maximum parameters proposed, it would have a significant impact on the backdrop of this view. The 'gateway' landmark towers proposed at the junction of Albany Road/ Thurlow Street would become the focus of the view, clearly framing the entrance to Thurlow Street. Other proposed buildings along the Park Edge would also be visible, with only their lower levels screened by the trees.
228. Again, it is considered appropriate, given the prominence of Thurlow Street and Albany Road, that the gateway towers proposed at this junction should become a new focal landmark on the skyline. Furthermore, as a backdrop to the park, the proposed development would introduce a far greater degree of visual interest through variation in the skyline than the existing slab like structures on the estate. Accordingly, it is considered that, through the removal of the existing, the introduction of new landmark buildings to aid legibility, and the creation of a more varied and interesting skyline, have the potential to enhance it.

View 09 East of the Almshouses in Burgess Park, looking west

229. Despite its distance from the viewing point, the slab block of Chiltern on the existing estate is visually dominant from this perspective. It is not considered beneficial to the setting of the listed buildings.
230. Whether the outline application site was to be developed to the minimum or maximum parameters proposed, it would have a significant impact on this view in the mid distance. The taller building proposed to mark the junctions of Albany Road and Portland Street and Albany Road and Well's Way would become the focus of the view. Whilst the amount of built form visible in this view would undoubtedly be increased by the proposals, it is considered that any harm this could cause is mitigated by the varied rhythm and articulation of the skyline proposed, which would be a marked improvement on the static horizontal mass of Chiltern. The use of brick as the predominant material (as controlled by the Design Code) would also enhance this view as it is considered to be a more appropriate material for the setting of the listed Almshouses. On balance therefore, whilst it is acknowledged that the greater quantum of built form in this view could cause some limited harm to the setting of the listed buildings, this is mitigated by the improvements proposed to the skyline and, through detailed design, including the use of more appropriate materials, the setting could be enhanced even further.

View 10 Canal Bridge on Wells Way, looking north

231. This view is taken from the southern edge of the bridge over the former canal on the western footpath of Wells Way, looking north. In the foreground of the view is the Grade II listed Groundwork Trust offices.
232. Whether the outline application site was developed to the minimum or maximum parameters, only one of the taller Park Edge buildings would be visible and have a significant impact. A small stretch of the lower buildings along the Park Edge would

also be visible, but even if developed to the maximum parameters, these would sit within the silhouette of the existing blocks on the estate.

233. Whilst the new tall building would have a significant impact, it is not considered that it would harm the setting of the listed building. The presence of the Shard in roughly the same location has already established a taller skyline setting for the heritage assets and, subject to detailed design, the use of brick as the predominant material (as controlled by the Design Code) would compliment the listed buildings.

View 11 Southwest of the Lime Kiln in Burgess Park, looking north towards Portland Street

234. The Lime Kiln in Burgess Park is Grade II listed. Its heritage significance is primarily derived from its historic and evidential value. The foreground of the view is dominated by the landscape of the park. Punctuating the end of the long tarmac path that runs north from the viewing position is the slab block of Chiltern on the existing estate.
235. Whether the outline application site was to be developed to the minimum or maximum parameters proposed, the landmark gateway towers proposed at the junction of Albany Road and Portland Street (one in the Detailed application and one in the Outline Application Site) would become the new focus of this view. Between them, the view of the Shard would be very successfully framed. As a result, not only would they mark the entrance to the important thoroughfare of Portland Street, but indeed would celebrate the relationship of the new development to the rest of the borough and indeed the wider city. Subject to detailed design, this successful composition is considered to enhance this view and accordingly, the setting of the listed structure.

View 12 Burgess Park looking north towards the Detailed application

236. This view focuses predominantly on the Detailed application. Only a slither of the Outline Application Site is visible. Accordingly, it is not considered necessary to assess its impact here.

View 15 Portland Street at northern edge of Michael Faraday School looking South

237. This view is taken from a point on the northern edge of the Michael Faraday School looking south towards Burgess Park. The viewpoint is within the Liverpool Grove Conservation Area. On the left hand side is the contemporary architecture of the newly rebuilt primary school and existing mature trees. On the right is a Grade II listed terrace of two storey houses. Dominating the setting of the terraced houses is the slab block of Chiltern within the existing estate. It is not considered to enhance the setting of the listed terrace.
238. This view focuses predominantly on the Detailed application, with the tower proposed at the end of Portland Street becoming the new focus of the view. If the outline application site were to be developed to the minimum parameters proposed, the corresponding tower intended to create a gateway to Portland Street would be almost entirely screened by the mature trees on the left hand side of the view. Glimpsed views may be possible in winter when the trees are not on leaf, but it is not considered that this would have a harmful impact on the view. If it were built out to the maximum parameters, it would be visible above the trees, at a height to match that of the tower proposed in the Detailed application.
239. It is considered that, through the removal of Chiltern Building that looms over the listed terrace, and replacing it with a well considered composition of tall gateway buildings

marking the entrance to an important thoroughfare, this view and the setting of the listed houses would be enhanced by the proposed development.

View 16 Liverpool Grove in front of Grade I listed Church of St Peters, looking east

240. This view has been chosen to assess the impact of the proposed development on the Grade I listed Church of St Peters, the Grade II listed terraced housing on Liverpool Grove and the wider Liverpool Grove Conservation Area. The heritage significance of the church is derived from its design by Sir John Soane, its unaltered elevations and well restored interior and its historic, evidential and social value.
241. Large Plane trees planted within the church grounds dominate the right hand side of the view, screening the buildings along Liverpool Grove. Nonetheless, the listed terrace creates a regular, consistent urban edge and an attractive street scene. The existing buildings of the Aylesbury Estate cannot be seen in this view.
242. Whether the outline application site was to be developed to the minimum or maximum parameters proposed it would have a minimal impact on this view. It is unlikely that the proposed development, even at its maximum parameters, would be seen above the listed houses on Liverpool Grove, which are also screened by the mature planting. It is therefore considered that there would be no harm caused to the setting of the listed buildings or the wider conservation area.

View 17 Corner of Aylesbury Road and Brettell Street looking east

243. This view is from the western corner of Aylesbury Road and Brettell Street junction, looking east along Aylesbury Road. This view is within the Liverpool Grove Conservation Area. The view is enclosed on both sides by two-storey terraced housing with pitched roofs. On the left hand side of the view, a brown fence encloses some allotments. The grey slab block of the existing Taplow building on the Aylesbury estate fills the termination of the view. It is partially screened by mature trees at the end of Aylesbury Road. The corner of the Taplow building can also be seen above the houses on the left hand side of the view.
244. Whether the outline application site was to be built out to its minimum or maximum parameters, the development will have a significant impact on this view. The taller building proposed to sit on the new Aylesbury Square will become the new focus, rising above the existing houses in the centre of the view. The new building will be designed as a landmark within the scheme, and it is considered appropriate that a taller building should mark the presence of the new civic space on offer at Aylesbury Square. The Design Code offers sufficient comfort that this will be a high quality building finished in materials that compliment the conservation area and wider existing townscape. Its presence would enhance the legibility of the area and integrate the proposed development into the existing area. Furthermore, whilst this new building would undoubtedly have an impact on the conservation area, it would not disrupt the cohesiveness of the conservation area, but would be read as a relatively distant object on the skyline. On balance therefore, it is not considered that this view would be harmed by the proposed development.

View 18 Junction of paths within Nursery Row Park, looking to southeast

245. This view is taken from within Nursery Row Park; a local designated open space. The view looks south towards the development site over the Liverpool Grove Conservation Area. Regular lines of mature Plane trees screen the view of any buildings in the background and dominate the view. As a result of the number of trees and their close

proximity to each other is likely that this screening value would remain substantial during the winter months when the trees are not in leaf.

246. Whether the outline application site were to be built out to its minimum or maximum parameters it is unlikely that the development would be seen through the trees or above the existing buildings along East Street. It is therefore concluded that the proposed development would have no harmful impact upon this view.

Summary of impacts

247. The visual impact assessment of the agreed views demonstrates that, whilst the proposed development may have some substantial impacts upon the surrounding area, the changes are positive, enhancing the townscape character, improving legibility and better revealing the significance of heritage assets.
248. The views from Burgess Park show that, despite the increase in built form, the new, varied and visually rich skyline would be a marked improvement on the monotony of the existing slab blocks in the estate. The thoughtful positioning of taller elements along the Park Edge would also enhance legibility without cause unjustifiable harm to the settings of any listed buildings or conservation areas. Views of the sky would be maintained whilst creating a new urban edge to the park, as encouraged in the AAAP.
249. Similarly, the tall building proposed at Aylesbury Square (again, as established in the AAAP) would have a beneficial impact on the Liverpool Grove Conservation Area by enhancing legibility, introducing a far more varied and visually rich skyline and (subject to detailed design) using more appropriate materials that would compliment the existing townscape character. The views from the Addington Square and Coburg Road Conservation Areas and the settings of the listed buildings within the park would also be enhanced by the proposed development for similar reasons.

Highways and Transport impacts

Street network

250. As described earlier in this report, one of the key problems with the existing estate is the lack of permeability and poor linkages through the estate to the surrounding area. The ground floor parking areas and garages dominate much of the street frontage, and create a hostile street environment. The AAAP Policy TP1 requires development proposals to provide a well-connected network of streets that provide a safe and attractive environment for walking and cycling and at the same time create practical and logical access routes for motor vehicles. The Plan suggests a street layout, based on a simple grid, which identifies key pedestrian routes and crossing points.
251. The proposed layout of the outline proposal is not as rigid as the AAAP masterplan, but the applicant has created a network of streets that will make it easier to move around compared to the existing situation. The submitted illustrative masterplan deviates from the AAAP in some respects, including a realignment of the Community Spine, and a finer grained block layout. It is considered that the submitted proposal has some advantages over the AAAP layout in terms of its linkages to the surrounding streets. As discussed under the urban design section, it does not include the Green Fingers, but does include a series of tree-lined, traffic-calmed streets which provide safe and attractive pedestrian and cycling routes.

252. A hierarchy of streets has been established in the design code comprising of primary, secondary and tertiary roads. The primary routes are the existing public transport corridors – Thurlow Street and Albany Road; secondary routes are Portland Street and the east-west connections – the corridor along Westmoreland Road, Hopwood Road and Inville Road and Alsace Road. All other routes are proposed as tertiary and local in character and include ‘green links’ and ‘green streets’ that will provide attractive green routes for pedestrians and cyclists to parks and squares within the Aylesbury Estate and to the surrounding area.
253. Traffic calming measures such as raised tables and traffic carpets at key junctions are proposed as well as wide footpaths and the introduction of roads closed to motor vehicles. The detailed design and location of these traffic calming measures will be dealt with as a reserved matter in consultation with the Highways Department when phases come forward for redevelopment. The principle of new vehicle access in and out of the estate to surrounding streets is broadly acceptable subject to detailed design as phases come forward. A guiding principle for the design of new streets is to ensure vehicles travel at low speed, to maintain bus priority on Thurlow Street and Albany Road and to improve pedestrian and cyclist routes with protected facilities where appropriate.

Shared surface areas

254. The AAAP advocates streets that are accessible for all users, taking into account the requirements for vulnerable road users and mobility impaired (Policy TP1 – Designing Streets). Several of the streets in the masterplan are indicated as being shared surfaces for the use of pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles. A high quality pedestrian and cycling environment is required on new routes through the estate in accordance with this policy for all users.
255. Under the outline proposal shared surfaces are proposed adjacent to parks and squares as part of a wider street calming strategy that is seeking to create attractive, legible, safe routes for pedestrians and cyclists which integrates into the existing routes and connections with the adjoining areas surrounding the estate. The site wide approach to shared spaces is supported but particular attention will need to be given to the detailed design of the various proposed shared spaces to ensure that the design is inclusive. Substantial parts of the spaces adjacent to parks and squares are likely to remain pedestrian and cyclist only to ensure vulnerable people have the opportunity to access and participate in activities that take place in the proposed parks and squares. Continuous Routes that are marked using both visual and physical means (i.e. surface materials) have also been suggested along-side shared spaces for people who are not comfortable sharing space with vehicles. The detailed design of these spaces will be a matter dealt with as a reserved matter in consultation with the council’s Highways Development Control team to ensure that the design of shared spaces takes into account the requirements of vulnerable road users and mobility impaired people and remain safe and attractive in accordance with AAAP Policy TP1 (Designing Streets).
256. Combined with the detailed and early phases, the proposed street network will link well with the surrounding street pattern and local amenities. The detailed design of existing streets will be controlled through a legal agreement requiring the submission of a section 278 application for existing streets and a section 38 and or 33 application for new streets. The design and specification of streets and shared surfaces will be

managed in consultation with the Highways Team at reserved matters on a phase and development parcel basis. Based on this analysis the proposed approach to street design is supported and in accordance with AAAP Policy PL1 (Street layout).

