

Item No:	Classification: Open	Date: 01 March 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/4337 for: Council's Own Development - Reg. 3 – 74-82 Rye Lane in front Of Peckham Rye Station and 2-10 Blenheim Grove, London, SE15 4RY

Update to paragraph 89 of the officers report

- 3.1 Air source heat pumps would provide 15% of the development's predicted energy requirements.

Additional responses received:

- 3.2 Seven objections including an objection from Peckham Vision have been received, together with five general comments and one representation in support. The grounds for objecting and commenting are as follows:

Consultation

- 3.3 Shortcomings in the CoDesign process, including any discussion about the extension to 2-10 Blenheim Grove – officer response – this is not a material planning consideration.
- 3.4 Late inclusion of the Equalities Impact Assessment on the Council's website – officer response – neighbouring residents were notified of the submission of this document and a 21 day re-consultation was carried out. Paragraph 113 of the officer report notes

that it had already been displayed on the Council's dedicated webpage before the planning application was submitted in October this year.

- 3.5 Lack of consultation with minority groups and existing tenants must be given priority and not priced out – officer response – paragraph 35 of the officer report describes the measures which have been taken to support existing leaseholders affected by the proposal. Paragraphs 100-104 deal specifically with equalities issues.
- 3.6 Inadequate consultation on the planning application, difficulties accessing information on the Council's website and lack of consultation on the addition of trees – officer response – appendix 1 of the officer report sets out the consultation carried out on the planning application. The documents are listed on the Council's website according to their title or the date they were uploaded. A condition is recommended requiring landscaping details to be submitted for approval which would include details of the new trees, and officers recommend that all residents who commented on this planning application be consulted on the landscaping conditions when they are received.
- 3.7 Further discussion with the community are required; the decision should be deferred or only elements linked to the creation of the square should be permitted to proceed – officer response – officers consider that the proposal would be acceptable and would comply with the Council's adopted planning policies.
- 3.8 Local artists and schools should be involved in designing the scheme – officer response – paragraphs 96-99 of the officer report set out the measures which were taken to involve the local community in the design of the proposals.

Principle of the proposed development

- 3.9 The arcade buildings could be remodelled rather than demolished in order to create additional pedestrian space in front of the station – officer response – The arcade buildings are identified as negative contributors in the Rye Lane Peckham Conservation Area Appraisal and officers raise no objections to their demolition to make a good sized public square.
- 3.10 One of the commercial units should be assigned to a news vendor – officer response – A news agents would fall within Use Class A1 (retail) and retail units would be incorporated into the scheme. Beyond this there is no scope to specifically require a news agent to be provided within the scheme.

Design and landscaping

- 3.11 Inappropriate design and materials for Blenheim Grove extension – officer response – this is considered in detail at paragraphs 54-55 of the officer report. The plans have been amended to omit polycarbonate to the extension and replace it with corrugated glass which would be a much more durable material and appropriate to the conservation area location.
- 3.12 Hard surfacing materials for the square should be York stone or cobbles which would be durable and would deter skateboarders; comments from the Victorian Society have

not been addressed and African references in the square misconceived; – officer response – officers are satisfied that the hard landscaping to the scheme would result in a high quality appearance which would provide an appropriate setting to the listed station building. The colour of the stone would be similar to cobbles found in the area and the chevron formation would not appear overly busy, being mostly discernible from the station platforms above. The Council's Highways Development Management Team has advised that York stone must be used for repaving the pavements around the edges of the site where necessary. A detailed landscaping plan could include measures to deter skateboarders.

- 3.13 Height of Blenheim Grove extension inappropriate, it would be unsymmetrical with the opposite side of the square and it would block the view of 133 Rye Lane from platforms 1 and 2; the building should simply be restored like its neighbour to the west – officer response – this is considered at paragraph 55 of the officer report. Views of 133 Rye Lane are not protected and it would still be visible from Blenheim Grove.
- 3.14 Inaccurate descriptions of surrounding buildings in the submission – officer response – the material provided in support of the application is sufficient to demonstrate the how the proposal would sit within the context of the existing surrounding development.
- 3.15 Harm to the setting of the listed station building – officer response – officers consider that the setting of the listed station would be enhanced, as set out at paragraphs 46-56 of the officer report.
- 3.16 A lighting artist should be instructed – officer response – the Design and Access Statement provides some detail about the lighting which is proposed, and a condition for a full lighting plan forms part of the draft recommendation.
- 3.17 Lack of space in the square for public events / contrary to funding requirements of the Greater London Authority (GLA) – officer response – the proposal would provide a 1,200sqm public square. The planters would incorporate seating and the wider square would include space for mobile traders and café seating, creating a vibrant and animated space. This could limit but would not necessarily preclude the use of the space for public events depending on their size and nature.
- 3.18 Design of structural supports for the station and metal canopies to the railway arches – officer response – the applicant has advised that it may be possible to re-use the existing platform supports once the northern arcade building has been demolished. However, this would not be known until demolition has taken place. The supports shown on the plans are the largest that would be required, and their simple, industrial appearance is considered to be appropriate.
- 3.19 Corten steel will rust and cause staining – officer response – corten steel can be treated to prevent rusting, and this would be considered when samples of the materials are submitted to the Council for approval.
- 3.20 The wider development could appear disjointed as proposal does not include the station, Dovedale Court and buildings on Holly Grove and Blenheim Grove – officer response – planning permission would be required for the redevelopment of these

