

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|
| Item No: | Classification: Open | Date: 12 January 2016 | Meeting Name: Planning Committee |
| Report title: | | Addendum Late observations, consultation responses, and further information. | |
| Ward(s) or groups affected: | | | |
| From: | | Director of Planning | |

PURPOSE

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

RECOMMENDATION

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

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

3. Late observations, consultation responses, information and revisions have been received in respect of the following planning applications on the main agenda:

Item 6.1 – 15/AP/3508 for: Full Planning Permission – 94-116 Southwark Park Road, London, SE16 3RR

- 3.1. C
Clarifications
Paragraph 71 - The number of replacement trees in the proposed development is nine, not six.

- 3.2. I
In terms of affordable housing, it should be noted that the proposed development forms part of the off-site affordable housing provision for the 185 Park Street development, as detailed in the report. The committee report states at paragraph 23 that the development would provide 100% affordable housing and all of this will be provided as social rent Extra Care homes. The wording of the 185 Park Street Legal Agreement states that *the affordable Housing will be made available on Social Rented Terms or in the case of provision by United St Saviour Charity, on such terms approved in writing by the Council and which are deemed by the Council to be reasonably equivalent*. The agreed wording allows for the Southwark Park Road development to be provided as 100% social rent or a rent equivalent to it that would be approved by Southwark Council. This wording is required to accommodate United Saint Saviours Charity, who has charitable status and as such do not operate on normal commercial rental terms. This is a legal position and in practise the scheme would operate as a Social Rented development as stated in the report.

3.3. R
revised draft decision notice

Following further discussions with the applicant, minor changes have been made to the draft decision notice. The principal issues are the requirement for separate demolition and construction environmental management plans, clarification that several pre-commencement conditions exclude demolition from the definition of commencement, and some minor corrections. The updated decision notice is attached.

3.4. A
Additional Consultation Responses

An email has been received from the occupier of 1 Reverdy Road in relation to a legal 'Right of Way' extending from Reverdy Road to the rear garden of the dwelling at 1 Reverdy Road. Whilst issues relating to a 'Right of Way' are not planning matters, it should be noted that a gated access is shown on the plans indicating that an access from the rear garden of Reverdy Road will be maintained. Furthermore, Officers have been advised that the issue is still under further discussion between United Saint Saviours Charity, Southwark Council (as current landowner/freeholder) and the relevant parties.

Item 6.2 – 15/AP/3729 for: Full Planning Permission – Tower Bridge Business Complex (Plot 5), 100 Clements Road, London, SE16 4DG

3.5. A
Amendment to s106 agreement completion date

An error was made to the date specified in paragraph 1 b) of the main report. This date should be amended to read **30 April 2016**.

3.6. A
Amendment to condition No. 2

Since the publication of the main report, revised drawings have been received providing further clarification on the landscaping. The development would now be carried out in a single phase.

3.7. A
As such, the following plans are to be omitted from Condition No. 2 (Approved plans) and the list of drawing numbers.

Proposed Site Plan at Phase 2 ~~14109_02_(00)_P001~~
Proposed Site Plan Phase 3 ~~14109_03_(00)_P001~~
Proposed Ground Floor Plan at Phase 2 ~~14109_02_(00)_P100~~
Proposed Ground Floor Plan at Phase 3 ~~14109_03_(00)_P100~~
Proposed site location plan at phase 2 ~~14109_02_(00)_P002_P00~~
Proposed site location plan at phase 3 ~~14109_03_(00)_P002_P00~~

The same condition should **add** the following plan numbers:

Proposed Site Plan at Phase 1 **14109_01_(00)_P001_P01**
Proposed Ground Floor Plan at Phase 1 **14109_01_(00)_P100_P01**

3.8. R
Reference to building height

The main report, at paragraph 53, refers to the overall building height being 22m. This height is correct when measured from ground level, but when described as AOD, would be slightly higher at 23.48m AOD to parapet level, and 24.80m AOD to plant level. Due to a lack of clarity in the submitted documents, the building was assumed to be within the approved parameters but is actually 1.03m higher on the Drummond Road frontage.

The daylight and sunlight tests were undertaken on the AOD height and therefore remain correct, ensuring that there would be no additional impact to these neighbours.

The building would continue to sit appropriately within the streetscape and would have an acceptable relationship with the retained building J which it would sit adjacent to.

3.9. C
Contamination and flood risk assessment

The Environment Agency (EA) has provided additional comments on the most recent submissions. The EA is satisfied with the revised FRA, particularly on the finished ground levels and the EA also provided further advice on emergency planning.

3.10. A
further ground contamination assessment and remediation strategy was submitted by the applicant (dated 27th October 2015) and the EA agreed that, on the basis of the information provided, remedial measures are not required for the protection of controlled waters.

3.11. C
Condition No. 4 sets out the requirements in respect of land contamination. The October 2015 submission goes further and provides a Phase 2 contamination site investigation and risk assessment. No response on the October version of the contamination assessment has yet been received from the Council's Environmental Protection Team and Officers therefore consider that the condition shall remain.

3.12. C
Comments from the Director of Planning
The recommendation remains that planning permission be granted with conditions and subject to completion of a s106 agreement.

REASON FOR URGENCY

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

REASON FOR LATENESS

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

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

| Background Papers | Held At | Contact |
|-------------------|---|--|
| Individual files | Chief Executive's Department 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2QH | Planning enquiries telephone: 020 7525 5403 |