Public transport

257. The estate currently has a diverse spread of public transport accessibility. The PTAL levels across the application area range from level 4 (medium level of accessibility) when close to the transport corridors of Walworth Road and rapidly falls to level 1 and 2 (low to very low accessibility) towards the centre of the estate. This is due to the lack of regular bus routes running through the heart of the estate.
258. Transport for London (TfL) has confirmed that the bus route 100 will be extended through the estate from Elephant and Castle to Old Kent Road. When combined with the recent extension to bus route 136 and existing routes 42 and 343, the areas with a low accessibility level of 1 and 2 for the estate will increase to at least PTAL 3 or 4. This reflects the improved connections and transport for the neighbourhood and the incoming population, as expected under AAAP policy TP2.
259. The layout safeguards a route for high capacity public transport along Thurlow Street and Portland Street in the form of bus routes on a shared carriageway, in line with AAAP Policy TP2. Improvements to existing bus stops are also indicated as part of the programme of works in the development specification in particular on Albany Road and Thurlow Street. Details of the improvements that will be needed to be made and their timing will be agreed in consultation with TfL at the appropriate time taking account of the proposed programme of works across the three phases. A 'pool' of funding is proposed for the bus stop upgrades that will be secured as part of the legal agreement.
260. The ES suggests that a large proportion of trips to and from the site will be made bus and TfL have requested a contribution of around £3.75 million from the scheme which will be used to increase the frequency of operation on any of the routes passing directly through the Masterplan area. At the time of writing discussions were on-going with TfL and the applicant has agreed to the principle of a contribution. The amount will be agreed with TfL as part of the Stage 2 referral and form part of the legal agreement.

Impacts of demolition and construction on bus services

261. The demolition and construction of the estate will put pressure on the current bus routes and may require the temporary re-routing of existing bus routes and movement of bus stops impacting on the level of service. These changes will be most marked when construction commences for development parcels immediately adjacent to Thurlow Street.
262. As part of a phased Construction Management Plan officers will require details of how construction and construction traffic will be managed to ensure bus reliability is reduced to a minimum. It will require the applicant to work with TfL and the council to detail route changes that best serve remaining residents and those that have moved back into phases already completed.

Cycle and pedestrian routes

263. Several objections cite the concern that the scheme makes no provision for segregated cycle lanes. The concern is that not providing a segregated cycle lane

would be contrary to the aspirations of the council's recently published draft cycling strategy.

264. Consultation on the council's draft cycling strategy commenced following the submission of the planning application. At the time of writing, the strategy remains a draft document that has not been adopted. Notwithstanding this, it sets out a corporate ambition for a new cycling network, including key routes through the development. For this reason it is considered a relevant material consideration when assessing this proposal.
265. The Cycling Strategy identifies a 'Southwark Spine' cycle route, that will run through the estate along Thurlow Street, crossing Albany Road and into Burgess Park. The Strategy commits to providing a high level of service for cycling and will require segregation on busy traffic corridors such as Thurlow Street. Improvements at Elephant and Castle within the Heygate development are anticipated to better link cycling infrastructure for cyclists moving from the north to the south of the Borough. In addition, Portland Street is designated as a 'Quietway' and traffic reduction measures are anticipated.
266. Discussions with the applicant are ongoing to create a design for Thurlow Street that meets a number of criteria including allocation of space for pedestrians, cyclists, trees, bus reliability and general traffic. In addition, the council's Highways Department will be designing the junctions for both Thurlow Street and Portland Street with Albany Road and the junction of Thurlow Street and East Street, with priority being given to providing safety for cyclists and pedestrians.
267. Officers estimate that around 25 metres width will be required along Thurlow Street between development parcels to accommodate a segregated cycle lanes and allowing for adequate pavement widths, street furniture and trees along the route. In response to consultation revisions have been made to the parameter plans which now include the necessary flexibility to accommodate cycle segregation along Thurlow Street at the detailed design stage. This flexibility allows more space to be created along the northern section of Thurlow Street should the indicated highway width be insufficient at the maximum development parcel extent on the parameter plans.
268. The design for Thurlow Street will need to be widely consulted upon before a final design solution can be implemented. The applicant is committed to delivering a high quality cycling environment on Thurlow Street and will be working with the council to ensure there is an appropriate interim solution in place during demolition and construction. The obligations will be set out in the S106 agreement along with other aspects on highway design and delivery.
269. To ensure future phases are designed to prioritise pedestrian and cycle safety a series of site wide strategies will be required to be submitted prior to reserved matters which will clearly identify how each proposed street has been designed taking account of the hierarchy. These strategies will include a Pedestrian and Cycling Delivery Plan that will formalize the segregation of routes and where routes will be informal and form part of a general street environment. The plan will also include details on cycle parking, cycle hire and other cycle facilities that will be required on the estate and ensure that pedestrian and cycle safety and permeability is at the heart of all street design across the entire estate.

Impacts of demolition and construction on cycle routes

270. The demolition and construction of the estate is likely to result in temporary traffic management works that may affect the amenity of cyclists owing to the closure of existing cycle routes across the site and temporary restrictions. Temporary routes and diversions are estimated to have short-medium term negative severance effects in the absence of mitigation in the ES. These changes will be most marked when construction commences for development parcels immediately adjacent to Thurlow Street.
271. As part of a phased Demolition and Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) details will be required setting out how construction traffic will be managed and its impact minimised for cyclists and pedestrians. Some disruption to footway and cycle routes will be unavoidable given the nature of this project and the period of construction and the CLP will need to demonstrate that consideration has been given to pedestrians and cyclists of all abilities to ensure that high levels of safety awareness is at the core of construction operations, particular with regarding to vehicle movement on the surrounding road network. It will be a requirement for construction vehicle drivers, particularly for Large and Heavy Good Vehicles to have received valid cycle awareness training in accordance with the Freight Operator Recognition Scheme in order to minimise the risk of accidents from construction movements. It will also be necessary to ensure that due regard is given to minimise the impacts on and make provision for amenities during construction i.e. outdoor amenity spaces, bus stops and access to those amenities including disabled access.
272. Discussions are ongoing regarding what temporary works may will be required during the construction period, in particular works to the junction of Thurlow Street and Albany Road. This applicant is working with the council and TfL to ensure an adequate temporary solution delivered prior to the implementation of demolition and construction works so safeguard pedestrians and cyclists using this junction and key junctions in the immediate area.
273. In the completed development the detailed design of streets and cycle routes will include traffic calming measures as described above which are consistent with Southwark's 20mph borough policy. 'Quietway' cycle routes will be incorporated in the emerging street network which will be tree lined and designed to have attractive public realm that will support walking and cycling in accordance with AAAP Policy TP1 (Design streets; Policy PL 1 – Street layout).

Cycle parking

274. Cycle parking will be provided across the outline application site in line with the Further Alterations to the London Plan (London Plan 2015) cycle parking standards resulting in 5,093 spaces across the site based on the illustrative masterplan. Table X below shows the proposed level of cycle parking in the event that the maximum number of dwellings and non-residential floor space is delivered.

Table 25: Proposed cycle parking

Use class	Long stay	Short stay
A1 – A5 (retail)	15 spaces	63 spaces
B1 (office/business)	39 spaces	7 spaces
C3 (Residential)	4,829 spaces	69 spaces
D1 (Health Care and	27 spaces	44 spaces

community uses)		
Total	4,910 spaces	183 spaces

275. The design and location of cycle parking areas for all use classes will be secured as part of the Pedestrian and Cycling Delivery Plan within the legal agreement. Mandatory guidance in the design code requires cycle parking to be provided close to the entrance of buildings and public open spaces.

Cycle Hire

276. Provision will be made for two cycle hire docking stations within the outline proposal each with the capacity for up to 30 bicycles. The precise locations will be determined at reserved matters in consultation with TfL and relate to public buildings and public spaces. Details of the cycle hire docking stations including their phasing will be included in the Pedestrian and Cycling Delivery Plan.

Car parking

277. Car parking for existing residents is currently provided as a mix of on street parallel parking bays, and off street garages and parking courts. Most of the off-street parking is managed by the Housing Department under the estate parking permit regime and garage leases. The parking on the public highway (for example on Portland Street) is managed by the Highways Department (Parking Shop) and is also available as metered parking for non-residents.

278. The estate sits within the boundaries of two existing Controlled Parking Zones (CPZ) CPZ-M1 and CPZ-M2, with Thurlow Street acting as the boundary between the two areas. The two CPZ areas extend further than the Aylesbury application site boundary to the north east and west into the surrounding residential neighbourhoods.

279. The current parking availability within the estate is broadly as follows:

- On-street parking – 371 spaces (including 2 disabled)
- Off-street parking – 1,151 spaces (estate managed)
- Total – 1,522 spaces

280. However, it must be noted that some garage spaces may be used for storage rather than parking, and the informal layout of many of the parking courts may mean that they are used differently than intended. The above figure does however give an indication of the general level of parking available at present.

281. The outline application site accommodates around 2,080 residential dwellings which, on the basis of 1,522 spaces would result in a parking ratio of 0.52 spaces per unit.

282. The proposed scheme provides car parking in a mix of on site spaces in basements or undercroft (which would be available at a cost to occupiers of that block only), and on-street spaces which would be unallocated and available under a permit regime. Since it is assumed that all trafficked streets would be adopted and managed by the council as Highways Authority, the council would be responsible for managing the on-street parking.

283. Due to the outline nature of the application, a definitive number of parking spaces is not available at present. The final number will be dependent on the detailed design of

the street layouts, which will be influenced by the site wide pedestrian and cycle delivery plan and the expectation for attractive tree-lined streets which are not dominated by parked cars. In the case of Thurlow Street and Albany Road, on-street parking will be constrained as a result of the detailed design of cycle routes, bus priority measures or junction improvements. The figures below are therefore only a guide and represent a maximum before other requirements are taken into account; more definitive figures would be produced for each phase as reserved matters are brought forward which will be in line with a site wide parking strategy.

284. The proposed development includes the following provision for parking:

- On-street spaces – up to 737
- Off-street spaces – 361
- Total – 1098 spaces

285. On the basis of an assumed maximum 2,745 new dwellings, this represents a maximum ratio of 0.4 spaces per unit in total, which is in accordance with AAAP Policy TP3. This policy notes that, within the overall aim of keeping car use down, the amount of parking must take into account public transport accessibility, transport for families, and any negative impacts from overspill parking.

Car Parking Allocations and Management

286. The applicant has explained that off street parking spaces in basement or undercroft car parks will be privately managed and restricted to the residents in those buildings. Not all blocks will have on-site parking: the submitted parameter plans show the potential for on-site parking will only be provided on development parcel 18 and along the Park Edge comprising development parcels 4, 14, 16 and 17. It is proposed that dwelling houses will be reliant on on-street parking spaces. It also recognised that on-site basements or podia may not be built, or may accommodate less parking than currently anticipated, and some residents may opt to seek a Highways parking permit rather than purchase an on-site parking space. With 2,745 residential units being provided there is the potential for demand to exceed the supply of on-street spaces. A strategy therefore needs to be put in place to manage the demand for spaces as well as a mechanism to ensure any new parking stress does not disadvantage existing residents in neighbouring streets.

287. To manage the impact of overspill parking on adjoining residential streets it is proposed that a new Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) will be created that covers the entire outline application site and the FDS. This would ensure that all on-street parking generated as a result of these developments is contained within the new streets and within the existing estate boundaries. This would give reassurance to surrounding residents that their ability to park a reasonable distance from their own homes will not be adversely affected by any parking from these new developments. This is consistent with the approach in TP3 which expects parking levels to take into account the availability of capacity in nearby controlled parking zones.

288. Whilst the proposed parking level of 0.4 spaces per unit would exceed the current car ownership levels on the estate this is the maximum permitted under AAAP Policy TP3. The level of parking provided on the estate will in practice be contingent on the proposal of other street elements including disabled parking bays, servicing bays and pedestrian and cycle facilities. Future car ownership levels are likely to be affected by

the new tenures and dwelling types and continuing trends towards increased public transport and cycle use. Nonetheless, in terms of the on-street parking bays, it is reasonable to assume that there will need to be a system to ration the allocation of spaces. For instance, if every new household applied for a permit, then this would result in 3.7 cars per available space. This may lead to conflict between residents, and complaints to the Highways Department. It is therefore recommended that the legal agreement secures a Parking Delivery Plan with reviews of that plan at every subsequent reserved matter or such time that is considered appropriate.