additional areas, and consideration would be given to the use of materials to tie in with neighbouring sites to ensure consistency and coherence. Public realm including works to pavements would be overseen by the Council's Highways Development Management Team.

- 3.21 Landscape architects should be appointed – officer response –Landscape architects Fabrik have now been appointed and have advised on potential tree species and locations.
- 3.22 Lack of trees / new trees should not be in planters / no re-consultation carried out about the inclusion of trees – officer report – the plans were amended to include four trees and to show their indicative locations and species including Crab Apple, a Judas tree and a Rising Sun Tree. At this stage it is anticipated that three smaller trees would be provided in planters, and a larger tree would be provided planted in the ground. The detailed landscaping including tree species would be subject to a condition and the applicant would need to provide details of the planter sizes and soil volumes to ensure that the trees could thrive. Residents who commented on the application would be consulted on the landscaping details when they are received.
- 3.23 Vertical and edible plants should be included and a local growing group set up – officer response– detailed plant species would be secured through the landscaping condition. The setting up of a local group is welcomed, but could not be secured by way of a planning condition.
- 3.24 No reference to Townscape Heritage Initiative in the planning application documents – officer response – officers consider that the proposal would be of an acceptable design. It would remove the unsightly arcade buildings and reveal the splendour of the fine, listed station building, representing a significant enhancement to the local townscape and would not compromise the Townscape Heritage Initiative.
- 3.25 Lack of an overall public realm plan – officer response – In the event that planning permission is granted a s278 highways agreement would be required which would consider the public realm around the site in detail. This would be overseen by the Council's Highways Development Management Team which has been consulted on the planning application and is satisfied with the details provided.
- 3.26 Lack of individuality to shop fronts – officer response – this is considered in full at paragraph 53 of the officer report.

Amenity

- 3.27 Light pollution, loss of privacy and glare from the extension to Blenheim Grove –officer response - these matters are considered at paragraph 71 of the officer report.
- 3.28 Noise pollution and the possible use of the square by buskers / preachers / people with megaphones - officer response –Any noise nuisance arising from people playing amplified music and using megaphones could be dealt with under environmental protection legislation.

- 3.29 Possible use of terrace for parties and cinema screenings – officer response – A condition in the draft permission recommends limiting the hours during which it could be used to 10pm daily.
- 3.30 Loss of light test not carried out correctly as section taken too high on the neighbouring windows and a lower adjacent building – officer response – The 25 degree loss of light test was taken through 1a Blenheim Grove and the architect has confirmed that it has been carried out correctly. There is a lower, adjoining building to the east but its windows are set further back than 1a Blenheim Grove. There would be 12m between the properties facing each other across the street which is a typical relationship where properties face each other across a street. The structure would be lightweight in appearance and would not appear overbearing.
- 3.31 Glass community building affected by train and bus noise and not fit for purpose – officer response – the applicant would need to obtain Building Regulations Approval in order to construct the scheme, which would consider sound insulation. A conditions has also been recommended by the Council's Environmental Protection Team regarding internal noise levels, and this has been included in the draft recommendation.

Transport

- 3.32 Lack of taxi drop-off facilities – officer response – the proposal does not include taxi drop-off facilities and arrangements would remain as existing i.e. from Holly Grove and Blenheim Grove. It is not anticipated that the proposal would result in increased taxi use.
- 3.33 Question whether there is an approved traffic management plan for Blenheim Grove – officer response – the proposal does not include any changes to the existing traffic management arrangements on Blenheim Grove. The Transport Statement submitted with the application proposed that servicing for the southern part of the square take place from Blenheim Grove, but this would not have been possible without making changes to the road. The applicant has been advised of this and a condition requiring details of an alternative servicing arrangement has been included in the draft recommendation.
- 3.34 Inadequate disabled parking – officer response – there are disabled parking bays on Holly Grove and officers are satisfied these would be sufficient to serve the development.
- 3.35 Bus stops should be moved and Transport for London (TfL) should be made aware of this requirement – officer response – TfL are aware of the planning application and have commented on it. It falls within TfL's remit to relocate bus stops.