289. The Parking Delivery Plan will need to be agreed in the first instance for the FDS and subsequently for each phase brought forward under the outline application. The following principles will underpin the detailed strategy which will be reviewed on a phase by phase basis.
290. Firstly, no household would be entitled to no more than one permit. In most parts of Southwark, households can apply for more than one permit, however, due to the limited availability of on-street parking here, it is proposed that this would be an equitable means of distributing the permits.
291. Secondly, existing Aylesbury residents will be given priority, particularly as many will be rehoused in new homes on the estate and some of these residents will own cars, and may be reliant on them for work or family reasons. It is therefore proposed that, to avoid these residents being disadvantaged by the move, any relocating residents, who already have an estate permit or garage, should be able to apply for a permit under the new CPZ regime.
292. Parking provision should take into consideration transport for families in accordance with AAAP Policy TP3 (Parking Standards: Residential). Therefore it will be necessary to restrict the quantity of permits available across the new CPZ by prioritising family units. Regular reviews of permit allocations and parking stress will be undertaken on a phase by phase basis and upon completion of the master plan and will inform any future adjustments for the permit allocation policy.
293. The Parking Delivery Plan will detail phasing of the new CPZ. The parking density will be regularly monitored and if parking levels are able to cope with a greater allocation this will be decided at the appropriate time. Those residential addresses that are not allocated a permit will be designated car free and unable to receive a council on-street permit.
294. In addition to permit allocation, the Parking Delivery Plan will also detail:
 - The location and design of all on-street car parking spaces.
 - The location and design of loading bays
 - The location and number of car club bays
 - Provision of ambulance, doctor and drop off bays
 - The requirement for any pay and display parking
 - The design and layout of off-street parking bays
 - The allocation of off-street parking bays, including provision for disabled persons
 - The location and timings of the new CPZ including permit allocation.

295. Parking provision will be provided for wheelchair users and disabled drivers that is conveniently located to their homes. However, many of the plots (including the houses) will not have any dedicated on-site parking. Any disabled person who holds a 'Blue Badge' is entitled to park in on-street bays and so the scheme will include on-street disabled bays interspersed around the streets. Whilst these bays cannot be allocated to an individual dwelling, if there is sufficient provision there is a realistic expectation that a disabled resident would be able to park close to their home. This will be secured as part of the Parking Delivery Plan on a phase by phase basis.
296. Up to thirteen car club spaces are proposed across the outline application. A full study of the anticipated demand and ideal locations of car club spaces will be required and with each phase and delivered in conjunction with the nominated car club provider. Free membership to the car club will be provided for each eligible adult for a minimum of three years upon first occupation. This is anticipated to reduce the demand for private car ownership and therefore the demand for parking spaces.

Servicing and waste

297. A Delivery and Servicing Plan has been submitted with the application. This shows that, of the non-residential uses, the Health Centre will generate the most vehicle trips (90 per day) including ambulances and deliveries. The other commercial uses generate relatively modest levels of vehicle movement which could be accommodated on the road network.
298. However, given that many of these uses are on Thurlow Street, which is the main bus and cycle corridor, it is important that the servicing layouts are designed to avoid either delays to buses or danger or inconvenience for cyclists. This will be a key factor in the detailed design submitted with the reserved matters. Thurlow Street is also a location for some of the high density residential blocks, which are anticipated to receive a significant number of home deliveries. It will be necessary for home deliveries to be carried out on-site, or in delivery bays off the carriageway.
299. The likely rise in home deliveries will require more service and delivery bays on the residential streets, and this will in turn impact on the level of car parking which can be provided. Servicing will need to be avoided on key movement corridors i.e. Thurlow Street to minimise the impact on pedestrian and cycle movement and buses. The Delivery and Servicing Plan will at each reserved matters application, review current usage on neighbouring plots and make sufficient provision with the design of new streets.

Highways Phasing and Construction

300. A Highways Phasing Plan will be secured through the s106, this will detail the extent of all works to the public and private highways. It will also identify when elements of the highway will be delivered and what provisions will be made during demolition and construction. In some cases a temporary surface may be required as an interim measure until construction is completed, when a full reinstatement and final finishing elements will be delivered.
301. The Phasing Plan will ensure that delivery of the highways infrastructure is agreed according to the phasing of the development and taking into account inclusive access requirements from all users including pedestrians, cyclists, public transport providers and other road users. Combined with the Construction Management Plan, it will include details of temporary segregation measures for cyclists along busy roads and

or at key junctions. Cycle training awareness will be required for all drivers of construction vehicles and a key priority of the plan will be to ensure that all efforts have been made to ensure access to buses is accommodated throughout the construction of the estate.

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

- 302. A development of this scale clearly has the potential to have significant environmental effects on the amenities and quality of life of occupiers both within the estate and in adjoining areas near to the site. The site is within an Air Quality Management Area and suffers from high levels of ambient noise, particularly in areas in close proximity to Walworth Road, Thurlow Street, Albany Road and Old Kent Road. There estate is predominantly residential but there are also a number of adjoining residential, commercial and school properties which are considered to be highly sensitive to the impacts of demolition and construction over the life time of the regeneration project. Overall there are likely to be direct, temporary, medium term impacts on the users and occupiers of these properties across all phases of the development.

Demolition and construction

- 303. The proposed phasing of demolition follows the council’s rehousing programme for the Aylesbury, the intention being to wherever possible, rehouse existing residents within new affordable dwellings as they become available, preferably on the new estate or nearby within the borough. An indicative phasing is set out in the ES which is listed below:

Development Phase	Demolition Stage	Start	Finish
Phase 2	Stage 2a	January 2016	September 2016
	Stage 2b	December 2016	February 2023
	Stage 2c	July 2017	February 2025
Phase 3	Stage 3	May 2021	January 2027
Phase 4	Stage 4a/4b/4c	June 2023	July 2028
	Stage 4d	April 2025	May 2030
	Stage 4e	April 2027	March 2035

- 304. The key principles driving the phasing is to ensure security and safety for existing and future residents throughout the development period; to not adversely impact on the continuity of utilities/heat supply to existing and future residents; and to ensure access for pedestrians, cyclists, cars, emergency vehicles and refuse collection routes is maintained at all times. Where necessary, temporary routes will need to be created to maintain access across the estate and the applicant has committed to establishing close liaison with the council, the Police and local residents groups, including the Creation Trust prior to the commencement of works and during the regeneration programme to minimise the environmental effects of the project.
- 305. The ES has assessed the impacts of demolition and construction activities on sensitive receptors taking into account their proximity to the boundaries of each of the proposed phases and the type of construction activity likely to occur at each stage of the project (i.e. demolition, substructure, construction, fit out). The key impacts identified relate to noise, vibration, traffic and air quality. The applicant modelled a ‘worst case’ scenario in addition to a typical scenario to provide a snap shot of the potential effects of construction activities without mitigation. The impacts reported

below are for the 'typical scenario' and assumes that no mitigation is in place i.e. no site hoardings or restrictions on working hours.

306. Where adverse environmental impacts are identified it is not necessarily the case that planning permission should be refused. Consideration must also be given to whether those impacts are capable of being mitigated or reduced to a level that would lessen the effects of the development on the environment or sensitive receptors. Mitigation may lessen the severity of an adverse effect which has been identified to the extent that it would not necessarily warrant the refusal of planning permission.
307. The effects reported below also take account of the proposed demolition and construction work in connection with the full application which is being considered alongside this proposal.

Noise and vibration

308. The potential for major to moderate negative noise effects have been identified in connection with demolition and construction as well as plant and machinery operating on site. Effects of minor significance are estimated to take place when works are closest to nearby vibration sensitive receptors. Effects of negligible significance are anticipated in terms of noise from construction traffic.
309. The potential for major negative noise effects occurs for dwellings on Thurlow Street and Dawes Street for all stages of Phase 3. Moderate negative noise effects are anticipated for dwellings on Surrey Square, Surrey Grove, Kinglake Street and Bagshot for the duration of Phase 2; for the majority of existing and future receptors over the duration of demolition and construction works in connection with the FDS and Phase 3; and for Michael Faraday School during Phase 4. Minor negative noise effects are anticipated for Michael Faraday School during the demolition and construction phases of the FDS; and for the majority of existing and future occupiers during Phase 2 and 4.

Mitigation

310. Temporary screens or hoardings at the construction boundary would significantly attenuate noise impacts where a receptor is within direct line of sight. The ES recommends that noisy work in the vicinity of Michael Faraday School and the nearby Academy of Engineering should take place outside of term time wherever practicable and work generally programmed to minimise disturbance during lesson periods. A suite of noise mitigation measures are recommended including strict site working hours, adherence to best practice equipment and construction methods that would reduce most the anticipated effects to be of minor negative significance. Occasional effects of moderate to major negative significance may occur during some activities when works are at their closest to nearby sensitive receptors and protocols to minimise these effects and those associated with vibration will need to be secured to minimise potential effects.
311. Officers are satisfied that if the noise and vibration control measures cited in the ES are implemented the proposed development could reduce its impact on the surrounding population. It is also recommended that liaison is undertaken with the council's Environmental Protection Team well in advance of the submission of a site specific Construction Environmental Management Plan so that it is possible to ensure appropriate and adequate mitigation and controls are applied throughout the construction of the development. It will be necessary for continuous noise monitoring

to take place across the site in order to establish noise and vibration action levels that will assist in controlling noise and vibrations effects at sensitive noise receptor locations. This will be secured by planning agreement as part of a Demolition and Construction and Environmental Management Plan.

Completed development

312. Taking account of the residential character of the immediate area new noise generating sources from the development will need to be designed to ensure it doesn't adversely impact upon existing and future residential occupiers. New buildings will need to be designed to safeguard residential amenity. Where appropriate, noise tests may need to be undertaken prior to the occupation of non-residential units.

Air quality

313. The principal air quality impacts that are likely to result will come from demolition, earthworks and the storage of aggregates on site. Taking account of the sensitivity of the surrounding area the ES estimates that potential for direct, temporary, medium and long term impacts on nearby residential properties of moderate significance.

Mitigation

314. Control measures to minimise nuisance from dust, including the erection of hoardings, dust suppression techniques and dampening of surfaces will need to be secured as part of a Demolition and Construction Environmental Management Plan. It is recommended that protocols to minimise dust and monitor effects over the course of the development should be secured by planning condition to minimise potential effects and ensure robust management of impacts.

Completed development

315. The ES states that impacts of the completed scheme on air quality would be negligible. Emissions from the energy centre and the development would be in compliance with policy standards and no additional mitigation would be required.

Transport and movement

316. The effects of demolition and construction on transport for existing and future residents will not only come from on-site operations but also from the construction traffic accessing the site. Existing residents using vehicles will be affected by temporary traffic management in the vicinity of the site and the amenity of cyclists and pedestrian may be affected owing to the closure of existing pedestrian and cycle routes and temporary restrictions on the footway. It is likely that the implementation of temporary routes and diversions across the site during construction will have a direct short-term minor negative severance effects.

Mitigation

317. A summary of impacts is set out under the transport section of this report. Traffic and temporary diversions will be controlled through a Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) which will demonstrate that adequate consideration has been given to pedestrians and cyclists and ensure that a high level of safety awareness is at the core of construction operations. Cycle awareness training will be required and it will be necessary to ensure due regard is given to minimise the impacts on and make provision for amenities of residents during construction i.e. outdoor amenity spaces, bus stops and access to those amenities including disabled access.

Completed development

318. Comprehensive redevelopment will enhance the number of routes for pedestrians and cyclist through the estate improved connections with the surrounding area as well as pedestrian and cyclist facilities at the key junctions on Albany Road. These and other improvements within the outline site and adjacent will improve cycling and pedestrian amenity. Improvements in public transport will also improve connections with the surrounding area.

Daylight, sunlight and overshadowing (DSO) analysis

319. During the demolition phase of the development improvements are anticipated in terms of daylight, sunlight and overshadowing to dwellings and amenity spaces near the site boundary. This is by virtue of the demolition of large monolithic blocks such as Wendover and Taplow which tower over Victorian housing stock.

Completed development

320. At this outline stage the detailed design of buildings and gaps between them are unknown. An analysis of the illustrative masterplan shows what could be delivered across the site within the constraints of the parameter plans. The assessment focuses on existing properties which have windows that face directly onto the application site and has taken account of Site 7 which is under construction. The layout and design of these buildings as well as the location of habitable rooms are known and can be deduced from planning drawings. A list of all the properties that were assessed is detailed below:

- 25-57 Portland (odds) Street and 58-62 Portland Street (evens)
- 12 Villa Street
- 234-266 Merrow Street (evens) and 288-298 Merrow Street (evens)
- 98-124 Dawes Street, 128-130 Dawes Street and 69 Wooler Street
- 1-30 Everett House
- 153-197 East Street (odds)
- 27-31 Alvey Street
- 66 Surrey Square
- Favesham House, Kinglake Street
- 1-20 Tenterden House, Kinglake Street
- 15-37 Bagshot Street (odds) and 47-53 Bagshot Street (odds)
- Site 7 – Consented scheme under construction (12/AP/2332)
- Naylor House, Flint Street
- Domville Court, Bagshot Street

Assessment of daylight impacts

321. Three tests were used to assess the potential daylight impacts at these properties all of which are in accordance with BRE Guidance (2011). Across the outline boundary a total of 712 windows were assessed.
322. The first test (25 degree line method) was used to identify where the presence of new buildings that may impact upon daylight received at existing properties. A total of 396 windows (56%) passed the 25 degree line test and for these windows the development was assessed as being unlikely to have noticeable effects. A more detailed assessment was undertaken to calculate the potential loss of daylight to the remaining windows within buildings that did not pass the 25 degree test (316).

323. The second test was a more detailed assessment which looked at Vertical Sky Component (VSC). This is a measure of daylight reaching the outside face of a window. A VSC of 27% is normally recommended as a benchmark and the majority of remaining windows passed this test (77%) although a number of windows (74 windows) were assessed to have a VSC of less than 27% after the development. Whilst these windows would not have a VSC of 27%, this assessment does not take account of the existing situation in terms of daylight to those windows. The height, and massing of existing estate buildings impacts on the amount of daylight received at windows near the estate boundary and the vast majority of those assessed do not currently achieve a VSC of 27%.
324. Sixty six of the 74 windows (89%) currently experience a VSC that is significantly below the recommend minimum (27%). Analysis of existing and proposed VSC shows that there are a number of properties where VSC will improve from the existing situation. This is particularly the case for 21-31 Alvey Street and windows on the East and South Elevation of the consented development on Site 7 where improvements in VSC of around 30-35% on average occur. In accordance with BRE guidance, a comparison test which examines the impact on the assessed property compared with the existing situation was undertaken.
325. The third test (Comparison method) considered the existing VSC in relation to VSC results of the final completed development. Where VSC in the completed development is lower than 27% the existing situation was analysed. If the proposed VSC was less than 0.8 times its former value (i.e. more than 20% reduction), occupants of the building are likely to notice the reduction in the amount of daylight.
326. Each window which failed the 25 degree test was compared with the existing situation (316 windows). Three hundred and nine (309) of those windows were assessed to have acceptable impacts (no losses above 20% of former value) with some windows likely to experience noticeable improvements in daylight. Seven of the 316 windows assessed were identified as having the potential to experience moderate negative effects based on the comparison test. For those windows a reduction in daylight was considered likely to be noticeable.
327. Two of the windows relate to 58-62 Portland Street, a residential property with windows that front onto Roland Way. Ground floor windows on its flank elevation are likely to be affected by the erection of a new residential block to the south of these windows. The parameter plans would allow for up to a three storey building at this part of the site where currently there are no buildings. Whilst the proposed impact would be noticeable it would be possible to remedy the situation by increasing the distance between the proposed and existing building or by adjusting its height at the detailed design stage. The identified impacts could be successfully managed as part of a reserved matters application.
328. The remaining five windows relate to 128-130 Dawes Street which is a two storey property with a ground floor corner shop frontage. Its retail function appears to have ceased and the property occupied for residential use. The ground and upper floors are estimated to experience a reduction in VSC of between 44-49% from 27 to 15 on the upper floors and 26 to 13 at ground floor level.
329. Officers anticipate similar impacts could occur for the property known as The Queen Anne Public House (126 Aylesbury Road), which sits to the north of the site on the

corner of Dawes Street and Aylesbury Road. This property did not form part of the daylight assessment but officers have considered that effects on occupiers could be of an order that is similar to that stated for 128-130 Dawes Street. No objections were received from either of these properties but the likely effects are estimated to be moderate adverse.

330. The effects result from an increase in the maximum height of development parcel 18 which was reconfigured during the course of the application. Currently there are play areas on the site, and the western bookend of the Northchurch Block which is four storeys. The parameter plans would allow a building of up to 8 storeys that would accommodate a health centre and community facilities. The detailed design of the building is not known but the scheme would allow for a building of greater height than existing.
331. Whilst the impact would be noticeable the potential to successfully minimise these impacts could be dealt with through detailed design by increasing the distance between the proposed and existing buildings or by adjusting its height.

Sunlight

332. Only windows facing 90 degrees of due south were considered for this assessment, in accordance with BRE guidance. Three tests were used to assess the potential sunlight impacts in accordance with BRE Guidance (2011). Across the outline boundary a total of 407 windows were assessed.
333. The first test (25 degree line method) was used to identify where the presence of new buildings that may impact upon sunlight received at existing properties. A total of 204 windows (50%) passed the 25 degree line test meaning the development was assessed as being unlikely to have noticeable effects. A more detailed sunlight assessment was undertaken to calculate the potential effects on the remaining windows within buildings that did not pass the 25 degree test (203).
334. The second test was a more detailed assessment which looked at Annual Probable Sunlight Hours (APSH) and Winter Probable Sunlight Hours (WPSH). BRE guidance states that at least one window to a main living room should receive at least 25% of annual probable sunlight hours and at least 5% of sunlight hours during the winter. If a room has two windows on opposite walls the annual probable sunshine hours can be added together. The majority of windows assessed passed this test (94%). Twelve windows were assessed to not meet the APSH test, but this assessment does not take account of the existing situation in terms of sunlight daylight to those windows which are impacted by the height and massing of existing estate buildings.
335. The third test (Comparison method) considered the existing sunlight situation with the sunlight results of the final completed development. Where sunlight in the completed development is lower than APSH standard, the existing situation was analysed. If the proposed sunlight hours was less than 0.8 times its former value (i.e. more than 20% reduction), occupants of the building are likely to notice the reduction in the amount of sunlight.
336. The results of the analysis show that none of the remaining windows would experience noticeable sunlight impacts.

Overshadowing

337. BRE guidance recommends that for outdoor amenity areas to be adequately sunlit throughout the year at least half of a garden or amenity area should receive at least 2 hours of sunlight on 21 March. The results of the analysis indicate that the all, but one amenity space would continue to achieve good levels of sunlight in the completed development. One amenity space at 101 Mina Road is likely to experience a minor negative effect but this could be mitigated to become a negligible effect through detailed design.

Summary

338. The results of the analysis indicate that good daylight, sunlight can be achieved under this proposal. Daylight and sunlight impacts will be key consideration at the detailed reserved matters stage for adjacent properties near the boundary of the development.

Outlook and Privacy

339. Residential properties face onto the proposed development at several locations and guidance regarding outlook and privacy is set out in the Residential Design Standards SPD. 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.
340. Based on the parameter plans this distance can be achieved, however it will be necessary for the detailed design to ensure adequate separation particularly where there is a dramatic change in height between the proposed and existing context. This is a detailed design matter that can be dealt with adequately at reserved matters.

Telecommunications

341. The main effects associated with demolition and construction would be the temporary use of cranes and signal blocking associated with the physical size of the crane(s) and buildings under construction. Signal reflection caused by the metallic structure of the crane(s) or reflective building facades can have potential effects. Not all households on the estate are dependent on terrestrial TV as primary source of TV. A number of properties surrounding the site were observed to have externally mounted satellite TV dishes. Notwithstanding this, by virtue of the low mass of cranes, their effect on television signal is considered likely to be negligible. Any potential effects have been reported to be short term and not long lasting.

Impact of trees

342. Trees

Trees are an attractive part of the existing estate and the retention of existing trees has influenced the layout of the outline application. The AAAP makes no specific mention of tree protection or retention but Appendix 6 of the document expects trees to be selected for shade and outlook and biodiversity, and the use of semi-mature species to enhance the environment. London Plan policy 7.5 expects new development to seek opportunities for greening of the urban area and for existing trees of value to be retained and any loss replaced under a 'right tree, right place' approach (London Plan Policy 7.5 - Public realm; and Policy 7.21 – Trees and Woodland). The Core Strategy also seeks to protect trees, and to improve the overall greenness of places recognising that trees make areas more pleasant and attractive (SP11 Open spaces and wildlife) Table X lists the number of trees by category within

the outline site.

Table 26: Aylesbury Estate Trees – grouped by category

Category	No. of Trees: Tamla Tree Survey (2014)
A	1
B	153
C	127 individuals(including 7 groups)
U	134 individuals(including 8 groups)
Total	414

343. The applicant submitted a tree survey dated September 2014, carried out by Tamla Trees which is based on the methodology set out in BS 5837 (Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction). The council's Urban Forester has confirmed that the methodology and assumptions underpinning this survey are sound. The survey details the location, species, size, health and expected lifespan of each tree within the outline development (and separately the FDS). The trees are categorised under the standard classifications for grades, namely:

- Grade A – trees of a high quality and value, which make a substantial contribution to amenity. Usually have an assumed life expectancy of over 40 years;
- Grade B – trees of a moderate quality and value, which make a significant contribution to amenity. Usually have an assumed life expectancy of over 20 years;
- Grade C – trees of a lower quality and value, making an adequate contribution to amenity and with an assumed life expectancy of over 10 years;
- Grade U – the condition of these trees means any existing value would usually be lost within 10 years – these would not be expected to be retained in redevelopments, so would not be a constraint.

344. Table 27 below summarises the proposed tree loss across the outline scheme and demonstrates that the majority of category A and B trees will be retained. These trees are mainly located on Thurlow Street and Albany Road and considered to provide significant amenity value.

Table 27: Retained and removed trees

	Trees retained	Tree removed	Total
Category A	1	0	1
Category B	117	36	153
Category C	22	104	120
Category U	1	133	103
Total	141	273	414

345. Overall it is proposed to remove 273 trees which in numerical terms is significant. However officers are satisfied that the layout of the outline scheme has retained the majority of trees that provide value. Discounting U category trees which would not normally be considered a constraint due to their limited life expectancy, the loss of trees is estimated to equate to a loss of 51.4 metres of stem girth, for which replacement is required where feasible.

Tree replacement and tree planting strategy

346. Five hundred and twenty eight (528) new trees are proposed to be planted within the area covered by the outline application which will be planted within streets, parks, public squares and communal courtyards. When including the 141 existing trees that will be retained, it is estimated that there will be a net gain of 255 trees above the existing tree baseline. However, this calculation does not take account of the projected canopy cover of trees, stem girth or species of new trees which will contribute to the street scene which at the outline stage has not been determined.
347. The proposed strategy is seeking to compensate for the removal of existing healthy trees on a minimum like-for-like basis by providing equivalent new stem girth and tree canopy cover, when projected to a date 15 years after planting. This approach is consistent with planning policy and the council's highways design guidance however, by virtue of the scale of tree replacement it will be challenging to ensure that stem girth and highway canopy cover targets will all be met within the site without compromising other design objectives. Whilst the broad strategy is agreeable, it is recommended that an off-site strategy is secured that can be reviewed which would address any shortfall should the full equivalent tree replacement on site not be better achieved. This will be secured through a tree replacement strategy in the legal agreement that will set out the mechanism for compensation if tree replacement targets are not met. The strategy will be used to review tree replacement on a phase by phase basis.

Protection and enhancement of existing trees

348. The 141 retained trees are located on streets, as key groups and as better quality individuals. During demolition and construction it is proposed to safeguard existing trees using hoardings and root protection techniques to ensure piling does not adversely impact upon the roots of these trees. Detailed root investigation works will be undertaken as part of construction works as well as site monitoring to ensure retained trees are protected throughout demolition and construction phases. A Tree protection and enhancement method statement will need to be provided in accordance with advice given in the arboricultural statement and will be secured by a planning condition.

Ecology

349. There are no statutory designated ecological habitats of international, national or regional significance in or around the site. The estate is a highly urbanised environment, dominated by buildings and hardstanding with amenity grassland, scattered trees and shrubs in associated courtyard areas. Notwithstanding this the following habitats and fauna have been identified as sensitive receptors and potential environmental effects have been assessed.