Maintenance

- 3.36 Maintenance of the public toilets should be conditioned – officer response – the public toilets would be maintained by the Council.

- 3.37 Other toilets within the scheme should be made publically accessible for as long as possible during the day – officer response - this would be a matter for the applicant when formulating a lease for the new community space.

Energy efficiency

- 3.38 Omitting the steel canopies from the railway arches would reduce energy use and could result in BREEAM 'excellent' being achieved – officer response – the energy efficiency of the building is predominantly limited by the conversion and extension of existing buildings. Given these constraints officers are satisfied with the energy efficiency measures incorporated into the scheme.
- 3.39 Solar panels should be provided on the roof of the extended building – officer response – this is addressed at paragraph 89 of the officer report; solar panels were considered through the energy statement and not found to be suitable for this development. Air source heat pumps are proposed instead.

1 x support

- 3.40 A vast improvement with popular local support.
- 3.41 Highways Development Management Team
- 3.42 The materials shown on the plans would be acceptable for the public square, but resurfacing the footways fronting the development would need to be completed in York Stone.

TfL

- 3.43 General cycle parking is a matter for the borough

Metropolitan Police

- 3.44 The applicant should consult with the police around security measures to make sure the new project incorporates measures that mitigate crime and criminality, and that pedestrians and travellers will feel safe at all times of the day and night while using the transport hub or new square. Strongly recommend that there is a condition that the development must achieve SBD commercial 2015 accreditation. Officer response this is covered by condition in the draft recommendation.

Environment Agency and Natural England

- 3.45 No further comments to add following re-consultation.

Network Rail (NR)

- 3.46 No objections. Request that the applicant continues to liaise with NR Asset Protection Team. Phasing plans may require agreement with NR and the train operating company if works are likely to affect the station and NR assets.

- 3.47 Officers have considered the additional representations received and the recommendation remains that planning permission should be granted.

Item 6.2 – 15/AP/3886 for: Full Planning Permission – 25-29 Harper Road, London SE1 6AW and Crown Court, Swan Street, London SE1 1DF

Harper Road

- 3.48 Community Infrastructure Levy (paragraph 94)
- 3.49 Amend the Mayoral CIL contribution to £202,686 and the Borough CIL contribution to £953,801 owing to a minor reduction in floorspace.

CIL expenditure

- 3.50 The Trinity Newington Residents Association has asked that CIL money from the scheme contribute towards addressing deficiencies in the Trinity Church Square Conservation Area, as set out in the Council's adopted Conservation Area, including replacing poor quality pavements with York Stone. Officers have advised that this could be added to the CIL list when it is reviewed by the Community Council later this year.

Amendments to the following conditions:

- 3.51 Condition 4 – material samples. Change the wording to enable the samples to be submitted prior to the commencement of above grade works for the relevant block, rather than prior to commencement of development.
- 3.52 Condition 8 – contamination study. Change the wording of this condition to enable demolition to take place before the details have to be submitted for approval.
- 3.53 Condition 9 – development in accordance with energy statement. Add the words 'unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority' to the end of this condition.
- 3.54 Condition 15 – landscaping. Change the wording to require the details to be submitted prior to the commencement of above grade works to the relevant block, rather than above grade works for the entire development.
- 3.55 Additional condition – surface water run-off:
- 3.56 No above grade works shall commence until details of a surface water drainage scheme, that achieves a reduction in surface water run-off to greenfield run-off rates for storm events up to a 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP), has been submitted to and approved in writing by Local Planning Authority. The surface water drainage scheme should incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), in accordance with the recommendations of the Southwark Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA), the London Plan (2011). The SuDS hierarchy within the London

Plan should be followed in the development of the surface water drainage scheme, with a preference for SuDS measures that control surface water at source.

3.57 Reason: To minimise the potential for the site to contribute to surface water flooding in accordance with saved policy 3.9 Water of the Southwark Plan, Strategic policy 13 of the Core Strategy (2011) and guidance in the Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (2009).

3.58 This is in response to an additional comment from the Council's Flood and Drainage Team.

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