Receptor	Nature Conservation Value of Receptor	Potential pathways to be considered
Habitats (Non statutory sites) and flora		
Burgess Park (46.25ha)	Borough importance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Degradation resulting from air quality changes (i.e. dust deposition during construction and operational phase; and • Enhancement resulting from increased habitat

		connectivity
Surrey Square (1.17ha)	Local importance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Degradation resulting from air quality changes (i.e. dust deposition during construction and operational phase; and • Enhancement resulting from increased habitat connectivity
On-site Habitat	Site	Potential impact pathways include enhanced and expanded habitat creation has the potential to have positive effects of greater significance.
Fauna		
Bats	Local	<p>Five species are known to be active over the estate. Potential impact pathways include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct loss (mortality and injury) during construction phase • Direct habitat loss (roost destruction) and fragmentation during demolition and construction • Disturbance (noise and light) during the construction and operational phase; and • Habitat creation and future management during the operational phase.
Birds (breeding)	Site	<p>An assemblage of breeding birds likely to be present on site. Potential impact pathways include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct loss (mortality and injury) during construction phase • Direct habitat loss (land take) and fragmentation during demolition and construction; and • Habitat creation and future management during the operational phase.
Others species of principal importance (Hedgehog)	Site	<p>Habitat is suitable for hedgehog and this species was thought likely to be present. The following was assessed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct loss (mortality and injury) during construction phase • Direct habitat loss (land take) and fragmentation during demolition and construction; and • Habitat creation and future management during the operational phase

Non-statutory sites (Burgess Park and Surrey Square)

350. The demolition of buildings has the potential to be significant source of dust pollution during the construction phase. Due to the phased nature of the development any dust deposition would be temporary, relating to the demolition of individual buildings over the course of redevelopment. In the absence of mitigation, it is anticipated that a relatively narrow band of habitat within Burgess Park and Surrey Square would be

subject to dust deposition sufficient to cause direct, temporary negative effects that are significant at the site level.

Mitigation

351. To minimise the release of dust during demolition and construction phase specific measures will need to be secured as part of the demolition and construction environmental management plan including the restriction of certain activities (i.e. incineration of materials) and management of the location of dust generating activities and methods of these activities (e.g. management and maintenance of plant and management of stockpiles). The above measures will reduce the probability, and extent of effects associated with dust deposition minimising direct temporary negative effects upon Burgess Park and Square to an acceptable level that is of negligible significance.

Bats

352. Several buildings across the estate have been identified as having the potential to support roosting bats or as exhibiting multiple features suitable for transitional/ summer roosts of crevice roosting species. In addition the removal of trees during the demolition and construction phase may impact upon lower flying species of bat (i.e. common pipistrelle) as well as discrete tasks associated with junction installations that may occasionally require night-time working. In the absence of mitigation these activities are likely to have a direct, permanent and temporary negative effect upon the bat population of significance at the local level.

Mitigation

353. The presence of bat roosts cannot be ruled out at the outline stage based on the information submitted with the application. Therefore within one year prior to demolition, where buildings that exhibit features with potential to contain bat roost, a condition will require that they must be surveyed to establish the presence of bat roosts. If roosts are confirmed to be present, mitigation may then be implemented under licence from Natural England; ensuring measures are taken to protect the conservation status of bats. This would comprise the installation of similar roosting opportunities, removal of existing roost features prior to demolition during the seasonal period when roosts are least likely to be occupied, and appropriate methods selected to avoid effects upon individual bats. Whilst demolition and construction of buildings across the estate will result in the temporary net loss of habitat for bats the completed scheme has the potential to create habitats suitable for foraging bats thus minimising the period during which habitat will not be available.

Birds (Breeding)

354. In the absence of mitigation, it is likely that demolition and construction activities during the main breeding season would have direct, permanent and temporary negative effects upon the bird population on estate. The removal of buildings and vegetation will reduce the area of suitable habitat for nesting birds.

Mitigation

355. To avoid direct effects upon birds, works requiring vegetation removal will need to be seasonally timed to avoid the main nesting season and/ or checks completed by a suitably experienced ecologist to confirm the absence of active nests prior to removal. Whilst there will be a temporary net loss of semi-natural habitat area during construction, the phased nature of the development means that there is an opportunity for habitats to be created as early development parcels are delivered which create

nesting opportunities, thus minimising the period during which habitat will not be available. Additional features suitable for nesting birds can be incorporated within new buildings on the estate such as bird boxes/bird bricks. Overall the scheme has the potential to provide a net gain in habitat available to nesting birds and minimise the potential negative effects to a short-term period at the very beginning of the demolition and construction phase.

Other Species of Principal Importance

356. In the absence of mitigation, construction activities have the potential to lead to adverse impacts on Species of Principal Importance such as hedgehog through vegetation clearance required to facilitate the development.

Mitigation

357. Hedgehogs are a mobile species and therefore over the course of the 20 year construction period they could move between locations or expand their range into the site. Management protocols will need to be established and secured by condition to ensure risks to hedgehogs during construction are minimised. However similar to that above, the phased nature of the development means that the possible negative impacts will be limited to the short term at the very beginning of demolition and construction.

Sustainable development implications

Energy centre

358. The AAP expects all development to connect to an Energy Centre with a central CHP system (AAP Policy BH6 Energy). The aspiration is for there to be no net growth of carbon emissions from the estate despite an increase in the number of dwellings as new homes are expected to be highly energy efficient.

Zero carbon growth

359. The estate is currently served by a central community heating network which provides heating and hot water to existing dwellings. The existing boilers are in need of replacement owing to their age and general condition and the need to meet more stringent energy standards.
360. The outline scheme is seeking to provide a combined heat and power plant (CHP) which would replace the existing communal system. The CHP plant is expected to reduce carbon emissions by 30% resulting in savings of 1,539 Tonnes of CO₂ per year. The table below compares the carbon emissions of this scheme, the FDS and early phases against the existing estate baseline.

Table 28: Overview of proposed carbon emissions from Aylesbury regeneration

	Carbon Dioxide emissions Tonnes CO₂ per annum (*includes unregulated emissions)
Existing estate baseline	18,400
Early phases	583.1
Detailed application	1,681.2*
Outline Application	5,999*
Total:	8,263.3

Net change against baseline:	- 10,136.7
-------------------------------------	-------------------

361. Based on the analysis above, the combined carbon emissions of the proposed and committed developments would be less than half that generated by the existing estate which demonstrates the new dwellings will be highly energy efficient compared to existing. This is a significant environmental benefit in terms of carbon emissions which is a key consideration in accordance with the AAAP (Policy BH6 Energy).

Location of energy centre

362. AAAP Policy BH6 (Energy) states that the energy supply for the action area should be generated by a CHP plant located immediately to the south of the junction of Inville Road and Thurlow Street. However, discussions at the early design stages of the outline scheme between the applicant and Energy Service Companies indicate that there may be a need to locate the energy centre closer to Burgess Park where the density of residential development is highest. The applicant has explained that a key consideration has been the supply of hot water to residential dwellings – rather than heating which in contemporary buildings is minimised through building fabric. Ongoing discussions indicate there may also be a need for a gas pressure reduction system (PRS) to operate the CHP plant which they anticipated would need to connect to existing mains nearby to Albany Road.
363. The need for the energy centre and pressure reduction system gravitates the location of the energy centre to the southern edge of the site and away from the junction of Thurlow Street and Inville Road. For this reason the applicant is proposing to meet the aspirations for an energy centre at a different location, close to Albany Road on development parcel 4.
364. The rationale for the location of the energy centre in the AAAP was that it would be at a central location within the estate, could utilise existing gas and utilities infrastructure as well as its relatively less sensitive townscape context. The option of locating it close to Albany Road adjacent to Burgess Park was an alternative that would be acceptable provided the energy centre positively contributed to the townscape and park edge; did not result in disruption caused by deliveries of fuel (i.e such as biomass) and would not prohibit connection to the existing and new dwellings at the north of the AAAP area. These are key material considerations in determining the acceptability of the proposed location.
365. At this outline stage, the detailed design and size of the Energy Centre plant are not known. Townscape analysis suggests that, under the minimum and maximum parameters buildings at this part of the site will have a moderate to major visual impact on the existing views of the park and could positively contribute to a coherent sky line to the park. Biomass is not proposed as a fuel for the CHP and so the impact of deliveries in connection with biomass would not preclude the proposed siting of the energy centre at this location. Officers have indicated that it will be necessary for all dwellings to connect to the CHP network, which the applicant is committed to and will form part of a detailed phased energy strategy.
366. Based on the analysis above the energy centre presents an opportunity for future architects to design a building that promotes the sustainability credentials of the scheme and positively contribute towards the local townscape. Subject to detailed design discussions, officers are satisfied that the principle of its location is acceptable and its detailed appearance can be carefully considered as a reserved matter.

Renewables

367. AAAP Policy BH6 (Energy) states that a 20% reduction in carbon emissions should be achieved through the use of renewable technologies. Rooftop photovoltaics will contribute towards a reduction (3%) in carbon emissions at a level that is proportionally similar to levels observed on the detailed application and early phases. Discussions with the applicant suggest it would be difficult to increase the contribution from renewables to carbon emissions reductions to achieve the policy target. Officers recognise this would be challenging taking account of the likely need to provide rooftop amenity spaces particularly for higher density blocks along the park edge where sunlight within ground floor courtyards has been assessed as likely to be limited. Rooftop photovoltaics will therefore need to be balanced with the aspiration to provide good quality amenity spaces for new residents, particularly where those roofs are south facing and will benefit from views across Burgess Park. Careful consideration will be required at the detailed design stage to ensure new development balances the need to maximise the contribution from renewables as well as provide good quality amenity space as these goals need not be mutually exclusive.

Summary

368. The applicant is also employing a 'Be Lean, Be Clean, Be Green' energy strategy. Energy supply for the scheme will be generated by a combined heat and power plant in accordance with AAAP Policy BH6 (Energy) and London Plan Policy 5.2. The contribution of renewables towards carbon reduction will however need to be balanced with the need to provide good quality amenity spaces for south facing roofspaces particularly for high density blocks.

Ground conditions hydro-geology and contamination.

369. The site is underlain by a secondary and principal aquifer and public water mains associated with the existing residential development and preliminary investigations have identified the risks that need mitigation. A range of mitigation measures are set out in the ES that would need to be in place in order to minimise the potential for adverse impacts to construction staff, public water mains on site, the secondary and principal aquifers and nearby occupiers. The Environment Agency are satisfied that these works could take place safely subject to planning conditions which are recommended.

Flood risk and surface water flooding

370. The ES states that the scheme is likely to increase the volume of run-off and impact upon the drainage system. This will require reconfiguration. Mitigation in the form of sustainable urban drainage systems including bio-retention areas, geo-cellular vaults and green roofs will need to be incorporated if the development is to achieve a 50% reduction in run-off rates above existing in accordance with guidance in the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (2009). Subject to conditions and a site wide drainage strategy officers are satisfied that measures can be put in place that ensure the scheme achieves this standard.

Water resources

371. Following initial investigation, Thames Water has identified an inability of the existing waste water infrastructure to accommodate the needs of this application. Accordingly a condition requiring the submission of details is recommended in accordance with advice from Thames Water.

Archaeology

372. Due to the scale of the Aylesbury Estate it is recommended that a programme of archaeological building recording is undertaken. At the nearby Heygate Estate, a similar type of system building, this was achieved through an examination of historic planning documentation to identify the different types of units, the recording of good examples of different unit types and general recording of the estate together with the identification of the locations of archive material and other background research.
373. It is recommended that a programme of archaeological building recording is applied to this area of the site where a written scheme of investigation can be produced, firstly, to examine documentary evidence for the types and distribution of flat types and secondly to provide for their recording on site. It is recommended that the first stage of recording should be undertaken across the site whilst it is still occupied to provide a record of the use of the buildings, not simply sterile photography.
374. Conditions have been recommended to secure a suitable written scheme of investigation and a timely archaeological report.
375. The Estate lies outside the archaeological priority zones of Southwark although the area covered by the outline there are areas of archaeological interest within development parcels.

Plot 8a and 8b

376. These two development parcels are adjacent to East Street. Records held by the Greater London Historic Environment Record indicate that there is a potential Roman road in this area which runs from Watling Street, the modern Old Kent Road west to a ford across the Thames to Westminster. It is therefore recommended that an archaeological watching brief should be maintained during groundworks in these areas.
377. Conditions have been recommended for a written scheme of investigation for an archaeological watching brief and a timely archaeological report.

Development Parcel 17c

378. This site contains the location of the former St Stephen's Church. Remains of this building are of archaeological interest. It is not assumed that this site contains a burial ground.
379. Within this plot, and in adjacent development parcels, there are likely to be geo-archaeological remains associated with a now lost river, the Earl's Sluice. This river originally rose in Ruskin Park, just off Denmark Hill and flowed to the west of Camberwell Road, crossing under this road and running through the area of the Aylesbury to the north of Albany Road, reaching and crossing the Old Kent Road at a site known as St Thomas a Watering. The river provided an important boundary in Medieval Southwark and due to antiquarian finds on the Old Kent Road, considered important enough for Daniel Defoe to report them in 'A tour through the whole island of Great Britain' it is likely to have been significant in the Roman period. Antiquarian finds reported by Defoe included a Janus head of a statue which was recovered and a second statue head, which was not recovered, together with remains of a stone and brick building built on piles. The junction of the Old Kent Road and the Earl's Sluice remained important through the medieval period as the boundary of Camberwell St Giles Parish and as the point where the Lord Mayor of London traditionally met the

King before escorting the monarch into the city. In the post-medieval period this area was also important as one of the main execution sites in the County of Surrey with a number of notable executions, including protestant martyrs during the reign of Mary.

380. Conditions are recommended for an archaeological evaluation, including geo-archaeological assessment, further archaeological mitigation works and a timely archaeological report.

Development parcels 15a, 15b, 14b and 14a

381. These four development parcels are located on the site of the former St Saviour's Union Workhouse.
382. These development parcels are also likely to contain geo-archaeological remains relating to the river formerly known as the Earl's Sluice that ran east-west to the north of Albany Road.
383. Conditions have been recommended for an archaeological evaluation, including geo-archaeological assessment, further archaeological mitigation works and a timely archaeological report.

Equalities considerations

384. Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 states that the council must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:
- (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
 - (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
 - (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.
385. An Equalities Impact Assessment was carried out of the as part of the preparation of the AAAP and this assessment has been a material consideration when assessing this proposal.
386. Consideration has been given to the outline application and the proposed programme of the Aylesbury Regeneration project and whether not it will discriminate against any particular individuals or groups. The ES has informed this assessment as well as the supporting documents submitted in connection with this application.
387. The key equalities issues identified in the AAAP EQIA can be summarised as:

Development phasing: In particular the re-housing of existing residents and relocation of other non-residential use and services within the estate. It was concluded that it would be beneficial if the phasing of development minimises the disruption of social groupings and localised communities for existing residents on the estate.

388. The phasing of the outline has been structured to reflect considerations set out in the AAAP and is seeking to:
- Minimise the number of moves for residents;
 - Minimise the number of residents that move off site;

- Allow those residents who move off site to have the right to move back into the estate at a future date should they want to, where possible;
- Provide a range of housing types within each phase including low-rise houses and medium and high-rise flats.
- Protect the health and well-being of existing and new residents by minimising disruption, maintaining security and ensuring that all redeveloped sites adhere to good place making principle during construction;
- Try to keep the community together as much as possible;
- Parcel up sites so that new development will form complete urban blocks to create a higher quality living environment and minimise disruption to the community associated with construction;
- Seek to bring forward as early as possible sites where there is potential for a large uplift in the numbers of new homes provided;
- Provide good access to community facilities throughout the regeneration process by delivering early community facilities and then phasing more facilities, shops and employment space over the course of the redevelopment.

389. The outline scheme is consistent with the phasing the development established in the AAAP and will, provide a range of housing types and tenures aimed at existing Aylesbury tenants and is seeking to provide community facilities early within the development programme to ensure the necessary social infrastructure is in place to support the new neighbourhood. Officers note that a community resource centre has already been delivered on Site 1A and community provision has also made within the new Michael Faraday School and committed as part of the detailed application. The overall equalities impact is therefore broadly considered likely to be positive across all groups in terms of the approach to the delivering development parcels.

Housing referencing

390. The process by which the housing needs and preferences of each tenant and leaseholder household on the Aylesbury Estate are discussed and assessed.

391. This will remain a key consideration over the lifetime of the regeneration programme and the applicant is working with the council to ensure decisions are fair and will not discriminate against individuals or groups. The applicant has made provision for both existing social rented tenants and leaseholders as part of a rehousing strategy which is supported. The overall equalities impact is therefore broadly considered likely to be positive across all groups and will need to be regularly reviewed as the regeneration programme progresses.

392. Maintaining effect housing management - As parts of the area are being rebuilt there will be a particular need to ensure that public and private services are delivered well to maintain a high quality of life. This will include basic environmental services – including keeping the area clean, ensuring community safety, and enabling community facilities including schools to function well.

393. An effective housing management strategy co-ordinated with a maintenance plan, a comprehensive community safety strategy and a health plan will be required to ensure the key considerations associated with maintaining effective housing management is addressed as the regeneration moves into the redevelopment phase. Strategies will be sought and required to be provided with each phase of redevelopment as the regeneration programme advances. The applicant is committed to regular liaison with

local groups as part of the demolition and construction programme providing regular updates about how the development will impact on local residents and what mitigation will be in place to minimise environmental effects. Arrangements to ensure coordinated and effective area management will be secured as part of the legal agreement which takes account of all groups.

394. Housing/density– Residents are highly diverse in terms of ethnic composition with 67% of them belonging to a minority ethnic group. Around 21% of them are over 60 years of age (compared with 14% across Southwark). There is also a relatively high proportion of lone parent households.
395. Very high standards for all new housing is proposed delivered as part of the outline application. All new homes will be designed to Lifetime Homes Standards and will be flexible enough to meet the changing lifetime needs of residents. This will prevent residents from having to move as their housing requirements change and will help to ensure that a sense of community is maintained amongst a long-term resident population.
396. There will be a range of housing types in each development block and at least 10% of all new homes will be designed to meet the needs of vulnerable groups such as the elderly and disabled including specialized housing schemes, providing appropriate level of support and homes designed for wheelchair users at each phase of the development. New homes will also be tenure blind with no visible difference between affordable and private housing. Both types of tenure will be of the same high standards of design which will help to eliminate discrimination and promote community cohesion and good relations between different groups. The overall equalities impacts are therefore broadly considered likely to be positive across all groups.
397. Transport– Temporary diversions, particularly along Thurlow Street may impact on bus services and routes through the estate which may exacerbate the need for older people, parents and carers to use unsustainable forms of transport, such as the car or equally to become less mobile.
398. Minimising severance and the impact of construction works on the mobility needs of people, in particular disabled people will be an important consideration over the regeneration programme. Highways works strategies will be secured as part of the outline application that seek to minimise severance and disruption during construction taking care to avoid circumstances where disabled people find it difficult in accessing convenient and reliable public transport due to poor design and management. This approach will coordinate key infrastructure works that needs to be delivered to support the new neighbourhood.
399. Community Facilities and other socio-economic infrastructure - The increase in population will increase the need for provision of community facilities in the area. A potential shortfall has been identified under the minimum development scenario for community space, retail and employment space and so there will be a need to carefully consider how to accommodate all members of the community within a broader socio-economic population.
400. Mitigation has been identified that will require details to be submitted which set out how community facilities and business space will be targeted and made available to local residents. It will set out how existing and proposed spaces will be used in the interim

over the course of the regeneration programme providing a mechanism that will enable space to be provided for public benefit over the medium and long term that is and can meet a range of uses such as meetings, parties, weddings, exhibitions, arts and cultural events, small scale recreation and sports, training, health related activities and faith based uses.

401. On-going discussions are taking place to relocate existing business within the estate and to provide assistance to find new premises for other uses. The applicant is investigating opportunities to provide small and affordable units for small and start-up businesses and as part of the legal agreement they will be expected to procure a proportion of the necessary goods and services required for the redevelopment from the local area in order to benefit local businesses and residents.

Summary

402. Taking the above into account, officers are satisfied that the proposed scheme will deliver a mixed and balanced community that provides for individuals and groups over the short, medium and long term. The assessment contained within this report is compatible with the council’s equalities duties and the proposal will have some beneficial impact on protected groups, the advancement of equality of opportunity and the fostering good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Planning obligations (S.106 undertaking or agreement)

403. Saved Policy 2.5 of the Southwark Plan and Policy 8.2 of the London Plan advise that planning obligations can be secured to overcome the negative impacts of a generally acceptable proposal. Saved Policy 2.5 of the Southwark Plan is reinforced by the recently adopted Section 106 Planning Obligations 2015SPD, which sets out in detail the type of development that qualifies for planning obligations. Strategic Policy 14 – Implementation and delivery of the Core Strategy states that planning obligations will be sought to reduce or mitigate the impact of developments The NPPF echoes the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulation 122 which requires obligations be:
- necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
 - directly related to the development; and
 - fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development
404. Following the adoption of Southwark’s Community Infrastructure Levy (SCIL) on 1 April 2015, much of the historical toolkit obligations such as Education and Strategic Transport have been replaced by SCIL. The Infrastructure Tariff identified in the Aylesbury Area Action Plan, is also replaced by SCIL and the where appropriate the remaining S106. Only defined site specific mitigation that meets the tests in Regulation 122 can be given weight.
405. After detailed evaluation, the following table sets out the required site specific mitigation and the applicant’s position with regard to each point. They are estimates based on the illustrative masterplan (maximum scenario).

Planning Obligation	Mitigation	Applicant position
Employment in the development	Up to £3.73 million (indexed), if 2,500 sq. m (GIA) B1 floor space requirement not delivered on site.Up to 3.1 million would be used to provide new or refurbished workspace on East	Agreed

		Street, Old Kent Road or Walworth Road with the remainder used to provide employment support in connection with this space.	
Employment during construction		<p>Minimum of 21 unemployed Borough residents into sustainable employment per year for at least six months at an average of 41 people per year.</p> <p>An average of 18 per people per year completing apprenticeships or equivalent traineeships at National Vocational Qualification (NVQ) Level 2, Advanced Apprenticeships (NVQ Level 3 or 4) and the opportunity to enrol on Foundation Degree Programme.</p> <p>Pre- and post employment training at an average of 25 people per year as well as financial support for up to 100 Borough residents per year to attain jobs.</p>	Agreed
Child play equipment		2 on site MUGAs, 10 on site public play spaces £737,786 indexed towards 5 -12+ year play in Burgess Park	Agreed
Transport site specific		Delivery of the Southwark Spine on Thurlow Street and its junction with Albany Road and East Street. The provision of improved footways, cycle signage and temporary and finished road surfacing on Portland Street, Dawes Street, East Street, Alvey Street, Bagshot Street, Albany Road and Thurlow Street. Temporary cycle safety measures and cycle routes through the development to north, south, east and west.	Agreed
Transport for London		New Bus stops on Thurlow Street and pooled contribution towards bus stop upgrade requirements on Thurlow Street and Albany Road.£3.75m (indexed) towards increased buses on the 42,100, 136, 343 with run through the estate. Further contribution of £35,000 (indexed) for six 'Legible London' signs.	Under discussion with TfL. To be resolved at Stage II referral.
Public Realm		The outline proposal includes 10 publically accessible open spaces; Street Gardens on Thurlow Street and Albany Road, Two Civic Squares and associated landscaping equipped playspace and infrastructure; community gardens.	Agreed
Archaeology		£39,116 (indexed) towards monitoring of archaeological works.	Agreed
Health		The development will deliver a new health centre on the Aylesbury Estate to mitigate the	Agreed

	impacts of the development with a contribution from other sources of funding. Limits on occupation of the development will be controlled by ensuring delivery of the health centre.	
Cycle Hire	Provision of 2 stations with up to 30 docking bays. £200,000 (indexed) to cover the cost of delivery and maintenance.	Agreed
Car Club	Provision of between 10 to 13 car club bays and 3 years membership for each eligible resident.	Agreed
Trees	Full provision made on site. Further mitigation in the form of a contribution where targets are not met on a phase by phase basis. Where tree replacement targets are not met then a payment of £XX per tree for new trees in Burgess Park, Surrey Square and Faraday Gardens or other spaces to be agreed.	TBC
Community facilities	A financial contribution of £583,570 (indexed), if less than 1,150 sq.m (GIA) of early education and childspace is delivered and less than 500 square metres of flexible community space. The contribution would be used to provide new or refurbished community space or pre-school facilities in Faraday Ward.	Agreed
Administration charge (2%)	£15,538.04. This figure is indicative. A higher sum will arise if the employment or community space is not delivered.	Agreed.

S106 provisions

406. The S106 Agreement will also secure the affordable housing as well as the standard of fit out and marketing period for the wheelchair accessible homes and an Estate Management Plan. The contributions and in lieu works detailed in the table above will also be secured under the S106 Agreement alongside any S.278 Highways works and amendments to the traffic management order. The Parking Delivery Plan will be included as an obligation within the S106 and will need to be formally approved by the council.
407. In the event that an agreement has not been completed by 31 July 2015, the Committee is asked to authorise the Head of Development Management to refuse permission, if appropriate, for the following reason:
408. In the absence of a signed Section 106 Agreement, there is no mechanism in place to avoid or mitigate the impact of the proposed development on affordable housing, public realm, health, affordable housing, the transport network, community facilities or employment and the proposal would therefore be contrary to AAAP Policy D2 'Infrastructure funding', Saved Policy 2.5 'Planning Obligations' of the Southwark Plan and Policy 14 - 'Implementation and delivery' of the Southwark Core Strategy, the Southwark Supplementary Planning Document 'Section 106 Planning Obligations' 2015, and Policy 8.2 Planning obligations of the London Plan.'

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

409. 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 is a material “local financial consideration” in planning decisions. The requirement for Mayoral and Southwark CIL is a material consideration. However, the weight to be attached to a local finance consideration remains a matter for the decision-maker.
410. Southwark CIL (SCIL) in this location has a residential rate of £50 per square metre, £125 for retail and zero for other proposed uses. SCIL is to be used for infrastructure that supports growth with a Southwark commitment to spend at least 25% locally.
411. Based on a maximum of 262,381 sq. m (GIA) residential and a maximum of 2,500 retail (A1, A3, A4) the estimated SCIL charge is £13,422,841.25. This estimate does not take account floorspace which may be exempt under the regulations and could reduce SCIL to £3,570,100. The final sum will be dependant on floorspace and agreed at reserved matters stage.

Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy

412. In accordance with London Plan Policy 8.3 the Mayoral Community Infrastructure Levy (MCIL) came into effect on 1 April 2012. All new developments that create 100sq.m or more additional floorspace are liable to pay the Mayoral CIL which is charged at £35 per square metre (indexed at current £40.02 per sq.m). Based on a maximum total floorspace of 272,594 sqm it is estimated that the MCIL charge for this development is £10, 909,211.88 and could reduce MCIL to £2,832,175.38. The final sum will be dependant on floorspace and agreed at reserved matters stage.

Conclusion on planning issues

413. The outline application scheme, following on from the FDS proposal, will transform the Aylesbury Estate. The fundamental failings of the estate design, with its monolithic blocks and poor pedestrian environment, the limited range of housing types and lack of integration with the surrounding area, meant that refurbishment could never secure an acceptable long term sustainable future for the area. The AAAP aims to create a mixed tenure area, with a range of good quality housing types, open spaces and community and work spaces, all clearly linked into the surrounding streets: a neighbourhood rather than an estate.
414. The adopted AAAP is the key planning policy document for the area and has very significant weight in determining applications. Any application which complies with the AAAP, and provides a sustainable form of development, would under the NPPF be presumed to be acceptable, unless any significant adverse effects of the proposal were identified.
415. The Outline application would deliver up to 2745 new homes, as well as employment, community, health and retail floorspace, all based on a network of new or improved streets. Due to the outline nature of the application, for a scheme to be delivered over an 18 year period, it is appropriate that the proposal incorporates flexibility to respond to changing circumstances and demands. The Development Specification therefore includes ‘minimum’ and ‘maximum’ scenarios for residential and non-residential floorspace. The illustrative masterplan demonstrates that the maximum scenario is not an unrealistic prospect, subject to detailed design, and either scenario could

incorporate a good range of housing types and sizes, as well as supporting infrastructure such as corner shops and space for small and medium sized businesses.

416. The layout provides a clear structure, with a grid of streets onto which the new dwellings face. This allows for good permeability, and a safe and legible pedestrian and cycling environment. The layout is less rigid than that shown in the AAAP, and this would create more interesting streets, with changing views, and the off-set junctions would deter rat-running traffic. The new streets link well into the surrounding area, easing movement into and through the area. A clear hierarchy of streets has been created, reflecting the scale and density of development and the role of the street in terms of vehicle and pedestrian movement. The plot layout has been designed to safeguard the public transport route along Thurlow Street, as well as the Southwark north-south cycle spine, as set out in the draft Cycling Strategy. The design for the cycle spine has not yet been formalised, and would need to be subject to consultation, and this will be led by the council. The parameter plans allow for sufficient space between building plots to accommodate a range of options, including cycle segregation, and the developer has committed to delivery as part of the masterplan. Detailed design of the route by the developer at this stage would be premature, and could exclude options coming forward through consultation. It is acceptable that the plans give flexibility for a range of options to be considered, which also take into account the desire to retain trees, to ensure safe and attractive routes for pedestrians, and convenient access for buses.
417. The submitted Design Code establishes a series of distinct character areas, reinforcing the transformation of the area from a singular estate to a series of distinct areas within the new neighbourhood. These character areas respond to the nature of the surrounding townscape, and the scale and character of the streets onto which they face. Albany Road is described as a Park road, defining the edge of Burgess Park. Thurlow Street is the 'High Street', a focus for community activities, and commercial uses, with the public transport corridor and cycle spine. Other areas are more modest in scale, and are predominately residential, linked by the Community Spine.
418. The application does not include the two 'Green Fingers' shown in the AAAP. Instead, the masterplan includes a series of parks and open spaces distributed through the new neighbourhood. These provide the play and community functions anticipated for the Green Fingers, but could each have a more differentiated character, and act as the focal point for their local community. The traffic calmed and tree lined streets would provide the attractive routes to and from Burgess Park envisaged for the Green Fingers. Overall, this deviation from Policy PL1 of the AAAP is positive in terms of the total open space provision, and would adequately address the wider objectives in the AAAP in terms of open space and movement.
419. The distribution of heights and density of buildings reinforces the character areas, with the taller building generally located on Albany Road and to a lesser extent Thurlow Street, and the lower density townhouse blocks closer to the edges of the estate closer to the Liverpool Grove Conservation area. This complies with the requirements of policy BH2 'Density and distribution of homes', and the overall density is below the maximum set out in the AAAP.
420. AAAP policy PL4 'Building heights' expects buildings along Albany Road, Thurlow Street and their hinterlands to be mostly between 7 and 10 storeys, with two local

landmark buildings of 10-15 storeys, and one district landmark, of 15-20 storeys, this on the corner of Albany Road and Thurlow Street. The parameter plans show a larger number of tall buildings: three at 15-20 storeys along Albany Road, and four at 10-15 storeys on Thurlow Street and Albany Road. The impact on this additional height in terms of local views has been tested using the maximum envelope achievable under the parameter plans. This shows that the tall buildings, carefully located to identify key junctions and focal points, could have a positive impact on the skyline, aiding legibility and creating a distinctive silhouette. Subject to high quality design, based on the requirements of the AAAP and the Design Code, these tall buildings would add to the character of the new neighbourhood. As such, the distribution of building heights, and the number, height, and design quality of the tall buildings is considered to be acceptable notwithstanding the deviation from policy PL4.

421. The illustrative masterplan shows a mix of towers, perimeter blocks and terraces of houses, which directly face the new streets. The 'plot extents' plan and Design Code show that the entirety of the buildings, including all front gardens and balconies, would be included within the development parcels, leaving sufficient space between the plots for generous tree-lined streets. The layout and design of the FDS illustrates the quality of housing, and quality of street design, which could be achieved across the masterplan.
422. The development is capable of providing a wide range of housing types and sizes. The final mix will be determined with the submission of each reserved matters application, but the illustrative masterplan demonstrates the range of housing types which the masterplan can supply. Although the Development Specification sets out the minimum threshold for unit sizes, consistent with AAAP policy BH4 'Size of Homes' the illustrative plans does indicated that, even at a maximum 2745 units, an enhanced number of very large units could be achieved. A Housing Delivery Plan would be secured to secure delivery of a mix of housing types throughout the phases of delivery.
423. The AAAP recognises that the delivery of high quality homes, including affordable homes, is a key objective of the estate regeneration. It requires 50% of the new housing to be affordable. The Outline application will follow delivery of Phase 1 (consisting of Phase 1A, Site 7, and the FDS application), and the delivery of affordable housing will take into account the provision across the entirety of the redevelopment. The developer has committed to there being no net loss of affordable housing overall (as measured in habitable rooms), and that 50% of the new affordable housing (again in terms of habitable rooms) will be affordable. Of the affordable housing on the outline site, 75% would be social rented and 25% intermediate. The amount and mix of affordable housing complies with AAAP policy BH3 'Tenure Mix', and the GLA have indicated that they are satisfied that this is the maximum amount of affordable housing that the scheme could support. The affordable housing would be built to the required larger floor areas, and include private amenity space and flexible floor layouts. The FDS has demonstrated the commitment to deliver a genuinely integrated and tenure blind development. The quality of the affordable homes will be significantly higher than the existing flats, easier to heat and to maintain, and with high quality communal space. This, together with the affordability assured by the social rent tenure, is a major benefit of this redevelopment. The objections to the principle of redevelopment, and the concern about lack of affordability, are noted. However, the amount and tenure of affordable housing are consistent with the AAAP, which as an up to date policy document holds considerable weight in determining this application.

The AAAP recognised that the fundamental shortcomings of the estate, in terms of layout and design, could not be overcome through refurbishment, and that redevelopment offered the best opportunity to create a truly sustainable future for the area and its residents.

424. The parameter plans indicate that some blocks could include undercroft or basement car parking, but many would be reliant on on-street parking within the new streets. The total amount of parking will not exceed the 0.4 spaces per unit adopted as a maximum on the AAAP. It will be important that the new streets do not feel dominated by parked cars, and that pedestrian and cycle movement and safety are prioritised. The availability of parking permits for the on street spaces will need to be managed to avoid parking stress, and it is recommended that a new Aylesbury CPZ be designated to avoid overspill parking impacting on nearby streets. Car club bays have been incorporated to offer an alternative to private car ownership, which can reduce pressure on on-street parking. The Development Specification sets out the provision of cycle parking across the site, but detailed design for the cycle storage will need to be submitted with each reserved matter. The application is considered to meet the requirements of AAAP Policy TP3, and the expectations in Appendix 6 relating to design.
425. The development would necessitate the loss of a number of trees; whilst none are subject to Tree Preservation Orders, a number do have amenity value, including 1 Grade A specimen. The masterplan was designed to retain key trees and groups of trees including those on prominent street frontages such as Thurlow Street and Albany Road, which offer the greatest visual amenity. Retention of a greater number of trees would preclude the creation of a clear network of streets with well defined frontages. On balance, the scheme is considered to maximise the possible tree retention, and design changes were made to retain additional trees, although the impact of trees will need to be further examined with each reserved matters application. The indicative tree planting strategy includes trees on streets and in new parks and open spaces, and trees will be selected for their biodiversity value and year round interest, and include native species. The intention is to ensure full tree replacement, in line with London Plan policy 7.21 'Trees and Woodlands', but if at the detailed design stage this is not practicable, additional tree planting will be required nearby in Burgess Park, or other local open spaces. These new trees, selected on 'right tree, right place' principles, would mature with the new neighbourhood, adding to the overall sustainability of the development.
426. The CIL and s106 contributions would support the infrastructure needs of the development. These are in line with the expectations in the AAAP, updated in line with more recent legislation and policy. The development will deliver a hub of new community facilities at Aylesbury Square, including a large new health centre, meeting the infrastructure needs of the new population.
427. The development is expected to achieve the no carbon growth aspiration of the AAAP, and the higher design specification for the new homes will reduce their energy use. The outline scheme would include a single CHP energy centre, and although its location is at variance with the Policy BH6 of the AAAP, the justification for the relation is accepted to be appropriate.
428. The ES identified no significant adverse impacts which could not be mitigated through detailed design or conditions. The development would not harm the amenities of

neighbouring occupiers in terms of daylight or privacy, and would protect and enhance the setting of nearby heritage assets. The detailed impacts will be further assessed at the reserved matters stage for each parcel, when the final form of each building is known.

429. In conclusion, the scheme is considered to be a positive response to the AAAP objectives and will provide a range of types and sizes of new homes to expand housing choice. The development provides full replacement for all existing affordable housing, measured by habitable rooms, and the new affordable housing will include a much higher proportion of larger family units, including houses with gardens. 50% of the new housing will be affordable, and the majority of this (75%) is social rented, making the homes genuinely affordable. The balance, of intermediate tenures, affordable housing, widens local housing choice, catering those aspiring to home ownership or perhaps leaseholders wishing to remain in the area.
430. The scheme provides a sustainable form of development, in line with NPPF, increasing the density on a brown field site as part of a plan-led regeneration programme. It is therefore recommended that planning permission be granted, subject to conditions, and the mitigation provided through the s106 agreement.

Community impact statement

431. 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.
432. A Statement of Community Involvement was submitted which details the consultation carried out by the application. A series of community engagement events that took place to inform the development of the proposal which commenced in March 2014. Over 30 meetings were held with residents and local stakeholders to discuss the plan and identify issues including how to best engage groups and representatives in the local area. Excursions were arranged for local residents to visit examples of other housing schemes developed and managed by the applicant as well as Public exhibitions held at Thurlow Lodge and the Southwark Resource Centre.
433. Local groups were approached to take part in discussions including Friends of Burgess Park, Southwark Living Streets, the Creation Trust, Michael Faraday School, Walworth Academy the Aylesbury Medical Centre, Tykes Corner Parent and Toddler Group, Southwark Cyclists, East Street Traders, Cooltan Arts. A range of methods were used to consult these groups and individuals including public exhibitions, 1-21 meetings, Pop-ups, design workshops and presentations providing opportunities for feedback to be given that would inform the design development of the outline proposal as well as help locals understand the planning process.
434. An overview of consultation carried out between March 2014 and August 2014 is provided below:

Consultation event	Number of events	Total attendance
NHH development visits	2	28
Pop ups	5	100+

Public exhibitions	4	368
Public workshops	3	36
Public presentations	2	30
Outreach/Education	5	170
Total	21	732+

435. An overview of feedback from consultation and publicity is summarised below:

Consultation tool	Number of comments
Canvas Cards	72
Feedback forms	77
Quick comment cards	80
Interactive board comments	30+
Total	250+

436. Among key comments is the aspiration for the proposal to improve connections between Burgess Park and the redeveloped estate for cyclists as well as making provision for good quality open spaces and youth facilities. It was also raised that there is a need for a community centre/hub to replace Thurlow Street, to keep trees, deliver family homes and commemorate the history of the estate past present and future.

437. Comments were pre-dominantly positive and support was given to the vision for the area and evolution of the masterplan. However, concerns were also raised about gentrification and people being priced out of the area as well as the need for the project to minimise the impact of new buildings on the surrounding areas. Feedback from these events has informed the design development of the masterplan application

438. The report concludes that the applicant will continue to consult and engage with the local community through the regeneration programme. The statement sets out that they are continuing to work with schools and young people, local residents, the Creation Trust and other community organisations to deliver involvement and positive dialogue around planning, design and the regeneration of future phases.

439. Post-submission of the proposal to the planning authority, the applicant has hosted a series of consultation events where residents could find more about the application and see the final plans. Documents were also made available by appointment at Taplow House within the Estate during December (first round of consultation) and over the course of March (re-consultation).

Design Review Panel

440. The design of the outline has also been informed by a series of workshops with Southwark Design Review Panel. The workshops concentrated on early architectural proposals for the detailed planning application and the feedback used to inform the development of the parameter plans and Design Code. The Panel noted that there were many aspects that may benefit from being addressed on the parameter plans or Design Code. This included:

- Roof gardens to Towers
- Brick/cladding strategy for each phase
- Articulation intentions of the facades (formality/symmetry/ordering)
- Encourage use of patterns and decoration – provided they have meaning

- Stepping up locally to respond to a place or pick up a view
- Deeper facades on taller buildings – a proportionate approach to façade depth
- The concept of a ‘family’ of buildings in a phase
- Giving Burgess Park a sense of enclosure – allowing it to expand across Albany Road
- Double-height entrances, particularly for larger buildings/blocks
- Maisonettes around the perimeter of blocks
- Proportionality and order – blocks having an order that relates to their scale
- Set a target for dual aspect across the Masterplan

441. The Panel considered that the site represented an opportunity to create well designed and generous spaces and good quality accommodation for future occupiers in a desirable location and a well considered piece of the city. They challenged the designers to review the proposal so that they get a better understanding of the local context and invited amendment to the scheme to address their concerns.

Informal Presentations to Members

442. Planning Committee and local ward members were offered an informal presentation by the applicant. The first presentation took place on 17 September 2014 and was attended by Cllr Nick Dolezal, Cllr Darren Merrill, Cllr Maisie Anderson, Cllr Martin Seaton, Cllr Adele Morris, Cllr Paul Fleming and Cllr Sarah King.

443. A follow up presentation took place on 11 February 2015 and attended by Cllr Nick Dolezal, Cllr Adele Morris, Cllr Dan Garfield, Cllr Sarah King and Cllr Michael Mitchell.

444. The impact on local people and groups likely to be affected by the proposal is set out in this report.

Consultations

445. Formal consultation on the application was carried out by press notice, site notice and individual letters. Letters notifying neighbours of the application was sent to all properties on the Aylesbury Estate and within 150 metres of the Estate Boundary. Including properties facing on front Burgess Park on its southern edge. Approximately, 6,000 letters were sent by post for each consultation. 20 site notices were erected around the boundary of the site. Consultation was carried out jointly with the detailed application (FDS) and therefore many of the comments received related to both proposals. A list of all consultees can be made available upon request.

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

Consultation replies

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

Summary of neighbour consultation responses

448. 139 letters and comments were received in response to public notices. The majority of comments were received following re-consultation which commenced on March 2 2015. Of the responses received 34 originated from residents and local groups in and around the Aylesbury estate with a further 48 responses from further a field within the

borough. 40 were received from outside the borough and the UK and one response was received from Italy. Sixteen people did not leave an address or opted for their address not to be disclosed within this report.

449. The responses can be summarised as:
Support (4 Letters)
Comment (2 Letters)
Objection (133 Letters)

Demolition versus refurbishment

450. Various objections have cited concern regarding the decision to demolish and redevelop the estate as opposed to refurbishing the existing fabric. The main points of these objections are summarised and addressed below;
451. There is no justification for the demolition of the estate.
Response—Structural surveys have highlighted the extent of works needed to the existing fabric of the estate and it was concluded that the cost of refurbishing the estate to an acceptable standard would be prohibitive. Work to the individual blocks could not overcome the fundamental shortcomings of the layout of the estate, with its lack of active frontages, confusing and difficult pedestrian routes, and hostile architecture, and would limit opportunities for inward investment to support the regeneration.
452. Refurbishment of the estate would be a more sustainable option than demolition.
Response – Refurbishment of the Estate to a suitable level would have been prohibitively expensive and would not overcome the inherent design and efficiency shortcomings of the existing fabric. Redevelopment to provide well designed, safe, secure and energy efficient homes is considered a more sustainable approach for the long term.
453. The applicant has failed to provide supporting information to demonstrate the main alternatives studied by the applicant and an indication of the main reasons for the choice made, taking into account environmental effects;
Response – The principle of demolition and comprehensive redevelopment is established by the AAAP.

Re-provision of housing and affordable housing

454. The main points of the objections to have been summarised and addressed below. Further information on this topic can be found in the housing sections in the main body of the report.
455. There is a lack of clarity on the tenure of new homes.
Response – Three tenures are proposed under the outline proposal. Social rent, intermediate and private.
456. The scheme would result in the net loss of affordable housing and a net loss of social Rented housing
Response – The applicant has committed to delivering not net loss of affordable housing. Details are provided in the affordable housing re-provision section of this report.
457. There is a concern that the social rented housing will be become Affordable Rent

housing.

Response – The applicant has clarified that the target rent dwellings referred to in planning documentation are social rent in tenure.

458. The scheme is contrary to London Plan Policy 3.8 as it fails to provide a genuine choice of homes that people can afford.

Response – A range of tenures will be provided including social rent, intermediate and private tenures.

459. Affordable homes are unlikely to be affordable when rents are proposed at 80% of Market Rent.

Response – No affordable rent is proposed as part of the outline application.

Quality of accommodation, design and open spaces

460. Further detail on these issues can be found within the relevant sections in the main body of the report. The main points of objection on these topics are:

461. The proposal will result in the net loss of open space.

Response – Whilst there will be the loss of open space compared with the existing housing baseline, the proposed space will be of a much better quality.

462. The scheme is contrary to London Plan Policy 7.1

Response – The outline proposal is seeking to provide community facilities, places of work streets, neighbourhood and parks that will meet the needs of the community. The facilities will be accessible and foster interaction by virtue of the layout of the new neighbourhood compared to existing. New dwellings will be built to lifetime homes.

463. There is insufficient play space and recreation space for 12+

Response – The outline proposal is seeking to provide on-site playspace for all age groups. However it is recognised that it may be appropriate to provide some facilities off-site as well as there being a need for the proposal to contribute towards the more intense use of Burgess Park.

464. Lack of clarity on dwelling size standards.

Response – The proposed size of dwellings will be in accordance with the London Plan, the AAAP. South East London Wheelchair Housing Design Guidance Standards will apply for wheelchair accessible dwellings. In terms of private accommodation (and some types of intermediate accommodation) the minimum space standards given in the AAAP have since been overtaken by the more recently adopted borough-wide Residential design standards SPD. These more recent standards will apply.

465. Inadequate daylight in courtyards and private gardens.

Response – Achieving compliant sunlight levels within the private and communal amenity spaces for high density blocks will be challenging. The outline proposal is capable of providing well lit amenity space. This will need to be carefully considered at the reserved matters stage.

466. The private and intermediate dwellings have less generous floorspace than the affordable dwellings and this is discrimination.

Response – The AAAP sets different minimum flat sizes for social rented, intermediate and private flats. It states that the existing flats were built to 'Parker Morris' floorspace, plus an additional 10%. Following consultation with existing residents, it

was decided that the rented flats should be built to similar large dimensions, and that intermediate flats should also have enhanced floor areas. In terms of private accommodation (and some types of intermediate accommodation) the minimum space standards given in the AAAP have since been overtaken by the more recently adopted borough-wide Residential design standards SPD.

467. There is no parking allocated to visitors and no parking management plan.
Response – A new Controlled Parking Zone will be created and permits agreed as part of a Parking Delivery Plan.

468. No provision made for segregated cycle highway
Response – The applicant has revised the parameter plans to make allowance for a segregated cycle super highway along Thurlow Street.

Other points raised:

469. A number of objectors have indicated that they do not believe adequate provision has been made for leaseholders.

Response – The applicant has made some provision for leaseholders as part of the development.

470. Various responses offered comments on the planning application as opposed to points of objection or support and these are summarised below;

- The scheme should provide expressive architecture especially in the towers
- The design of buildings and materials should not be too repetitive
- Provision should be made for a places of religious worship as they provide vital emotional and spiritual services to the community
- The scheme should provide segregated cycle lanes
- Burgess park could be dominated by tall buildings impacting on visual amenity
- There should be a bus route along Albany Road linking Thurlow Street and Old Kent Road
- Barclays Bikes should be provided in the new development
- Traffic calming measures on Albany Road should be implemented to ensure vehicles travel no faster than 20mph
- Burgess Park Railings should not be removed from the park on Albany Road
- Adequate physical and social infrastructure should be in place for the new population (including energy, water, sewage, schools, doctors surgeries and hospitals)
- A high proportion of council and affordable housing should be provided to allow current residents to remain on the estate to retain local identity
- Little detail has been provided on how the proposed community space will be managed or used
- Inclusion of open spaces, cycle parking and community facilities is essential

471. The main points of support are outlined below;

- The buildings are not in a good condition and do not provide sufficient heating
- Regeneration is a positive thing for the area
- The current estate is unsightly and intimidating with a poor standard of housing
- The regeneration will bring a visual and atmospheric boost to the area
- Housing will be improved
- The site is in a prime location with excellent public transport links and extra housing will be easily absorbed into the area

- New healthy homes are needed as current homes suffer from mould, inside and out

Human rights implications

472. 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.
473. This application has the legitimate aim of providing new high quality homes, affordable housing, community uses, commercial and retail uses, new streets and open spaces as part of the Aylesbury Estate regeneration. The rights potentially engaged by this application, including the right to a fair trial and the right to respect for private and family life are not considered to be unlawfully interfered with by this proposal.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Site history file: TP/H1059 Application file: 14/AP/3844 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

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Gary Rice, Head of Development Management	
Report Author	Daniel Davies, Senior Planning Officer	
Version	Final	
Dated	14 April 2015	
Key Decision	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments sought	Comments included
Strategic Director of Finance & Corporate Services	No	No
Strategic Director of Environment and Leisure	No	No
Strategic Director of Housing and Community Services	No	No
Director of regeneration	No	No
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team		14 April 2015